2017 SOUTH DAKOTA WALKABLE COMMUNITIES TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM STUDY EVALUATION

9/20/17

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The South Dakota Department of Health (SD DOH) supports two similar programs related to community walkability and healthy community design, under the heading of the South Dakota Walkable Communities Technical Assistance Program. Those programs are the Walk Audit Grant Program and the South Dakota State University (SDSU) Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration. These programs have been ongoing since 2012. The purpose of this report is to bring together the background, progress, impact, barriers/challenges, and recommendations collected from the 13 communities that have participated in these two programs to date.

The following are major successes of the program:

- Identification of community areas that are problematic for walkability/active transportation, and reinforcement and documentation of known problems through organized walk audits
- Uniting groups of community stakeholders with diverse views to focus on walkability/active transportation issues facing the community
- Realistic recommendations for improvements made through the walk audits/active transportation assessments
- Communication with community members through multiple media channels about walkability/active transportation and active lifestyles in the community
- Changes (and planned changes) in multiple areas to make cities more walkable/active, including pedestrian safety; policy/city ordinances; collaboration on planning; aesthetics, wayfinding, and place making; parking; bike facilities; parks, trails, and paths; public transit; and community wide walking campaigns/programs

The following are major programmatic findings:

- Communities generally agreed that these projects increased the knowledge/experience of their stakeholder coalition members with respect to walkability and active transportation
- Most communities reported that this project had increased/would increase their funding for active transportation related projects, either from city or outside sources
- Most communities felt that they received the right amount of assistance from SD DOH and, among SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration communities, from the course instructor
- SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration and Walk Audit Grant Program have some differences between them:
  - The SDSU communities were less likely to retain their coalitions following the initial one-year time frame of the project
  - The Walk Audit communities indicated they may need additional technical assistance with the walk audits, particularly if they have not made a similar effort previously
- Engineering expertise is important for success, along with participation of elected officials/city council
- Under current limitations, collecting data to determine whether there are increases in walkability and other forms of active transportation is out of reach (communities do not regularly collect data on pedestrian traffic)
- Funding remains an issue for follow through in different ways for many communities, as does prioritization by city officials/planners

The following are recommendations for the future:

- SD DOH should continue to provide technical assistance at the current level to all previous program participants
- Pathways for communication between previous program participants and current program participants should be created and emphasized
- SD DOH should continue to provide participants with connections to potential sources of funding (e.g., grants)
- Weather in South Dakota winters can be unpredictable and cause delays for walk audits; communities should plan for one or more backup dates wherever possible, while also acknowledging there are benefits to seasonal audits
- Stakeholder coalitions should include or collaborate with city engineers
- Walk Audit Grant communities would benefit from more guidance with respect to the process of the walk audit (e.g., examples of walk audit forms, data extraction from walk audit, greater discussion of the process of a walk audit)
- The majority of communities indicated interest in learning more about developing Complete Streets policies, which could be integrated into the technical assistance provided by SD DOH

Background

The South Dakota Department of Health (SD DOH) supports two similar programs related to community walkability and healthy community design, under the heading of the South Dakota Walkable Communities Technical Assistance Program. Those programs are the Walk Audit Grant Program (in which SD DOH offers direct financial assistance as well as technical assistance) and the South Dakota State University (SDSU) Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration (in which SD DOH provides oversight and support alongside SDSU landscape architect students and Professor Donald Burger who provide technical assistance).

The South Dakota Walkable Communities Technical Assistance Program was launched to provide South Dakota communities with the catalyst for implementation of healthy community design principles. Walkable communities are healthier communities, where residents are more physically active, decreasing the overall burden of chronic disease. The Walk Audit Grant Program and the SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration provide the opportunity for communities to bring together multi-disciplinary teams, conduct assessments of the built environment, and dialogue with stakeholders and community leaders on next steps toward making improvements. A statewide Active Transportation Advisory Team (ATAT) convened by the SD DOH provides expertise to the Program.

The goal of this report is to summarize the progress and accomplishments of these programs, largely based on a survey that was recently provided to the community contacts in June 2017. Note that surveys were supplemented with other information gathered from the communities, including Walk Audit Grant Program community bi-annual reports, final course documents from SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration landscape architecture students, and follow up interviews conducted by Beth Davis. Occasionally, responses from the survey disagreed with information gathered in other ways, therefore Beth Davis followed up with the program contacts to ensure that contacts had the most up-to-date information and resources. This may be an indication that, in some cases, optimal contact was not maintained among the different members of the community coalition as responsibilities changed.

