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Goal of the Report Card

• To assess the extent to which the U.S. population and U.S. communities meet selected standards for participating in walking and providing physical and social supports for walking behavior.
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Methodology

• Creation of the Panel
• Selection of Factors
• Definition of the Factors
• Identification of Data Sources
• Specification of Indicators
• Adoption of a Grading System
• Assignment of Grades to Factors
## Grading Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Percentage of persons who engaged in a specified walking behavior</th>
<th>Percentage of states that met a specified standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>70-89%</td>
<td>70-89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>50-69%</td>
<td>50-69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>30-49%</td>
<td>30-49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt; 30%</td>
<td>&lt; 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC</td>
<td>Incomplete. At the present time, there is insufficient information available to assign a grade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factors

- Person-Level
  - Adult Walking Behavior
  - Children and Youth Walking Behavior

- Community-Level
  - Pedestrian Infrastructure
  - Safety
  - Pedestrian Policies
  - Institutional Policies
  - Public Transportation
  - Walkable Neighborhoods
  - Walking Programs
# Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Walking Behavior</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and Youth Walking Behavior</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Infrastructure</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Policies</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Policies</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkable Neighborhoods</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Programs</td>
<td>INC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adult Walking Behavior
Children and Youth Walking Behavior
Institutional Policies
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Adult Walking Behavior

**Definition:** Adults in all demographic subgroups report walking on a regular basis for transportation, work, recreation, and/or planned exercise.
Adult Walking Behavior

**Indicator:** Percent of adults who report walking for transportation or leisure in at least one bout of 10 minutes or more in the preceding 7 days

**Surveillance System:** National Health Interview Survey 2015, Cancer Control Supplement
Adult Walking Behavior

Grade and Rationale
Slightly half (63%) of adults report walking for transportation or leisure in at least one bout of 10 minutes or more in the preceding 7 days.
Adult Walking Behavior

- Gender differences in rates
- Little improvement over time
- Data collection relies on self-report
- Across surveys, assessment of walking differs
Children and Youth Walking Behavior

**Definition:** School-age children and youth walk to and from school on a regular basis.
Children and Youth Walking Behavior

**Indicator:** Percent of K-8 students who usually walk or bike to school as reported by parents

**Surveillance System:** National Household Travel Survey, 2009
Children and Youth Walking Behavior

Grade and Rationale
Less than 30% of children and youth walk to and from school on a regular basis
11% walk to school
15% walk home from school

F
Children and Youth Walking Behavior

- Mode of transportation to and from school has dramatically changed over time
- Distance from a child’s home to school is a strong determinant
- Data from parent, and only collected for K-8
Institutional Policies

**Definition:** Workplaces, schools and other institutions have adopted policies that support safe and enjoyable walking.
Institutional Policies

Indicator: Percent of states earning at least 25/35 points on Safe Routes To School funding and practices

Surveillance System: Safe Routes To School, National Partnership, 2016 State Report Cards
Institutional Policies

Grade and Rationale
Less than 30% of states (n = 10) have state legislation and appropriations for a Safe Routes to School Program.
Institutional Policies

- Institutionalized policies PLUS funding are key
- Five other states are “close” to meeting criteria
- Data reliant on FHA FMIS and state transportation departmental data
Pedestrian Policies
Safety
Walking Programs
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Pedestrian Policies

**Definition:** Communities have adopted policies that are consistent with a complete streets model; that is, streets are built for all users, including pedestrians and bicyclists.
Pedestrian Policies

**Indicator:** Percent of states earning at least 20/30 on Complete Streets Policies point system

**Surveillance System:** Safe Routes To School, National Partnership, 2016 State Report Cards
Pedestrian Policies

Grade and Rationale

Less than half of states (n = 21) meet the standard of at least a score of 20 on the 30-point scale of Complete Streets Policies developed by the Safe Routes To School (SRTS) 2016 State Report Cards.

D
Pedestrian Policies

• 4 states are close to meeting the standard (50% is within reach!)

