



Bicycle Program

February 2018



ROADWAY TO BIKEWAYS PLAN (2018 Addendum)

Roadways to Bikeways Plan (2018 Addendum)

Ada County, Idaho

Prepared For:
Ada County Highway District

Prepared By:
Kittelson & Associates, Inc.
101 South Capitol Boulevard, Suite 301
Boise, ID 83702
(208) 338-2683

Project No. 20987.0

February 2018

Adopted by ACHD Commission: February 28, 2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Project Technical Team

Brooke Green, MBA, PCED – ACHD Project Manager
Christy Foltz-Ahrlachs – ACHD Communications
Drew Pfefferle - ACHD Commuteride
Gail Jorgensen – ACHD Geographic Information Systems
Ray Hoobing – ACHD Bicycle Advisory Committee
Tim Curns, PE, PTOE – ACHD Traffic

Kittelson & Associates, Inc.

Nick Foster, AICP
Andy Daleiden, PE
Caitlin Shankle
Makenzie Cooper

2017-2018 ACHD Bicycle Advisory Committee

David Fotsch - Chair
Ray Hoobing – Vice Chair
Lisa Brady - Secretary
David Guiotto
Brent Jennings
Wava Kaufman
Brian Leisle
Kristin Little
John Mooney, Jr.
Gary Segers

A special thanks to the Boise Bike Boulevard Coalition for their efforts helping to identify the Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network through outreach to several neighborhood associations.



Bicycle Program

Roadways to Bikeways Plan (2018 Addendum) Executive Summary

INTRODUCTION AND CONTENTS

The Ada County Highway District (ACHD) is updating elements of the 2009 Roadways to Bikeways Plan. Since this plan was completed in 2009, ACHD and its partner agencies have adopted several plans, including eight neighborhood-level bicycle and pedestrian plans, and policy documents that affect bicycle planning and design in Ada County. Planning and engineering practices related to bicycling have also advanced since 2009, including innovations in separated facility design and increased understanding of factors that influence where and when people will bike. This addendum modernizes the 2009 plan by incorporating these recent plans and advances in the state-of-the practice into the following components:

- *Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures* – Updated goals and objectives for ACHD’s Bicycle Program are described later in this summary.
 - *Bicycle Program Status Report* – The Bicycle Program Status Report, to be prepared annually, will track progress ACHD has made to meet its goals and objectives related to bicycling. It is included as Attachment “A.”
 - *Bicycle Facility Selection Matrix and Definitions* – This matrix will guide ACHD to select the appropriate bicycle facility for a given road to meet ACHD’s goal of providing for people with a wide range of ages and abilities. The accompanying definitions further describe the different treatment types included in the matrix and provide additional context for when a certain treatment may be most effective. Both documents are included as Attachment “B.” ACHD will use this tool at the planning level as it begins to scope and plan for bicycle facility improvements.
 - *Prioritization Criteria* – Criteria that will be used to prioritize bicycle projects for programming into the ACHD Integrated Five-Year Work Program (IFYWP) in the Community Programs category. Prior to this addendum, the Community Programs prioritization criteria was focused on sidewalk projects. The criteria are included as Attachment “C.”
 - *Planned Bicycle Network Maps* – Two updated bicycle networks are defined in Attachment “D”:
 - The Existing and Planned Bicycle Network maps illustrate the existing network and all planned additions to it. These planned connections come from several adopted plans, including all eight neighborhood plans, corridor plans, ACHD’s Capital Improvements Plan (CIP), and ACHD’s Master Street Map, as well as the Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network and other additions identified through this process.
-

The level of facility shown on this map is based on information available today. Prior to designing any facility shown on the map, updated information on traffic speeds and existing and projected volumes will be reviewed to determine the appropriate facility level.

