APPLICATION FOR:
•STP-U FUNDS (Project Development, Preservation, Modernization)
•TAP FUNDS (Transportation Alternatives Program)
FY 2016-2018

Project Information				
Project Title:	Central Lane Active-Transportation System SurveY (CLASSY)			
Agency Applying:	Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (CLMPO)			
Applying for STP or TAP:	STP			
Fiscal Year(s):	2016			
Staff Contact:	Josh Roll		**Staff Phone:**	541-682-2454
Staff Email:	jroll@lcog.org			
Project Type:	☐ Preservation	☐ Modernization	☐ Project Development	☐ Other
Mode:	☐ Roadway	☐ Transit	☒ Bike/Ped	☐ Other

Project Description:

The Central Lane Active-Transportation Survey System (CLASSY) project would purchase and install 7-12 permanent bicycle counters at strategic locations (site selection process described below) in the Eugene-Springfield area. These installations would augment permanent counters currently funded and to be installed in FY 16.

The Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (CLMPO) manages the Regional Bicycle Count Program (RBCP) which collects bicycle count data at count stations throughout the Eugene-Springfield area using a consistent methodology that captures comparable snapshots of bicycle traffic over time and across seasons. The CLASSY project would significantly augment the data currently being gathered by collecting data 24-hours a day, 365 days a year, adding greater resolution to the bicycle traffic picture at the permanent count sites and augmenting the information collected at locations currently being surveyed.

The CLASSY project would see permanent count stations set up in both Eugene and Springfield, with the intention of capturing a diverse set of continuous counts for both facility and user type. Final site selection for each of the permanent counters would be made in collaboration with CLMPO partner agencies including the City of Eugene, City of Springfield, and Willamalane.

Description of Need or Problem

In support of surface transportation planning programs and projects, the CLMPO RBCP currently collects 24-36 hour bicycle traffic counts at locations throughout the region four times a year coinciding with each yearly season (i.e. Winter, Spring, Summer, Fall). These snapshots offer more detailed information than has ever been collected on bicycle traffic for the region and provide useful information for gauging bicycle demand changes over time, inputs to safety analysis and public health monitoring, and validation information for other analysis tools. However, the bicycle traffic information currently being collected is limited in

overall temporal resolution because it is only collected four times per year primarily during weekdays.

Continuous bicycle traffic count data from permanent bike counters would produce important information for estimating annual bicycle counts at those locations and allow for the augmentation and expansion of shorter term counts currently being collected (i.e. expanding daily counts currently being collected to annual average counts). These data would serve as important metrics for monitoring bicycle infrastructure investments and would support both the City of Eugene (2011) and City of Springfield's (1998) stated goals of collecting these data.

Before the RBCP was implemented the only reliable data source to track levels of bicycling over time came from the U.S. Census *Means of Journey to Work* information. A formalized counting program augmented with continuous counters represents a progressive step towards monitoring changes in active mode transportation at a much more detailed level.

These data and the augmentation components they provide will also serve to support safety and public health analyses as these examinations typically require observed bicycle traffic counts (WHO 2011; Miranda-Moreno et al. 2011, Wang and Nihan 2004, Sælensminde 2004). The data collected will thus be directly utilized in planning for facilities that will enhance and encourage active mode travel.

Eligibility	**YES**	**NO**
RTP Is the project listed in, consistent with, or able to be added to financially constrained RTP, during project time frame?	☒	☐
Timeliness. Does the agency have the ability to utilize funds in FY requested?	☒	☐
Federal Eligibility. Is project eligible for STP-U or TAP funding under Federal guidelines[1]	☒	☐
Local Match. Can agency provide minimum required matching funds (10.27% of project total)?	☒	☐
Sufficient Funding. Has sufficient funding been identified to complete project/phase	☒	☐

[1]For STP-U, see http://www.lcog.org/documents/meetings/mpc/0609/MPC5f-Attachment1-FederalGuidelinesforSTP-U.pdf
For TAP, see http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/guidance/guidetap.cfm

Cost Estimate/Funding Needs		
Total Estimated Project Cost	$115,000	
Funding Available	$15,000	Source: In kind partner contribution
	$	Source:
	$	Source:
Amount of STP-U/TAP Request (Indicate to the right funding source requested)	**$100,000**	

Note: Total non-federal funding must meet minimum match requirement of 10.27% of Total Project Cost.

Regional Priorities				
☐	**PRESERVES EXISTING TRANSPORTATION ASSETS**			
Goal:	**Meet a minimum Pavement Condition Index (PCI) on high volume Arterials, Collectors and Multi-Use Paths.**			
Measures:	**Roadway** ☐	**Transit Route** ☐	**Bike Lanes** ☐	**Multi-Use Path** ☐
	Functional CLASSY:		**Transit Volume:**	
	PCI:		**Freight Volume:**	
	Traffic Volume:		**Bike/Ped Counts:**	
Qualitative Assessment:				

Regional Priorities				
☒	**PRESERVES OR ENHANCES TRANSIT SERVICES**			
Goal:	**Maintain or increase transit ridership.**			
Measures:	**Existing ridership:**		**Projected ridership**	
	Existing service hrs:		**Proj. service hrs:**	
	Ex. area of service:		**Proj. service area:**	
	Title VI Issues:		**Title VI Issues:**	
Qualitative Assessment:				

Active modes are important methods for accessing transit. The National Household Survey (2009) shows that 89% and 1% of transit trips are accessed by walking and bicycling respectively. For the CLMPO region, walking and bicycling to transit is also important. A recent on-board transit survey for Lane Transit District (LTD) demonstrated that 85% and 4.5% of all transit trips are accessed by walking and bicycling respectively. Having the ability to measure active modes traffic in a meaningful way is important to preserving access to transit by allowing planners and policy makers to adequately assess infrastructure investments.