Program Commonalities

The following points are common to both South Dakota Walkable Communities Technical Assistance Programs:

- Communities convene a team of multi-sectoral partners including representation from elected officials, community/civic leaders, wellness, public works, zoning, planning, transportation, engineering, parks and recreation, transit authority, walking/bicycling advocacy, schools, historical preservation, local business, economic development, social services, tourism, older adults, youth, childcare, healthcare, people with disabilities, law enforcement, main street/downtown associations, and/or other local residents
- Results gear communities toward long- and short-term policy planning, position them for larger grant opportunities, and help them consider complete streets policies and future investments in built environment infrastructure
- Communities in both programs have a diversity of population sizes, with populations ranging from just a few hundred to upwards of 158,000 residents

- The long-term goal is that communities become more walkable, which encourages physical activity, ultimately reducing chronic disease burden and increasing quality of life

There are also some aspects that are unique to each of the programs:

The Walk Audit Grant Program
- Selected communities receive grants averaging $5,000
- Communities select or develop a checklist tool for their walk audit
- Communities conduct a local walk audit training event and complete a community walk audit
- Focus is specifically on leveraging support and capacity for walkability, with the ultimate goal of increasing the number of individuals walking for recreation, exercise, and transportation

The SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration
- Selected communities receive assessment assistance from SDSU spring 300 level city planning class taught by Professor Donald Burger; students conduct built environment assessments, develop recommendations for improving the built environments and increasing active transportation, and present results to the community
- Focus is specifically on leveraging support and capacity for active transportation, with the ultimate goal of increasing active transportation through activities such as walking or biking to work, school, grocery stores, and parks

Participating Communities
There are 13 communities who have participated in one of the two programs at the time of the recent evaluation survey. Table 1 outlines information about the seven communities who participated in the Walk Audit Grant Program, including when they first participated in their program, the sector of the main contact person, and the name of the person who completed the survey; Table 2 provides similar information for those six communities who participated in the SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration.

Table 1. Walk Audit Grant Community Summary

Community	Population	Year of Implementation	Contact Person, Sector	Survey Taker
Sioux Falls	158,800	2014/2015	Mary Michaels, City Prevention Specialist	Mary Michaels
Rapid City	70,555	2014/2015	Sandy Smith, Long Range Planner Sara Hornick, LiveWell Black Hills Coalition Partner	Patsy Horton
Pierre	13,646	2014/2015	Tom Farnsworth, Parks & Recreation	Tom Farnsworth
Burke	604	2014/2015	Ann Schwader, SDSU Extension Field Specialist	Ann Schwader
Mobridge	3,524	2015/2016	Christine Goldsmith, City Administrator	Christine Goldsmith
Keystone	340	2015/2016	Mike Bender, Engineer Sandi McClain, Town Board Trustee	Mike Bender
Lake Andes	821	2016/2017	Samantha Dvorak, SDSU Extension Field Specialist	Samantha Dvorak

Table 2. SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Community Summary

Community	Population	Year of Implementation	Contact Person	Survey Taker
Huron	12,592	2013	Ralph Borkowski, City Planner	Ralph Borkowski
Mitchell	15,254	2014	Dusty Rodiek, Parks & Recreation Nathan Powell, Parks & Recreation	Nathan Powell
Salem	1,347	2015	Lori Heumiller, City Finance Officer	Lori Heumiller
Volga	1,768	2015	Andrew Bremseth, City Administrator Tracy Nelson, Community Wellness Policy Committee	Jameson Berreth
Ft. Pierre	2.078	2016	Gloria Hanson, Mayor	Gloria Hanson
Crooks	1,269	2017	Jamison Rounds, Mayor	Jamison Rounds

Community Recommendations

Walk Audit Grant

All seven Walk Audit Grant communities had compiled a formal or informal set of findings or recommendations. One community hired an outside consultant who wrote a report/set of findings and recommendations. Of the other six communities, five reported that it was easy to interpret their own walk audit findings using their selected checklist, and of those five, four reported that it was possible to follow through with recommended changes. The fifth commented that "some of the findings were realistic to address, but others are definitely more 'long-term' goals that will need cooperation from multiple city departments, as well as funding." This community also reported that "there are times that bike [and pedestrian] projects are not prioritized over street projects designed to move cars." Another community felt that while it was possible to follow through with recommendations, the funding was "still pending, in line behind other city priorities."

