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USDOT Policy Statement (2010)

“... DOT encourages transportation agencies to go beyond the minimum requirements, and proactively provide convenient, safe, and context-sensitive facilities that foster increased use by bicyclists and pedestrians of all ages and abilities...”

United States Department of Transportation Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Regulations and Recommendations

Signed on March 11, 2010 and announced March 15, 2010

Purpose

The United States Department of Transportation (DOT) is providing this Policy Statement to reflect the Department’s support for the development of fully integrated active transportation networks. The establishment of well-connected walking and bicycling networks is an important component for livable communities, and their design should be a part of Federal-aid project developments. Walking and bicycling foster safer, more livable, family-friendly communities; promote physical activity and health; and reduce vehicle emissions and fuel use. Legislation and regulations exist that require inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian policies and projects into transportation plans and project development. Accordingly, transportation agencies should plan, fund, and implement improvements to their walking and bicycling networks, including linkages to transit. In addition, DOT encourages transportation agencies to go beyond the minimum requirements, and proactively provide convenient, safe, and context-sensitive facilities that foster increased use by bicyclists and pedestrians of all ages and abilities, and utilize universal design characteristics when appropriate. Transportation programs and facilities should accommodate people of all ages and abilities, including people too young to drive, people who cannot drive, and people who choose not to drive.

Policy Statement

The DOT policy is to incorporate safe and convenient walking and bicycling facilities into transportation projects. Every transportation agency, including DOT, has the responsibility to improve conditions and opportunities for walking and bicycling and to integrate walking and bicycling into their transportation systems. Because of the numerous individual and community benefits that walking and bicycling provide — including health, safety, environmental, transportation, and quality of life — transportation agencies are encouraged to go beyond minimum standards to provide safe and convenient facilities for these modes.

Authority

This policy is based on various sections in the United States Code (U.S.C.) and the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) in Title 23—Highways, Title 49—Transportation, and Title 42—The Public Health and Welfare. These sections, provided in the Appendix, describe how bicyclists and pedestrians of all abilities should be involved throughout the planning process, should not be adversely affected by other transportation projects, and should be able to track annual obligations and expenditures on nonmotorized transportation facilities.
Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares: A Context Sensitive Approach

NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide (2011/2012)

FHWA supports the use of these resources to further develop nonmotorized transportation networks, particularly in urban areas.
Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks (2016)

The multimodal design guidelines for the rest of us.
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alta
Focus on Complete Networks of Facilities

Facility Categories:
• Mixed Traffic
• Visually Separated
• Physically Separated
Multimodal Facilities

- Application
- Benefits
- Case Studies
- Guidance
  - Geometric Design
  - Markings
  - Signs
  - Intersection treatment
  - Implementation
  - Accessibility
Speed and Volume
Most appropriate on streets with low to moderate volumes and moderate speed motor vehicles.

Network
Applies to constrained connections between built-up areas.

Land Use
For use outside, between and within built-up areas with bicycle and pedestrian demand and limited available paved roadway surface.
Mixed Traffic

- Yield Roadway
- Bicycle Boulevard
- Advisory Shoulder
Yield Roadway

- Shared Space
- Residential Context
- Unpaved Roadside
- Narrow Two-way Travel Area
Manzanita, OR
Population: 3,000 (Seasonal)
Bicycle Boulevard

Speed Reduction Measures

Mixed Traffic

Route Markings
Ocean City, NJ
Population: 11,400
Advisory Shoulder

- Two-way Center Travel Lane
- Yield to Bicyclists
- Contrasting Paving Materials
- Permissive broken lane line
Advisory Shoulder

Note: Advisory shoulders are a new treatment type in the United States and no performance data has yet been collected to compare to a substantial body of international experience. In order to install advisory shoulders, an approved Request to Experiment is required as detailed in Section 1A.10 of the MUTCD. FHWA is also accepting requests for experimentation with a similar treatment called “dashed bicycle lanes.”
Bloomington, IN
Population 82,575
Edina, MN
Population: 49,300
Visually Separated

• Paved Shoulder
• Bike Lane
• Pedestrian Lane*

*The Pedestrian Lane treatment is located in chapter 5 of the Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks document, but is included in this category for informational purposes.
Paved Shoulder
Paved Shoulder

- Additional Width
- Robust Edge Striping
- Bicycle Tolerable Rumble Strips
- Contrasting Paving Material
Townsend, MT
Population: 7,700
Bike Lane
Lyndonville, VT
Population: 1,200
Pedestrian Lane
Pedestrian Lane

Double Solid Line

Pedestrian Lane Markings

High Visibility Crosswalk

Bicyclists in Roadway

Pedestrian Lane Markings
Physically Separated

• Shared Use Path
• Sidepath
• Sidewalks
• Separated Bike Lanes
Sidepath
South Lake Tahoe, CA
Population: 20,100

Photo by Tahoe Regional Planning Association (TRPA)
Shared Use Path
Shared Use Path

Crossing Enhancements

Path Priority
Bentonville, AR
Population: 40,000
Sidewalk
Denmark, SC
Population: 3,400
Separated Bike Lane
Separated Bike Lane

Clear Sight Distance

Pedestrian/Bicyclist Separation
Jackson Hole, WY
Population: 9,600
Additional Topics

Main Streets

Bridges

Traffic Calming

School Connections
Questions & Comments