- The Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network identifies a regional-level bicycle network that primarily uses low-stress bikeways (defined in this addendum as low-volume and low-speed local roads where biking is likely to be comfortable for people with a wide range of ages and abilities) to connect Ada County residents and visitors across neighborhoods. This network is a subset of the Existing and Planned Network. During the design phase, bikeways will be evaluated for appropriate treatments, which may include, but are not limited to, pavement markings, wayfinding signage, and improved crossings where the routes cross roads with more traffic traveling at higher speeds. ACHD will closely evaluate through the design process the appropriate bicycle facility treatments needed to ensure that crossing and route connections along higher volume roads meet the vision of a low-stress bike network.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

ACHD reviewed and revised existing goals and objectives from the 2009 plan. The focus of the review was to ensure that only goals and objectives that can be directly influenced by ACHD were retained. ACHD's Bicycle Program's updated goals and objectives are as follows:

GOAL #1: Complete and maintain a bicycle facility network that maximizes safety, provides connectivity, and supports the bicycle as a viable transportation option among the residents of Ada County and its six cities.

GOAL #2: Promote bicycle safety and increased bicycling within Ada County and its six cities.

These goals will be achieved by accomplishing the following objectives:

OBJECTIVE #1: Implement the Planned Bicycle Network to support bicycling as a viable transportation option for Ada County residents with a wide range of ages and abilities.

OBJECTIVE #2: Maintain bicycle routes in a state of good repair in order to ensure they are consistently available for use.

OBJECTIVE #3: Promote awareness of existing bicycle routes and features and support encouragement programs.

OBJECTIVE #4: Facilitate coordination and cooperation among local jurisdictions in implementing the Roadways to Bikeways Plan recommendations.

PROJECT PROCESS

This addendum has been completed by ACHD with input from Ada County residents and visitors, the Cities of Boise, Eagle, Garden City, Kuna, Meridian, and Star, and Ada County. The project was guided by a Technical Team consisting of ACHD staff representing planning, engineering, geographic



information systems (GIS), communications, and Commuteride. Public feedback was obtained through four public meetings, held in conjunction with meetings of ACHD's Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC):

- *Meeting #1* – Introduced the project and discussed goals and objectives.
- *Meeting #2* – Discussed the results of the comfort ratings analysis.
- *Meeting #3* – Reviewed prioritization criteria and a sample application of the criteria.
- *Meeting #4* – Evaluated the proposed Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network. This meeting was supplemented with an online comment map.

In addition to these meetings, ACHD staff met with several neighborhood associations and its partner agencies and received comments through e-mails and phone calls. Public feedback was used to refine each component of this addendum. Notably, the volume and nature of the comments received from attendees at the first three meetings resulted in the development of the Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network map and the fourth public meeting. Comments from these meetings also resulted in additions to the overall Existing and Planned Bicycle Network map and modifications to the Goals and Objectives.

The comments received from attendees at the first three meetings resulted in the development of the Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network map and the fourth public meeting.

IMPLEMENTATION

ACHD will review the newly created Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network to identify bikeway segments that will be prioritized and implemented on a project-by-project basis through ACHD's Integrated Five-Year Work Plan (IFYWP). ACHD will track and report annually on the efforts made in achieving identified goals and objectives through the newly created Annual Report Card.

Attachment A Annual Report Card



Bicycle Program

BICYCLE PROGRAM STATUS REPORT

BICYCLE PROGRAM STATUS REPORT

The proposed Bicycle Program Status Report tracks the annual progress ACHD has made to meet its goals and objectives related to bicycling. The report card tracks different performance measures across each of seven categories. The seven categories and the individual measures within each category are described below.

Funding

Funding metrics are shown to provide the public an account of the amount of resources being spent on bicycling. The two metrics in the Funding category are:

- *Budget* – This metric shows the amount of construction funds spent by ACHD on bicycling projects. This includes stand-alone bicycle projects, as well as the percentage of construction funds for roadway widening or rebuilding projects that are spent on bicycle facilities (to calculate this latter component, ACHD will likely need to determine a percentage of construction funds that can be assumed to go toward bicycling infrastructure on its roadway projects with a bicycle component).
- *% of ACHD's Construction Budget* – This metric shows the % of ACHD's overall construction budget that is spent on bicycling infrastructure (i.e., the proportion the amount in the previous metric represents of ACHD's overall construction budget).