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

All six SDSU active transportation communities felt that the recommendations made by SDSU were realistic, and that it was possible to follow through with recommended changes. Some communities made some qualifying comments; two communities indicated that funding was a potential problem (one specifically indicated that follow up on the recommendations did not happen because of lack of funding). One community had concerns about a very specific recommendation due to potential undesirable effects on the residents, but was considering alternative options to address the related issue.

Coalitions of Community Stakeholders

Walk Audit Grant

Six of the seven communities felt that the multi-sector coalition of community stakeholders they established for the project was useful for completion of the audit. Most communities mentioned the importance of having diverse perspectives, as well as input from a vested community perspective. One community specifically mentioned that because of the small staff in their own office, they relied on city colleagues from other departments and community coalition members to move projects forward.

There were also comments with respect to what may have been lacking on the teams. This included engineering and planning experience, better input from local residents, city/elected officials (who in some cases were part of the coalition but did not frequently attend), and information technology expertise in order to incorporate technology into walking paths.

Six out of seven communities indicated that they had provided training for the team (e.g., walk audit facilitator training) and that the training tools provided by the SD DOH were helpful in this endeavor. All seven communities felt that the team's knowledge, attitudes, and abilities with respect to community walkability have improved as a result of this grant. Most commented on how engagement with the project has helped to improve awareness (for example, one community mentioned that no one on the team was familiar with the term "walk audit" prior to the project), and has also helped them to recognize the barriers and issues involved with having a walkable community. Burke specifically mentioned that as a result of the effort, "a walking program has been established"; "in addition, an America Walks! mini-grant has been obtained to install Burke's first cross walk."

Four of the communities reported that their teams will remain in place in the future. These communities commented on the general usefulness of the team. The three other communities that reported their teams would not stay in place. One of these indicated their group would become part of a combined group focused on more general community health, while another indicated that there had been a lot of turnover of group members—many from the original team were no longer in the same role or even in town anymore.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

Five of the six SDSU active transportation communities felt that the multi-sector coalition of community stakeholders was useful for the completion of the assessment. The sixth indicated there was no formal group of local stakeholders and that led to lack of follow through on the initiatives. One of the communities indicated that although the coalition was useful, they did not have buy in from the school district and that this impacted their ability to act on some of the suggestions. The remaining communities, like those involved in the walk audit grant, felt that the diversity of the coalitions and the investment in the outcome were major contributors to the success of the coalition.

Unlike the walk audit communities, the communities who felt that some expertise was lacking on their coalition all generally indicated that there was a lack of engineering expertise. One community clarified that while they did have an engineer on the coalition, there had not been enough exchange of information during the process of the assessment. One additional comment indicated that transition in city management led to a lack of ability to carry out the proposed projects. Two communities both felt that the right individuals were included on the coalition.

Five of the six SDSU communities felt that the team's knowledge, attitudes, and abilities with respect to active transportation have improved (one community indicated that their team had not met). The communities commented on greater awareness of shortcomings and barriers to improving walkability, expanded viewpoints due to including outside opinions, and increased knowledge of the concepts involved in active transportation (particularly walkability). Only two of the teams will remain in place in the future as part of the effort to implement the recommended changes. Two communities cited transition in management and personnel as part of the issue, while another noted that the projects will

not be completed under the current city budget. Yet another community indicated that the projects had been taken over by the city council.

Support through (Additional) Funding

Walk Audit Grant

Five of the seven communities reported that the walk audit either had or they believe it would help with obtaining dedicated city funding. One of the other two communities said that while there may be future plans by the city to fix sidewalks and other problem areas, they did not see funding happening right away. The communities that answered "yes" generally indicated that they thought it would help for the future. Two communities commented that they thought funding would probably be provided to help fix sidewalk issues, while another indicated that funding may become available for trail improvements. A fourth indicated that "funding would help develop a safe path within city limits for residents to get out of the middle of the street when walking" and that some neighborhoods had "substandard sidewalks and/or lighting that would have to be improved."

