

Tom Rogers

From: Mark Egge <mark@eateggs.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2019 6:56 PM
To: Lacie Kloosterhof
Cc: Cathy Costakis (costakisce@gmail.com); Chris Mehl; cob@espt.com; George Thompson; Henry Happel; Jennifer Madgic; Lauren Waterton; Paul Spitler; Tom Rogers; Chris Saunders
Subject: Growth Plan Transportation Objectives & Metrics
Attachments: Egge Transportation Objective and Metric Suggestions.docx

Planning Board Members, Planning Staff—

In preparation for our continued discussion of growth plan metrics on 6/4/19, I have attached (and pasted below) a short document with suggested metrics to measure progress toward our accessibility and mobility goals.

I've listed seven proposed metrics. Five of these proposed metrics are simple look-ups from national sources (implying minimal burden to maintain).

Finally—invoking the right of perpetual reconsideration (after missing the May 14th meeting where these were discussed)—I've also included a set of suggested objectives to support our accessibility and mobility goals that I believe may more readily yield progress toward our goals.

Thank you for your consideration,

Mark Egge
542 N Black Ave, Bozeman, MT 59715

A CITY THAT PRIORITIZES ACCESSIBILITY AND MOBILITY CHOICES | Our City fosters the close proximity of housing, services, and jobs, and provides safe, efficient mobility for pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and drivers.

Goal: Accessibility to jobs, services, and amenities for users of all modes

Rationale: property values, talent attraction, job creation, transportation costs, livability, improved public health, reduced injuries and deaths from car crashes and air pollution, climate change, equity, community and social capital.

I worry that the current list of objectives is very focused on pathways and trails. In my view, these objectives are more appropriate under the “City Influenced by our Natural Environment, Parks, and Open Space” vision statement, to the extent that our existing pathways and trails serve primarily recreational—not mobility—purposes. Instead, I would propose the following objectives:

Objectives:

1. Prioritize mixed-use land use patterns. Encourage and enable the development of housing, jobs, and services in close proximity.
2. Develop safe, connected, permeable and complimentary transportation networks for pedestrians and mobility-impaired users; bicyclists and other medium-speed users (bicycles, e-bikes, electric scooters, etc.); and, motor vehicles.
3. Make investment decisions that prioritize the mobility of pedestrians, then cyclists, then transit users, then automobiles.
4. Create inviting places to walk.
5. Develop an interconnected network of low-stress bicycle facilities such that at least 80% of households and 80% of jobs are within ½ mile of the network.
6. Develop a trunk network for high-frequency, priority transit service connecting commercial districts, dense residential areas, employment centers, and other significant demand generators.

Indicator	Why track this?	Data Needed	Notes
Walk Mode Share	Indicates effectiveness at building a walkable city	Census – ACS Journey to Work	Each mode should be tracked individually, because each mode requires different strategies.
Bicycle Mode Share	Indicates effectiveness at building a bikable city	Census – ACS	
Transit Mode Share	Indicates effectiveness at building a city well-served by transit	Census – ACS	
Bike Accessibility: Percent of jobs and residents within 1/2 mile of a low-stress bike facility (Level of Traffic Stress 1)	Indicates effectiveness at building a connected network of low-stress bicycle facilities.	Census - LODS, bike facility network	LTS 1: protected facility or low-speed, low-volume road, e.g. buffered bike lane, cycle track, bicycle boulevard
Transit Accessibility: Percent of jobs and residents within 1/4 mile of a bus route, or 1/2 mile of a high-frequency express service route	Measures the coverage of the transit network. (should exclude routes with headways > 30 minutes)	Census - LODS, GTFS	Willingness to walk is greater for high-frequency transit

In my view, Bikescore, Walkscore, etc. are good measures for broad multimodal interconnectivity, but lack a direct connection to the outcomes of achieving our objectives (they're a bit of a black box, and don't reflect how many people are actually walking, biking, or taking transit). These broad metrics seem appropriate for the goal of "Ensure multimodal connectivity within and

between districts” under “A City Bolstered by Downtown and Complementary Districts,” but I believe our mobility goals deserve more specific metrics that directly connect to our effectiveness at accommodating each mode.

Goal: Enhance pedestrian, bicyclist, and vehicular safety measures throughout the City

Objective: Adopt a Vision Zero policy

For improving transportation-related safety, Vision Zero is the gold standard, encompassing a host of strategies that improve safety for all users.