Network Build-Out

This category tracks ACHD's progress in building out the bicycling network. Different roadways require different facilities in order to be comfortable for a wide range of people. As such, the metrics in this category cover a range of facility types. The metrics in the Network Build-Out category are:

- *Miles of Level 3 Bike Routes (and increase from the previous year)* – The total number of lane miles (e.g., one mile of road with protected bike lanes on both sides of the roadway would have two lane miles of protected bike lanes) of Level 3 bike routes (i.e., protected bike lanes, raised bike lanes, cycle tracks, and multi-use paths). This number should be calculated based on the latest ACHD GIS inventory, which will require ensuring that the inventory tracks these types of bike lanes separate from other types.
 - The increase in the number of lane miles is tracked on a year-over-year basis.
- *Miles of Level 2 Bike Routes* – Similar to the previous metric, but for Level 2 Bike Routes (i.e., Buffered Bike Lanes, Conventional Bike Lanes, and Shoulder Bikeways).

- *Miles of Level 1 Bike Routes* – Similar to the previous metrics, but for Level 1 Bike Routes (i.e., Low-Stress Bikeways). For the purposes of reporting this information, a Low-Stress Bikeway is a street that meets the criteria in ACHD’s Bike Facility Matrix and accompanying Facility Definitions related to motor vehicle speeds and volumes and has been designated as such a route through the following treatments:
 - On-street markings (e.g., sharrows) and/or signage (e.g., wayfinding or branding signage); and
 - Appropriate crossings of collector and arterial roads.
- *% of Plan Network Built* – This tracks the proportion of ACHD’s planned network that has been built out. This can be calculated from ACHD GIS information of the planned and built networks.

Access

This category measures the level of access and connectivity provided by ACHD’s bicycling network. The metrics in this category include:

- *% of Population within ¼-mile of Low-Stress Network* – The percentage of Ada County’s population located within ¼-mile of built-out sections of ACHD’s Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network. This metric is calculated in GIS using Census data.

Safety

Safety related improvements are tracked based on implementation of measures that may reduce the frequency and/or severity of crashes involving people bicycling. Crash data metrics are not tracked on an annual basis, because the number of crashes that happens on an annual basis is relatively low and subject to fluctuation for a variety of reasons, making it difficult to draw meaningful conclusions from the data.

The metrics in this category include:

- *Traffic Calming Projects* – The number of traffic calming projects completed in the year. Reducing the speeds at which people drive can reduce the severity of any crash between a person driving and a person bicycling.
- *New or Enhanced Crossings* – The number of crossings implemented, or enhanced, during the year (does not include ADA-related improvements, which are made for people walking only). Improving crossings can reduce the likelihood that a crash occurs.

Maintenance

Continuing to maintain the bicycle network once components of it are built is important so that the network is consistently available for use. Maintenance is monitored through the following metrics:

- *Average Pavement Rating of Designated Bike Routes and Roads with Bike Lanes* – The average of the pavement rating on all roads that either 1) are designated as shared bike routes or 2) have a bike lane of any type.
- *Miles of Bike Lane Swept* – The number of miles of roadway with bike lanes that have been swept during the year.

Outreach Efforts

ACHD completes a variety of outreach efforts to educate the public about the bicycling network, how to properly use new treatments, resources available to support bicycle commuting, and bicycle safety. Much of this outreach is completed through ACHD's Commuteride program. Metrics in this category include:

- *Employers Engaged* – The number of employers that ACHD Commuteride has connected with in the year as part of its efforts to promote transportation options.
- *Informational On-site Events* – The number of informational on-site events that ACHD Commuteride has hosted during the past year.
- *Printed Bike Maps Distributed* – The number of printed bike maps ACHD has distributed in the past year.
- *Other* – ACHD may also choose to highlight other outreach efforts it has completed during the year, such as the launch of an educational campaign about a new treatment type.

Local Planning Efforts Completed and Adopted

ACHD coordinates with local jurisdictions to plan for and implement the bicycling network. This category highlights the number of planning efforts related to the bicycling network that have been completed and adopted in the past year with cooperation from one or more of ACHD's partner cities and Ada County.