Five of seven communities indicated they felt the walk audit would help to obtain funding from sources outside of the city. Sioux Falls mentioned that they were continuing to look for external funding/grants, and that they felt "having completed walk audits and implemented some strategies can help to attract other funding to expand what we are able to do." Burke emphasized the $1500 America Walks! mini-grant for their first cross walk. Lake Andes mentioned they did a parent/guardian survey about children walking or biking to and from school that could help to obtain funds from the SD DOT Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) grant going forward. Pierre felt that it could help them apply for grants such as RTP (recreation trails program) funds from the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks for trail improvements.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

Five of the six SDSU communities answered that the active transportation assessment helped (or they believe it will help) their community to obtain dedicated city funding to address the concerns and recommendations made in the assessment. Individual explanations were provided by each community:

- Fort Pierre: The first project funded was signage and wayfinding, now in its final stages. There are a number of improvements in the park system.
- Salem: We are currently applying for funding through the SD DOT TAP program and are using this study to develop a phase program for sidewalks to the schools, city park and main street.
- Mitchell: Due to a transition in staff, some of these projects have been put on hold but others are being implemented in the downtown revitalization projects.
- Volga: Some small projects (ex: crossing lights) were completed but there is more work to be done.
- Crooks: We believe it shows our commitment and gives us some options with which to move forward. We think this will make our grant applications more clear, more reliable, and more realistic.

Half of the communities indicated they felt the active transportation assessment helped or would help in the future to find funding from outside the city:

- Fort Pierre: Improvements in existing parks; development of a new park.

- Mitchell: We will use the recommendations to secure trail grants in the future. The State of SD has begun re-constructing Burr Street and these recommendations are being implemented.
- Crooks: Not yet, but we think it will. It did inspire the CHRC [Crooks Housing and ReDevelopment Commission], a quasi government entity to focus more on parks, paths, and transportation in its funding of public projects.

Other Support

Walk Audit Grant

Five of the seven walk audit communities indicated they had obtained additional support other than funding by elected officials and others who could make an impact on the community:

- Sioux Falls: A complete streets policy was the follow-up from the first walk audits we did in a neighborhood and downtown. We plan to complete an "annual report" of complete streets project[s] each year [...] and that will (hopefully) bring more support from city leadership and the community.
- Burke: Members of the Burke Wellness Coalition met with Burke's City Council and the Gregory County Commissioners to request their support prior to applying for the America Walks! mini-grant.
- Rapid City: City Council working toward implementing additional sidewalk funding, either through assessment projects or capital improvement funds.
- Keystone: Vocal support of providing adequate facilities as projects are completed within the community.
- Mobridge: One councilman has started an after-work walking group - sends out Fitbit challenges and provides general encouragement for anyone wanting to get more walking in their life. He has really emerged as a leader in this area.

When asked who were the primary supporters necessary to implement the recommended changes from the walk audit, each community responded somewhat differently according to their situation. In many cases, the communities mentioned city councils/town boards/mayors and others who could implement and fund plans:

- Sioux Falls: Planning & Zoning Dept., Public Works (street engineering) Dept., Parks Department, Mayor and City Council, Community Advocates
- Burke: The Burke Wellness Coalition, Burke City Council and Gregory County Commissioners, as well as the Gregory County Highway Department
- Rapid City: Council, city staff and users
- Keystone: Town Board
- Lake Andes: The Lake Restoration Committee is the primary supporter in this effort, because the results will show support for their project that they are asking TAP grant funds to support.
- Pierre: The City Administrator and Mayor need to engage more as well as the City Planners to make sure walkability issues are in strategic plans for the future.
- Mobridge: City officials who vote on budget. Hospital could be helpful too - they just hired a new CEO

All seven programs indicated they had received the right amount of assistance from Beth Davis and SD DOH for completing and following up on the walk audit grant; all seven also felt the grant provided learning opportunities around healthy community design principles that they would not have had otherwise. Information that was specifically mentioned as being helpful was related to resources and webinars, the opportunity to be part of the Active Transportation Advisory Team, knowing when grants are available, and information about past awardee projects such as what worked and what didn't.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

Five out of the six SDSU communities indicated they have received non-financial support from elected officials and others who can help to make an impact on the community:

- Fort Pierre: The mayor and president of the Development Corporation are leading the way by coordinating meetings of community leaders to plan for the future.
- Huron: The engineer and City Commission are supportive but active transportation projects do not get city funding due to the other higher priority needs.
- Salem: I believe the Council supports the assessment and will use it as a planning tool for future projects.
- Mitchell: Full support from the Mayor into downtown projects.
- Crooks: The City will use this with its planning and zoning board as we move forward in revising our comprehensive plan. … Also the CHRC, a quasi governmental entity has committed to using this plan where possible. Also, the City has agreed to hire one of the students to help prep the planning work to implement some suggestions in coordination with our engineer and the CHRC.

