

# THE CASE FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION - Mobility

Getting around our neighborhoods, cities and regions is a basic function of daily life, whether it be accessing jobs, grocery shopping or visiting friends and family. Providing our citizens with accessible, convenient, and affordable means to meet these daily needs is a key component of our quality of life.

Active transportation provides three important benefits to local mobility:

**More people are walking and biking, especially in more urban areas**— Bicycling alone increased 70% between 2007 and 2012, and biking and walking make up over 13% of all trips in the SCAG region.

**Increased access to jobs and other destinations** – walking and biking provides residents with more choices in transportation (including connections to public transit), reducing costs of parking, gas and automobile maintenance.

**Less congestion** – congestion is usually the result of too many cars for the capacity of the roadway. By enabling more people to walk and bike (including to access public transit), we can more effectively use the available roadway.

Urban Density in SCAG Region	2012	
	Walk Trips	Bike Trips
Very Urban	16.7%	1.4%
Mostly Urban	14.5%	1.9%
Semi Urban	11.5%	1.4%
Suburban	10.6%	1.2%
Semi Rural	7.0%	1.0%
Rural	9.8%	1.2%

## Congested?

Pedestrians and bicyclists take up less space and use less infrastructure resources which reduces congestion and makes our communities more attractive places to live.



### Why Invest in Active Transportation?

1. **Safety:** While biking and walking make up over 13% of all trips, they made up 32% of all traffic fatalities in the SCAG region in 2013. In our urban areas, their fatality rate is even higher.
2. **Mobility:** The existing infrastructure for bicycling is fragmented, forcing bicyclists onto busy streets. For pedestrians, many sidewalks are broken and not usable for wheelchair users. Connecting the networks can increase safety and numbers of walkers and bikers.

3. Connectivity: SCAGs 2016 Regional Transportation Plan proposes to:
  - (1) Increase biking and walking connections to transit
  - (2) Connect cities with dedicated bike routes
  - (3) Increase connections for biking and walking to business centers, main streets and activity centers
  - (4) Make neighborhoods safer to walk and bike, repairing sidewalks, reducing traffic speeds, and connecting to local destinations.

Changes in California law now require us to build transportation systems that benefit all roadway users. An automobile should be a choice, not a requirement, particularly for trips less than three miles. Too often, roads, neighborhoods and cities have been designed to move vehicles, and not pedestrians or bicyclists. If we design are cities for cars, we get cars. If we design cities for people, what are the possibilities?

**Mobility-related case study references**

Location	Theme	Case Study Results
U.S. National	Job Creation	Pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure projects create 8–12 jobs per \$1 million of spending. Road infrastructure projects create 7 jobs per \$1 million of expenditures. <sup>i</sup>
U.S. National	Reducing Congestion	Traffic congestion in 2011 caused Americans in urban cities to travel an additional 5.5 billion hours. This means, on average, each car commuter spends roughly 40 hours and over \$800 per year waiting in traffic. <sup>ii</sup>
Pikes Peak, CO	Local Economy	It was estimated that a \$1.00 investment in biking could yield \$1.80 to \$2.70 in direct economic benefits to the local area. <sup>iii</sup>
Fort Worth, TX	Local Economy	Retail sales increased 163% between 2009–2011 after a bicycle lane was installed in the City of Fort Worth along with improved bicycle parking. <sup>iv</sup>
U.S. National	Housing Prices	Traffic calming infrastructure reduces volumes on residential streets by several hundred cars per day, and increases home values by an average of 18%. A 5 to 10-mph reduction in traffic speeds increased adjacent residential property values by around 20%. <sup>v</sup>

<sup>i</sup> Garrett-Peltier, H. (2010). Estimating the Employment Impacts of Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Road Infrastructure Case Study: Baltimore. Retrieved from [http://www.downtowndevelopment.com/pdf/baltimore\\_Dec20.pdf](http://www.downtowndevelopment.com/pdf/baltimore_Dec20.pdf).

<sup>ii</sup> Schrank D. et al. (2012). TTI’s 2012 Urban Mobility Report. Texas A&M Transportation Institute. <http://d2dtl5nnlpfr0r.cloudfront.net/tti.tamu.edu/documents/mobility-report-2012.pdf>.

<sup>iii</sup> Steer Davies Gleave for the Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments <http://www.walkbikeconnect.org/downloads/Economic%20Impact%20of%20Cycling%20March%202015%20FINAL.PDF>

<sup>iv</sup> Fort Worth South, Inc. (2011). Near Southside Dashboard, Second Half 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.fortworthsouth.org/wpcontent/uploads/2012/02/Dashboard-FWSI-2H-2011.pdf>.

<sup>v</sup> Cortright, J. (2009). Walking the Walk: How Walkability Raises Home Values in U.S. Cities. Retrieved from <http://www.ceosforcities.org/research/walking-the-walk/>.