Regional Priorities				
☒	**IMPROVES SAFETY**			
Goals:	**Reduce the number and severity of accidents involving pedestrians, bicyclists, and/or vehicles. Address areas perceived to have safety issues to increase the use of multi-use paths.**			
Measures:	**Roadway** ☒	**Multi-Use Path** ☒	**Sidewalk** ☐	**Mixed** ☒
	Vehicular Crash Data:		**Traffic Volume:**	
	Bicycle Crash Data:		**Transit Volume:**	
	Pedestrian Crash Data:		**Bike/Ped Counts:**	

Qualitative Assessment:

Highway safety programs require volume counts to identify areas that have abnormal incident rates. In addition to auto counts, bicycle and are needed to characterize bike/ped and motorized traffic collisions (Miranda-Moreno et al. 2011, Wang and Nihan 2004, Sælensminde 2004). Without these data, analyzing changes in safety outcomes is more difficult due to lack of knowledge of changes in the exposure rates of bike/peds to autos. Data collected through the CLASSY project would allow for normalization of safety incidents by using traffic count information, and would lead to identification of projects to mitigate hazards to people riding bikes.

Regional Priorities				
☒	**REDUCES GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**			
Goals:	**Reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing congestion, increasing operational efficiency, supporting alternative modes, and managing transportation demand.**			
Measures:	**Congestion Reduction** ☐	**Operational Efficiency** ☐	**Alternative Modes** ☐	**Trans. Demand Management (TDM)** ☐

Qualitative Assessment:

Active modes have great potential in reducing greenhouse gases (GHG) from transportation sources. Existing studies have demonstrated that shifting more motorized travel to active modes could reduce GHG emissions. (Frank et al. 2010, Lindsay et al. 2011). The CLASSY project would serve to augment the RBCP in order to monitor the active transportation system and gauge changes in these modes traffic allowing for informed metrics on reduction of GHG from bicycle travel.

Additional Project Benefits	
Connectivity	Will completed project fill in key gaps in the transportation system, complete system components, or provide better pedestrian, bicycle, or roadway connectivity at a regional scale?
Measures:	
Multiple Modes	How will completed project benefit more than one mode or purpose (i.e., roadway & transit, bicycle & roadway users, or roadway & identified freight route)?
Measures:	
Congestion Reduction	Will completed project reduce congestion through provision of additional capacity or critical link or other means?
Measures:	
Freight	Will completed project improve the freight system and freight movement?
Measures:	
Public Health	Will the completed project provide public health benefits?
There is strong evidence linking active transportation to positive health outcomes. Research demonstrates that people who participate in active mode travel are more likely to meet physical activity recommendations by engaging in as much as twice as much physical activity. (Berrigan et al. 2006; Genter et al. 2008; Dill 2009). More trips taken by active mode also has the potential to reduce vehicle miles traveled by motorized vehicles, thus reducing health risks associated with emissions from motorized traffic (Chen 2008).	
Measures:	
Economic Development	Will the completed project promote or support economic development?
Measures:	
Other	Are there other benefits that the completed project will provide?
Measures:	

Other Project Information
Scope of improvement, i.e., regional, community, neighborhood, local
Ratio of STP-U Overhead to Overall Project Cost
Opportunity Costs, i.e., cost of not doing activity/project
APPLICATION DUE DATE: **JULY 24, 2015**
PLEASE SUBMIT APPLICATION ELECTRONICALLY TO PAUL THOMPSON, LCOG pthompson@lcog.org

Citations:

Berrigan, D., et al., *Active Transportation Increases Adherence to Activity Recommendations.* Journal of Preventative Medicine, 2006. 31(3): p 210 - 216

Chen, H., M.S. Goldberg, and P.J. Villeneuve, *A Systemic Review of the Relation between Long-term exposure to Ambient Air Pollution and Chronic Diseases.* Rev Environ Health, 2008. 23(4): p243-97.

City of Eugene: Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. March 2012. http://www.centrallanertsp.org/sites/default/files/Eugene%20PBMP%20Final%20small.pdf (retrieved April 2013)

City of Springfield: Springfield Bicycle Plan. June 1998. http://www.ci.springfield.or.us/pubworks/EngineeringTransportation/documents/SpringfieldBicyclePlan.pdf (retrieved April 2013)

Dill, J., *Bicycling for Transportation and Health*: *The Role of Infrastructure*. Journal of Public health Policy, 2009. 30:p S95-S100.

FHWA. (2009). National Household Travel Survey. Retrieved March 2013, http://nhts.ornl.gov. Data Processed By Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization

Geneter, J.A., et al., *Valuing the Health Benefits of Active Transport Modes,* in New Zealand Agency Research Report. 2008, new Zealand Transport Agency.

Frank, L.D., et al., *Carbonless Footprints: Promoting Health and Climate Stabilization through Active Transportation.* Preventative Medicine 2010. 50: p S99-S105

Lindsay G., et al., *Moving urban trips from cars to bicycles: impact on health and emissions.* Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health.

Sælensminde, K. *Cost-Benefit analyses of walking and cycling track networks taking into account insecurity, health effects and external costs of motorized traffic.* Transportation Research Part A: A Policy and Practice. Vol. 38, Issue 8, October 2004, Pages 593–606

World Health Organization. *Health Economic Assessment Tools (HEAT) for Walking and for Cycling Methodology and User Guide, Economic Assessment of Transport Infrastructure And Polices.* 2011

Wang, Y., and N. L. Nihan. Estimating the Risk of Collisions Between Bicycles and Motor Vehicles at Signalized Intersections. *Accident Analysis and Prevention,* Vol. 36, 2004, pp. 313–321.