When asked about the primary supporters necessary to implement recommendations, nearly all of the communities indicated that they would require the support of their city council or commission. Some communities mentioned other supporters as well:

- Fort Pierre: representatives of Development Corporation and Tourism & Promotion Council, downtown business association, business park association, school district
- Salem: City residents
- Mitchell: mayor and city staff
- Crooks: School district

All six communities indicated that the technical assistance, support, oversight, and follow-up provided by SDSU Professor Donald Burger was useful and adequate for the collaboration. They also indicated that the communication, new resources, and support from Beth Davis and SD DOH has been the right amount of assistance for completing and following up on the active transportation assessment. However, only four of the six communities indicated that the collaboration provided learning opportunities around healthy community design that the survey taker otherwise would not have had. Some comments on the aspects of the support that were helpful follow:

- Fort Pierre: All aspects have been helpful. It's a great program that I would recommend to other small cities.
- Salem: Beth's ongoing contact with webinars and other information really keeps this thought process fresh. Doing an assessment is great, but if it sits on the shelf and isn't used doesn't do much good. So these reminders are helpful.

- Crooks: They let the team do their thing. They made themselves available, but didn't interfere. Was well done.

Community Involvement

Walk Audit Grant

Programmatic Note: All Walk Audit Grantees were required to assemble a multidisciplinary team as part of the grant process and encouraged to conduct a training event. Four of the seven communities reported conducting an educational event focused on walkability for the community. These events are described for each community:

- Sioux Falls: We brought Mark Fenton to Sioux Falls in 2013 and 2014. We were fortunate to be able to have grant funding available to support his visit. I think it was successful because it was through those events that we were really able to bring together our interdepartmental city team to talk about healthy community design (as well as having the opportunity to pull the developer community together for a similar conversation).
- Burke: The Burke Community held a healthy lifestyles workshop that promoted walking. It was held September 2014. Elaine Doll-Dunn was the keynote speaker. She coordinates the annual "Leading Ladies Marathon" in Spearfish, SD. Beth Davis also presented the benefits of walking and discussed the importance of walkability.
- Rapid City: Staff is always working on additional community educational opportunities.
- Lake Andes: We did a walking safely training with the 1-3rd graders. We did a Bike Rodeo and asked parents to go on a Walk Audit with us after. We did one other Walk Audit, but didn't have anyone besides committee members show up.

Five of the seven communities indicated they had communicated the results of the walk audit to the community, and a sixth had not yet but planned to. Table 3 provides a summary of the methods used to communicate information to the community. The most common method was press releases, but five of the communities indicated using a method not listed. These other methods included the Complete Streets annual report (Sioux Falls), an infographic shared with the Burke City Council and shared via social media (Burke), a presentation at a Town Board meeting (Keystone), hosting a 5K fun run/walk with handouts (Lake Andes), and "councilman chit chat" (Mobridge).

Table 3. Numbers of Communities Using Methods for Communication with Communities

Method	Number of Communities
Press releases	4
Newsletter articles	2
Social media	2
Official community websites	3
Other	5

Three of the six communities indicated they had conducted a community survey (Sioux Falls, Burke, and Mobridge), while Keystone had plans to do so. When asked about other ways in which community

members had been (or would be) encouraged to contribute their voices, several communities provided comments:

- Sioux Falls: Invitations to our healthy community design events, invitations to participate in walk audits, encouraging interaction through social media posts... also we are exploring how to develop a walkability toolkit that could be incorporated into the existing neighborhood association toolkit.
- Burke: A needs assessment was implemented prior to the walk audit using South Dakota Department of Health's Good & Healthy Toolkit.
- Pierre: We have not done a community wide engagement process, it has been limited to the coalition and the City park and recreation board.
- Mobridge: open visitor section at Council meetings and Park Board meetings.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

Programmatic Note: All SDSU communities were required to convene a group of stakeholders to meet and engage with the students during their visits. Other educational events hosted by the community were optional. Only one of the SDSU communities conducted an educational event on active transportation with the SDSU students for the community, which were not viewed as being extremely successful due to poor advertising/low attendance.

All six communities have communicated the results of the active transportation assessment to the community. Table 4 provides a summary of the methods used to communicate information to the community, as reported on the survey. The most common method is an official community website, and the next most common was newsletter articles. As for other methods of communicating results, Huron indicated they had presented at city commission meetings, while Crooks had presented results at a community meeting.