• Complete Streets definitions vary

• Enforcement is questionable

• SRTS Report Cards only reflect Complete Streets policies adopted at the state level
Safety

**Definition:** Communities create infrastructure and establish policies and practices so that pedestrians are safe from motor vehicles, criminal behavior, and other personal threats.
Safety

Indicator: Percent of states with fewer than 0.75 pedestrian fatalities per 100,000 population

Safety

Grade and Rationale
Less than 30% of states (n = 4) had fewer than 0.75 pedestrian fatalities per 100,000 population
Safety

• Safe and comfortable access for all forms of transportation, including walking, decreases pedestrian fatalities and increases walking for leisure and utilitarian purposes

• Safety for pedestrians = proper lighting, separate travel lanes for cars and people, and lower traffic speeds

• Pedestrians are over-represented in all traffic deaths

• Rural states are more likely to meet or come close to meeting the standard
Walking Programs

**Definition:** Structured, organized activities that promote and enable walking for transportation, work, recreation, and/or exercise
Walking Programs

**Indicator:** Percent of states within which communities consistently provide structured programs that promote and enable walking for transportation, work, recreation, and/or exercise

**Surveillance System:** Not available
Walking Programs

Grade and Rationale
No existing database or surveillance system monitors provision of community walking programs on a national basis in the United States
Walking Programs

• Few best practice models exist, and those that do exist have not been widely disseminated

• Most existing programs have limited reach – i.e., they engage a small percentage of community members

• Inconsistent or no evaluation

• Need to develop and implement a system for monitoring the status of U.S. communities with regard to providing programs aimed at promoting walking.
Pedestrian Infrastructure
Walkable Neighborhoods
Public Transportation
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Pedestrian Infrastructure - F

- Communities provide sidewalks, walking trails, and other infrastructure that supports safe and enjoyable walking

- Per Capita Funding if 3% of surface transportation funding (currently 1.5%)

- $5.26 per capita for biking and walking projects (National average is $2.47)

- Only 5 States met or exceeded the standard
  - Alaska $11.58
  - Rhode Island $10.29
  - Vermont $8.50
  - Delaware $8.28
  - Montana $5.49
Walkable Neighborhoods - D

• Neighborhoods are designed to support walking for transportation, work, recreation, and planned exercise.

• Percent of states with at least 30% of the population living in highly walkable neighborhoods

• 32% of States in compliance (16 of 50 States)
  • Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, and Washington
Public Transportation - F

• Community members have access to and utilize a well-developed public transportation system.

• Percent of states with at least a 6% public transportation commute share

• US 5.1% commuting trip involve public transportation or transit (0.4 to 27%)

• 14% (7 out of 50 states)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another way we’re measuring the walking movement
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Walking as a Social Movement

• The walking movement is a **coordinated and organized** effort between many different types of organizations to **re-prioritize** public and institutional **values** toward safe and **just**, walkable communities in all places.

• The walking movement mobilizes organizations to translate their values into actions in order change the rules of the game.
## Change Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Potential Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values</strong></td>
<td>(1) attitudes toward real estate/home ownership, (2) Percent commuters who walk, (3) MPO's &amp; regional councils with scoring criteria favoring active transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy</strong></td>
<td>(1) Complete Streets Policy Adoption, (2) Safe Routes to School infrastructure and funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diverse Relationships &amp; Strategic Cross Sector Collaborations</strong></td>
<td>(1) Schools with joint programs/degrees supporting cross-sector health &amp; transport work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>(1) Mayors signing campaigns for Vision Zero, (2) State has a goal to increase walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity/Access</strong></td>
<td>(1) Ped infrastructure investments are prioritized to decrease disparity, (2) trends in media of &quot;walking as a right&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Constructs within the Walking Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>re-prioritizing public and institutional values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>mobilizing new values into action (i.e, policies) to change the game's rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Relationships &amp; Strategic Cross Sector Collaborations</td>
<td>creating and maintaining strategic and coordinated new relationships, and interactions between diverse organizations and across sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>local, on the ground, organizations and advocates launch organized action for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity/Access</td>
<td>The work toward safe, walkable communities for all is done with a lens on social justice and equity even in the face of push-back</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data collection and scoring

• Using new and existing data to look at indicators individually and regionally.
Some interesting findings...

• 36 states have a specific goal to increase walking *(source: 2016 Benchmarking Report)*

• 15 cities have committed to Vision Zero 8 of those cities are in CA *(source: Vision Zero map)*

• 45 States have at least 1 city with a Complete Streets policy *(source: NCSC Database)*
  • 18 states have 10 or more cities with CS Policies
  • NJ has 117 policies

• 4 states have none of the above commitments/goals*
Some interesting findings...

• There are only 5 schools with accredited joint degree programs between health and planning (source: CEPH)

Things to come...

• Regional analysis
• Information on values (NAR) and access (media analysis)