Indicator	Why track this?	Data Needed	Notes
Bike/Ped Safety: Count of Pedestrian and Bicyclist Severe and Fatal Injuries	Nationally used measure of bike/ped safety	NHTSA FARS	Not the best measures, to the extent that these events are (fortunately) very rare and random variation can mask the impact of interventions. Calculating as a 5-year rolling average helps reduce noise.
Traffic Safety: Count of Severe and Fatal Injuries	Nationally used measure of traffic safety	NHTSA FARS	

A CITY THAT PRIORITIZES ACCESSIBILITY AND MOBILITY CHOICES | Our City fosters the close proximity of housing, services, and jobs, and provides safe, efficient mobility for pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and drivers.

Goal: Accessibility to jobs, services, and amenities for users of all modes

Rationale: property values, talent attraction, job creation, transportation costs, obesity, health care costs, injuries and deaths from car crashes and air pollution, climate change, equity, community and social capital.

I worry that the current list of objectives is very focused on pathways and trails. In my view, these objectives are more appropriate under the “City Influenced by our Natural Environment, Parks, and Open Space” vision statement, to the extent that our existing pathways and trails serve primarily recreational—not mobility—purposes. Instead, I would propose the following objectives:

Objectives:

1. Prioritize mixed-use land use patterns. Encourage and enable the development of housing, jobs and services in close proximity.
2. Develop safe, connected, permeable and complimentary transportation networks for pedestrians and mobility-impaired users; bicyclists and other medium-speed users (bicycles, e-bikes, electric scooters, etc.); and, motor vehicles.
3. Make investment decisions that prioritize the mobility of pedestrians, then cyclists, then transit users, then automobiles.
4. Create inviting places to walk.
5. Develop an interconnected network of low-stress bicycle facilities such that at least 80% of households and 80% of jobs are within ½ mile of the network.
6. Develop a trunk network for high-frequency, priority transit service connecting commercial districts, dense residential areas, employment centers, and other significant demand generators.

Indicator	Why track this?	Data Needed	Notes
Walking Mode Share	Indicates effectiveness at building a walkable city	Census – ACS Journey to Work	Each mode should be tracked individually, because each mode requires different strategies.
Bicycle Mode Share	Indicates effectiveness at building a bikable city	Census – ACS	

Transit Mode Share	Indicates effectiveness at building a city well-served by transit	Census – ACS	
Bike Accessibility: Percent of jobs and residents within 1/2 mile of a low-stress bike facility (Level of Traffic Stress 1)	Indicates effectiveness at building a connected network of low-stress bicycle facilities.	Census / LODES, bike facility network	LTS 1: protected facility or low-speed, low-volume road, e.g. buffered bike lane, cycle track, bicycle boulevard
Transit Accessibility: Percent of jobs and residents within 1/4 mile of a bus route, or 1/2 mile of a high frequency express service route	Measures the coverage of the transit network. (Should exclude routes with headways > 30 minutes)	LODES, GTFS	Willingness to walk is greater for high-frequency transit

In my view, Bikescore, Walkscore, etc. are good measures for broad multimodal interconnectivity, but lack a direct connection to the outcomes of achieving our objectives (they're a bit of a black box, and don't reflect how many people are actually walking, biking, or taking transit). These broad metrics seem appropriate for the goal of "Ensure multimodal connectivity within and between districts" under "A City Bolstered by Downtown and Complementary Districts," but I believe our mobility goals deserve more specific metrics that directly connect to our effectiveness at accommodating each mode.

Goal: Enhance pedestrian, bicyclist, and vehicular safety measures throughout the City

Objective: Adopt a [Vision Zero](#) policy

For improving transportation related safety, Vision Zero is the gold standard, and encompasses a host of strategies that improve safety for all users.

Indicator	Why track this?	Data Needed	Notes
Bike/Ped Safety: Count of Pedestrian and Bicyclist Severe and Fatal Injuries	Nationally used measure of bike/ped safety	NHTSA FARS	Not the best measures, to the extent that these events are (fortunately) very rare and random variation can mask the impact of interventions. Calculating as a 5-year rolling average helps reduce noise.
Traffic Safety: Count of Severe and Fatal Injuries	Nationally used measure of traffic safety	NHTSA FARS	