Bicycle Program

2018 STATUS REPORT



FUNDING

\$#

BUDGET

X%

ACHD'S CONSTRUCTION BUDGET



NETWORK BUILD-OUT

#

MILES OF LEVEL 3 BIKE ROUTES (PROTECTED/RAISED BIKE LANES, CYCLE TRACKS, & MULTI-USE PATHS)

↑X

MILES FROM 2017

#

MILES OF LEVEL 2 BIKE ROUTES (BUFFERED OR CONVENTIONAL BIKE LANES, SHOULDER BIKEWAYS)

↑X

MILES FROM 2017

#

MILES OF LEVEL 1 BIKE ROUTES (LOW-STRESS BIKEWAYS)

↑X

MILES FROM 2017

X%

PLAN NETWORK BUILT



ACCESS

X%

POPULATION WITHIN 1/4-MILE OF LOW-STRESS NETWORK

↑X%

INCREASE IN POPULATION WITHIN 1/4-MILE OF LOW-STRESS NETWORK FROM 2017



SAFETY

#

TRAFFIC CALMING PROJECTS

#

NEW OR ENHANCED CROSSINGS



MAINTENANCE

GOOD

AVERAGE PAVEMENT RATING OF DESIGNATED BIKE ROUTES & ROADS WITH BIKE LANES

#

MILES OF BIKE LANES SWEEP



OUTREACH EFFORTS

#

EMPLOYERS ENGAGED*

#

INFORMATIONAL ON-SITE EVENTS*

#

PRINTED BIKE MAPS DISTRIBUTED

LAUNCHED

BIKE BOX EDUCATIONAL CAMPAIGN



LOCAL PLANNING EFFORTS COMPLETED & ADOPTED

5

ADOPTED PLANS

NORTH BOISE NEIGHBORHOOD BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN PLAN

FAIRVIEW AVENUE & MAIN STREET LOCAL STREETS IMPROVEMENT PLAN

MASTER STREETS MAP UPDATE

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN UPDATE

2017-2021 INTEGRATED FIVE-YEAR WORK PLAN



*COMPLETED BY ACHD COMMUTERIDE TO DISCUSS TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS

Attachment B Bicycle Facility Selection Matrix and Definitions



ACHD Bicycle Facility Definitions

The following definitions are accompanied by the Bicycle Facility Selection Matrix. Both the definitions and matrix are meant to be guidance for District staff in selection of a bicycle facility type that fits the context of the road in question and is comfortable for cyclists of a wide range of ages and abilities. Special consideration should be given to adjacent schools, parks, and other land use types that may affect how the facility will be used. This may result in selecting a higher level of protection if the roadway in question falls within a grey boundary between levels in the Bicycle Facility Selection Matrix. Consideration should also be given to the ability to maintain a specific bike facility, the effects of on-street parking, effects on adjacent transit stops, driveways spacing, and drainage implications.

1

LOW-STRESS BIKEWAYS – A designation for a street with low volumes and speeds where motorists and bicyclists share the same space. Traffic calming and other treatments along corridors may be used to manage speeds and volumes, creating an environment that is comfortable for a wide range of ages and abilities. Low-stress bikeways utilize appropriate crossing treatments at intersecting arterials and collectors, per Traffic’s crossing treatment matrix. The desirable range of traffic volumes for a low stress bikeway is $\leq 1,500$ ADT, but may be up to 3,000 ADT for connections in constrained situations. The desirable speed range is ≤ 25 mph. Sharrows may be used in conjunction with signage to aid cyclists in navigating jogs/turns in the bikeway.

2

SHOULDER BIKE LANE – A bike facility meant primarily to accommodate long distance recreational and commuter cyclists, typically in rural or suburban fringe locations. Typical width is 5’ of pavement with no curb or gutter. Typical speeds are up to 40 mph and volumes are less than 15,000 ADT.