Table 4. Numbers of Communities Using Methods for Communication with Communities

Method	Number of Communities
Press releases	2
Newsletter articles	3
Social media	1
Official community websites	4
Other	2

Two communities indicated they had conducted a community survey related to the active transportation assessment collaboration, and a third had plans to do so. When asked about other ways the community has been encouraged to contribute their voices, three communities provided relevant comments:

- Fort Pierre: Public meetings
- Mitchell: Through our Parks and Recreation Master Plan and we will be incorporating the recommendations into the Master Plan.

- Crooks: We have had [eight community assessments in the last two years] for items touching on this directly or indirectly. We still want to do a survey, but [are facing] some delays.

Impact

Walk Audit Grant

Walk audit communities were asked about 10 areas in which they may have made changes, or are planning to make changes, as a result of the Walk Audit Grant Program. Table 5 provides the number of cities who indicated they had, had not, or were planning to make changes in those 10 areas. The most common area for changes to have already been made was in the area of pedestrian safety; four communities have made these changes, and the three other communities are planning to make changes to assist in pedestrian safety. Communities had also all either already made changes (three) or were planning to make changes (four) with respect to parks, trails, and paths. The least popular area for changes was public transit (five had not made any changes and did not plan to) and parking (four had not made changes and did not plan to). Pierre indicated they had made an "other" change, which was that a commercial landscape ordinance was adopted by the city that would enhance greenscaping and walkability.

Table 5. Numbers of Walk Audit Grant Communities Making Changes in 10 Areas

Area	Yes	No	Not Yet
Pedestrian Safety	4	0	3
Policy/City Ordinances	2	3	2
Collaboration on Planning	2	2	3
Aesthetics, Wayfinding, & Place Making	3	1	3
Parking	2	4	1
Bike Facilities	3	3	1
Parks, Trails, and Paths	3	0	4
Public Transit	1	5	1
Community Wide Walking Campaigns/Programs	3	1	3
Other changes	1	3	0

Communities were also asked if they had made changes to their "city wide master plan" or similar document based on the community walk audit. Pierre indicated that their plan has changed and now makes reference to multi modal transportation and alerts city planners and officials that this must be considered in future community growth. Mobridge indicated that community walking paths was added to the short list of strategic priorities of the city. Of the remaining five communities, two were not aware of such a plan in their community, one did not have plans to make changes to it, and two others had not made changes yet.

Communities were similarly asked if they currently had a Complete Streets or similar policy. Six out of the seven said they did not, while Sioux Falls indicated they did and that they had made changes to this policy based on the results of the walk audit. Three of the remaining communities indicated they would

be interested in learning more and possibly creating a Complete Streets policy for their community, based on the results of their current work.

Finally, communities were asked if they had utilized any form of traffic counting tools to measure pedestrian activity. Sioux Falls was the only community to indicate they had, and made the following comment:

> Our planning & public works department has done some measurement of bike & ped activity, but this is something on our "to do" list when we get our city team back together to review complete streets projects from the past year. In addition, a pedestrian plan exists but is outdated, so we (hopefully) can revisit that and enhance the way we are measuring mode share of cars, bikes, transit and pedestrians.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

SDSU active transportation communities were asked about the same 10 areas in which they may have made changes, or are planning to make changes, as a result of the Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration. Table 6 provides the number of cities who indicated they had, had not, or were planning to make changes in those 10 areas. The most common areas for changes to have already been made were collaboration on planning and parks, trails, and paths; five communities have made changes in each of these two areas, and the other plans to. Communities had also all either already made changes (three) or were planning to make changes (four) with respect to parks, trails, and paths. The least popular areas for change are parking, public transit, and community wide walking campaigns/programs (five had not made any changes and did not plan to in each of these areas). Crooks said they had made an "other" change, and commented "We just finished our plan, so are beginning to look at options and grants such as TAP (Transportation Alternatives Program) and Park Trails. We have begun those discussions in our park boards and with our engineers and the CHRC."

Table 6. Numbers of SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Communities Making Changes in 10 Areas

Area	Yes	No	Not Yet
Pedestrian Safety	3	1	2
Policy/City Ordinances	2	3	1
Collaboration on Planning	5	0	1
Aesthetics, Wayfinding, & Place Making	3	1	2
Parking	0	5	1
Bike Facilities	2	2	2
Parks, Trails, and Paths	5	0	1
Public Transit	1	5	0
Community Wide Walking Campaigns/Programs	0	5	1
Other changes	1	4	1

Communities were also asked if they had made changes to their "city wide master plan" or similar document based on the assessment findings. Mitchell indicated they were incorporating the

recommendations into their master plan, while Volga explained that the process brought up activities that their community needed to do which are being incorporated into a city strategic plan. Of the remaining communities, two were not aware of such a plan in their community, and two had not yet made changes to this plan.