CONVENTIONAL BIKE LANE – A bike facility meant to accommodate a wide range of ages and abilities on urban and suburban arterial and collector roadways. Minimum width is 5’ of pavement exclusive of the adjacent gutter, but may need to be up to 6’ if adjacent parking activity is allowed. Typical speeds are up to 35 mph and typical volumes are less than 15,000 ADT.

3

BUFFERED BIKE LANE – A bike facility meant to accommodate a wide range of ages and abilities on busier and faster urban and suburban arterial and collector roadways. Width of bike lane is 5’ of pavement, exclusive of the adjacent gutter, and includes a painted buffer of 2’-3’ between bike lane and vehicle lane. Typical speeds are above 25 mph and typical volumes are greater than 3,000 ADT.

3

PROTECTED BIKE LANE – A facility meant to accommodate a wide range of ages and abilities on busier and faster urban and suburban arterial and collector roadways. Width of bike lane is 5’-7’ of pavement, exclusive of adjacent gutter, and includes a buffer or at least 3’ in width between the bike lane and travel lane. The buffer area also includes a measure for protection, which may include 30” candles, curbing, planters (license agreement with another agency may be required), or parking. If parking is used as a buffer, passenger side door swing must be taken into account as

3

well as restrictions on parking to allow for adequate sight distance at driveways and side streets. Typical speeds are above 25 mph and typical volumes are greater than 15,000 ADT.

RAISED BIKE LANE – A bike facility meant to accommodate a wide range of ages and abilities on busier and faster urban and suburban arterial and collector roadways. Minimum width of bike lane should be 5' of pavement. Lane should be raised above the adjacent travel way approximately 3" and separated from traffic by a 4:1 mountable curb, as well as from the sidewalk by a 3" curb. Typical speeds are above 25 mph and typical volumes are 15,000 ADT or more. Raised bike lanes are not appropriate on roadways with frequent commercial driveways.


CYCLE TRACK – A two-way facility exclusively for bikes meant to accommodate a wide range of ages and abilities on busier and faster urban and suburban arterial and collector roadways. Cycle tracks are not advised as a substitute for bike lanes if frequent access to the bike facility is needed from land uses on both sides of the roadways. Width of facility is 10'-12' and may or may not be raised above the roadway. A buffer of at least 2'-3' must be included between the cycle track and adjacent travel lane. Special attention must be paid to protected intersection and driveway treatments to address crossing angles, corner radii, and queuing area for bikes and pedestrians. Typical speeds are ≥ 35 mph and typical volumes are 15,000 ADT or more.

MULTI-USE PATHWAY – A two-way facility meant to accommodate a wide range of ages and abilities, as well as pedestrians, on busier and faster urban and suburban arterial and collector roadway. Multi-use pathways are not advised as a substitute for sidewalks and bike lanes if frequent access to the facility is needed from land uses on both sides of the roadways. Width of facility should be 14' or larger to accommodate cyclists and pedestrians and should be separated from the roadway by a buffer of at least 2-3'. Special attention must be paid to protected intersection and driveway treatments to address crossing angles, corner radii, and queuing areas for bikes and pedestrians. Typical speeds of adjacent roadway are ≥ 35 mph and typical volumes are $\geq 15,000$ ADT.



Bike Facility Matrix

TRAFFIC
Average Daily Traffic | All lanes, both directions
1,000 vehicles per day or 100 vehicles per hour



SPEED 85th-percentile speed (preferred), design speed or posted speed (MPH)

Attachment C Prioritization Criteria



Bicycle Program

Community Programs Bicycle Prioritization Criteria

PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA

The following criteria will be used to prioritize bicycle projects for programming into the Ada County Highway District (ACHD) Integrated Five-Year Work Program (IFYWP) in the Community Programs category. Future neighborhood plans will also use these criteria for prioritizing bicycle projects.

Technical criteria are presented first. Programming criteria are then described in the final page attached here. Programming criteria are the same for all Community Programs projects currently. It is expected that ACHD will be adding a criterion for whether a project is identified in a neighborhood plan to the Programming criteria.

Technical Criteria

The following criteria are used to assess projects from a technical perspective. A maximum of 65 points is possible from these criteria.

Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network Build-out (15 points possible)

The Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network will provide important connections across neighborhoods that are suitable for a wide range of people. The regional network will link up local connections to provide access between neighborhoods and to popular destinations. Therefore, building out the regional network is a priority to ACHD and projects that build out the network are given highest priority. Projects that augment the regional network by either connecting to the network or by building out the supporting local network are also awarded points in this category. It is ACHD's goal to provide a bike network that is usable to a wide range of people. Only projects that meet this goal by implementing appropriate facilities, using ACHD's Bicycle Facility Selection Matrix, are awarded points in this category (i.e., a project providing a Level 2 facility on a road that should have a Level 3 facility is not awarded any points).

- 0 Project recommends a treatment type not in conformance with the facility selection matrix.
- 3 Project will provide a Level 2 or 3 facility not connected to a Low-Stress Bikeway identified in the Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network.
- 6 Project will provide a Level 1 facility not connected to a Low-Stress Bikeway identified in the Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network.

- 9 Project will provide a Level 2 or 3 facility connected to a Low-Stress Bikeway identified in the Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network.
- 12 Project will provide a Level 1 facility connected to a Low-Stress Bikeway identified in the Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network.
- 15 Project will implement a Low-Stress Bikeway identified in the Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network.

How this category is scored: Review the proposed project against the Regional Low-Stress Bikeway map to determine the possible points. Then, review the proposed project against the Bicycle Facility Selection Matrix to confirm the appropriate facility type is identified.

Connectivity Related to Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network (15 points possible)

This criterion focuses on creating a complete network by closing gaps, providing new facilities, and/or removing barriers. Priority is given to projects that connect between routes shown on the Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network map.

- 0 Project does not connect/extend any existing or planned routes or low-stress bikeways.
- 1 Project will provide a Level 2/3 facility parallel and within 1/2 mile of an existing low-stress bikeway.
- 3 Project will provide a Level 1 facility parallel and within 1/4 mile of an existing or future Regional Low-Stress Bikeway.
- 6 Project will provide a Level 2/3 facility parallel and within 1/2 mile of a future Regional Low-Stress Bikeway.
- 9 Project will provide a Regional Low-Stress Bikeway that does not connect to another existing Regional Low-Stress Bikeway.
- 12 Project will provide a Regional Low-Stress Bikeway perpendicular and connecting to an existing Regional Low-Stress Bikeway.
- 15 Project will connect 2 or more existing Regional Low-Stress Bikeway.

How this category is scored: Review the proposed project against the Regional Low-Stress Bikeway map to determine the possible points. This may be most easily completed in GIS software in order to measure distance.

Distance to School (15 points possible)

Projects that provide an appropriate network within close proximity to schools (i.e., K-12 schools and colleges/universities) are able to serve a high volume of active transportation users and help create safe routes to schools. Distance to School is given more weight than other criterion because schools are a generator of activity and are a high priority for ACHD and partner cities.

- 0 No schools within 1.5 mile
- 6 >0.5 and <=1.5 miles of a school
- 9 >0.25 and <0.5 miles of a school
- 12 <=0.25 mile of a school
- 15 Project directly connects to a school.

How this category is scored: Review the proposed project against the existing roadway network and school locations to determine the highest score that would be possible (e.g., if a project directly connects to one school and is also within 1 mile of another school, the project would receive 15 points). Distance measurements should be based on the actual travel distance to the school from the project and not on the straight line (i.e., “as the crow flies”) distance. This measurement can be readily accomplished using the Network Analyst extension in ArcMap software.

Distance to Civic Facilities/Transit/Commercial Destinations (15 points possible)

This criterion focuses on the proximity to popular destinations including commercial areas, civic facilities, community centers, and transit routes. Civic facilities include libraries, city halls, and parks.

- 0 Not within 1-mile of identified destinations.
- 2 Within 1-mile of one identified destination.
- 5 Within ½-mile of one identified destination.
- 10 Within ½-mile of two identified destinations.
- 15 Within ½-mile of at least three identified destinations.