Communities were similarly asked if they currently had a Complete Streets or similar policy. Five out of the six said they did not, and the sixth was not sure if they did. Four of the six communities indicated they would be interested in learning more and possibly creating a Complete Streets policy for their community, based on the results of their current work.

Finally, communities were asked if they had utilized any form of traffic counting tools to measure pedestrian activity. Volga was the only community to indicate they had, and explained "Traffic was counted on a couple streets to gauge whether crosswalks were needed, specifically before Dollar General opened in town across the highway."

Continuing Support

Walk Audit Grant

The walk audit communities made the following comments about the follow up they would like to have in order to continue to improve the walkability of their community:

- Sioux Falls: Continued update on webinars, resources, and potential grants.
- Burke: Continued support from Beth Davis regarding new and existing resources.
- Keystone: Coordination with SDDOT on projects affecting street corridors within community. Apply for additional grants to help improve pedestrian infrastructure within the community.
- Pierre: keep the communications going on the latest trends and what other communities are doing in this area.
- Mobridge: Continuity on email alerts to good webinars and new developments, funding sources—Beth is great at this!

Five of the seven communities also said that a future plan of action characterizing short, mid, and long-term goals would have been helpful as they completed their walk audit. One community did not respond to this question, and the final community indicated they had done this—but "with a small city that isn't growing, there [are] always way more projects than funds—still saving at end of each year to get some money put aside to even apply for a matching grant."

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

When asked about the follow-up they would like to have in order to continue to improve active transportation in their communities, the SDSU communities made the following comments:

- Fort Pierre: Involvement with our planning team for future city improvements.
- Salem: I believe the continued contact from Beth Davis on different aspects of education is helpful and should continue.
- Mitchell: A report on how the community has improved as a result of implementing the recommendations. Measurables that include healthier community or population increases or local economic benefits.

- Crooks: Continued communication with [Professor Donald] Burger and crew. We have hired one student as an intern to begin drawing some of the concepts in more detail and to work with our city engineer to put concepts in place.

All six communities believed that a future plan of action characterizing short, mid, and long-term goals would have been helpful as they completed their active transportation assessment. One community added that it might have helped convince the city commission to put funding into projects related to walking and biking. Another community wrote "Probably - our engineering firm has a copy of this assessment and will work to implement different aspects of the assessment as we do various projects throughout the City. But having goals wouldn't be a bad idea so the Council and/or Community can prioritize." Yet another indicated they are working on this as they begin to revise their comprehensive plan.

Barriers and Challenges

Walk Audit Grant

When asked about the biggest challenges experienced with respect to making changes based on the walk audit, many of the communities indicated that funding would be or has been a major challenge. Prioritization by community stakeholders was also mentioned by several of the communities as being a barrier. One community commented that it was challenging to get the engineering department to keep walkability issues in mind when planning future developments and retro-fitting old ones. Another indicated that some neighborhoods may not want a walking path by their house, as some community members are uncomfortable with people walking around their neighborhood.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

Four of the six SDSU active transportation communities identified funding as a major challenge to making changes based on the active transportation assessment. One community specifically mentioned that there is resistance from residents to extending the bike trail and making improvements to a specific major street. Another community indicated that prioritization of projects may present a barrier, and that it would be good to know what aspects of the recommended changes would have the highest benefit to the city. Another community, in addition to funding and difficulties with the school district, explained that they are a very car-driven community and culture, and felt that this culture would be difficult to change, as few residents would have experienced walkable communities.

Technical Assistance

Walk Audit Grant

When asked how the assistance offered by the SD DOH Community Walk Audit Grant Program could be improved, most communities commented that the program works quite well and that the assistance offered was adequate and very helpful. Additional suggestions included providing some good examples of walk audit forms/check lists of questionnaires, more one-on-one discussion about plans, meeting with the coalition to help describe the process of a walk audit, help getting "data" from walk audit surveys, and making it mandatory for a city planner and engineer to be on the team.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

When asked how the assistance offered by all of the individuals providing it—SD DOH, the SDSU student team, Professor Donald Burger—could be improved, the communities who made suggestions tended to make comments related to the SDSU student team. Comments included that the walkthrough and the prioritization survey portion of the project was confusing, and that it might be useful to provide some education prior to the survey in order to elicit thoughtful input rather than gut reactions. Additionally, one community mentioned that the timing of the assessment in the middle of winter is probably not as effective as it could be.