How this category is scored: Review the proposed project against the existing roadway network and a set of identified commercial destinations (e.g., COMPASS maintains a dataset of identified commercial and civic destinations, City of Boise Activity Centers). Distance measurements should be based on the actual travel distance to the destinations from the

project and not on the straight line (i.e., “as the crow flies”) distance. This measurement can be readily accomplished using the Network Analyst extension in ArcMap software.

Demographic Data (5 points possible)

Providing a bicycle network for people who are dependent on modes of transportation other than vehicles is very important. The transportation dependent population index is percentage of the transportation population as a percentage of the overall population. The transportation dependent population includes residents on a block group level that are over 65 years old, under 18 years old, with income under 200% of the poverty level, with a disability, and number of households with no vehicles. All census block groups in Ada County were evaluated.

- 1 Serves census block group with a transportation disadvantaged index in the bottom 25% of Ada County census block groups.
- 3 Serves census block group with a transportation disadvantaged index lower than 50% of other Ada County census block groups, and higher than the bottom 25%.
- 4 Serves census block group with a transportation disadvantaged index higher than 50% of other Ada County census block groups, and lower than the top 25%.
- 5 Serves census block group with a transportation disadvantaged index in the top 25% of Ada County census block groups.

How this category is scored: Review the proposed project against the locations where residents with transportation dependent characteristics live, as calculated using the transportation dependent population (TDP) index. This index is calculated for each Census block group in Ada County using data from the most recent American Community Survey as follows:

*TDP Index by Census block group = (Number of residents over 65 years old + number of residents under 18 years old + number of residents in poverty + (number of Households without vehicle * average number of people in Ada County household) + number of residents disabled) / Total Population of Ada County*

If a proposed project overlaps with more than one Census block group, it is scored based on the Census block group with the highest TDP index. This analysis may be most easily completed in GIS software.

Attachment D Planned Bicycle Network Maps




Figure 1
Existing and Planned Bicycle Network
Ada County, ID

H:\2020\09\7 - Roadways to Bikeways\Updates\Proposed Regional Bike Network_v2.mxd - cshantle - 11:13 AM 3/7/2018




Figure 2
Existing and Planned Bicycle Network
Star/W Eagle/NW Meridian

ACHD will closely evaluate through the design process the appropriate bicycle facility treatments needed to ensure that crossing and route connections along higher volume roads meet the vision of a low stress bike network.

H:\2020987 - Roadways to Bikerways\Updates\Proposed Regional Bike Network_v2.mxd - cshantle - 11:14 AM 3/7/2018




Figure 3
Existing and Planned Bicycle Network
Eagle/N Meridian/W Boise

ACHD will closely evaluate through the design process the appropriate bicycle facility treatments needed to ensure that crossing and route connections along higher volume roads meet the vision of a low stress bike network.





Figure 4
Existing and Planned Bicycle Network
West, North & Central Boise

ACHD will closely evaluate through the design process the appropriate bicycle facility treatments needed to ensure that crossing and route connections along higher volume roads meet the vision of a low stress bike network.



H:\2020\0927 - Roadways to Bikerways\Updates\Proposed Regional Bike Network_v2.mxd - cshantle - 11:16 AM 3/7/2018

ACHD will closely evaluate through the design process the appropriate bicycle facility treatments needed to ensure that crossing and route connections along higher volume roads meet the vision of a low stress bike network.




Figure 6
Existing and Planned Bicycle Network
Kuna/S Meridian/SW Boise

ACHD will closely evaluate through the design process the appropriate bicycle facility treatments needed to ensure that crossing and route connections along higher volume roads meet the vision of a low stress bike network.




Figure 1
Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network
Ada County, ID




Figure 2
Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network
Star/W Eagle/NW Meridian




Figure 3
Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network
Eagle/N Meridian/W Boise




Figure 4
**Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network
West, North & Central Boise**




Figure 5
Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network
East & Southeast Boise




Figure 6
Regional Low-Stress Bikeway Network
Kuna/S Meridian/SW Boise