Recommendations

The following are recommendations for the future of the programs:

1) SD DOH should continue to provide technical assistance at the current level to all previous program participants
2) Pathways for communication across program participants, both previous and current, should be created and emphasized
3) SD DOH should continue to provide participants with connections to potential sources of funding (e.g., grants)
4) Weather in South Dakota winters can be unpredictable and cause delays for walk audits; communities should plan for one or more backup dates wherever possible, while also acknowledging there are benefits to seasonal audits
5) Stakeholder coalitions should include or collaborate with city engineers
6) Walk Audit Grant communities would benefit from more guidance with respect to the process of the walk audit (e.g., examples of walk audit forms, data extraction from walk audit, greater discussion of the process of a walk audit)—this may be connected to recommendation 2
7) The majority of communities indicated interest in learning more about developing Complete Streets policies, which could be integrated into the technical assistance provided by SD DOH

Final Considerations and Next Steps

SD DOH continues to provide follow-up and ongoing technical assistance to all 13 communities who participated in this survey, and as funds allow, will continue to add new communities to the South Dakota Walkable Communities Technical Assistance Program. Whereas each community is at different stages of consideration and implementation of healthy community design principles that best fit their community, technical assistance and encouragement on the development of a Complete Streets policy for each community remains a priority.

Acknowledgments

The SD DOH wishes to thank all of the community contacts who not only completed this survey, but participated in the programs identified. Also, thank you to all of the stakeholders within each community who came together with a vision and continue to discuss improvements to walkability. A special thank you to Professor Donald Burger at SDSU and students for the work completed in each of the Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Communities. Finally, thank you to Spectrum Health Policy Research for compiling, analyzing, and producing the *2017 South Dakota Walkable Communities Technical Assistance Program Study Evaluation.*

For More Information/Programmatic Contact

For more information, please contact Beth Davis at the South Dakota Department of Health:

Beth A. Davis
Physical Activity Practitioner in Public Health
Physical Activity Coordinator
South Dakota Department of Health
Beth2022@pie.midco.net
(605)280-2429

Appendix

Supplemental Information by Community

Walk Audit Grant Communities

Sioux Falls

Sioux Falls participated in the Walk Audit Grant due to a growing population and concern about the health of community members. An earlier Community Needs Health Assessment through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) indicated lack of physical activity among adults, the need for traffic calming measures, and a need for the community's budget to accommodate walking, cycling, and other physical activities. The community also had environmental concerns from the growing city traffic. Sioux Falls conducted a fall walk audit and attempted a winter walk audit, but the winter audit could not be held due to temperature and weather concerns (staff level observations were completed instead). The goals of the walk audit were identifying opportunities, barriers and recommendations for improvement, with diverse walk audit teams. Sioux Falls had previously completed a walk audit and so had many tools available and already had some understanding of the purpose of a walk audit. The walk audit focused largely on sidewalk/crosswalk accessibility and conditions. Ultimately Sioux Falls made changes to a major downtown street, including reducing from three lanes of traffic to two and providing diagonal parking to increase the distance between the sidewalk and traffic. They added planters, benches, and bike racks to make this area more attractive, and partnered with downtown Sioux Falls on an awareness campaign for bicycle and pedestrian situations. Throughout the process, this community partnered with multiple programs (including the Sioux Falls Design Center, and the Transdisciplinary Obesity Program) and town boards/committees. The city is also reviewing the Complete Streets approach to community walkability.

Rapid City

Rapid City participated in the Walk Audit Grant in order to help combat known problems with community walkability (for example, lack of sidewalk connectivity) and to bridge the gap between those who walk often and those who do not walk as often by identifying specific problem areas. The city wanted both children and elderly individuals to participate in the walk audits, and to hold educational workshops about healthy living. Rapid City eventually held three walk audits, spread out through fall and early winter. The interest in the walk audits by the community was strong, and 11 routes around Rapid City were audited by groups of community members on all three occasions. A wide variety of community members were represented. The walk audit revealed some previously unknown walkability issues to the city, and also helped the participants reflect on ways they could more actively navigate the city. Rapid City grew the interest in the project through press releases, flyers for local businesses, and a social media page on Facebook. The final report and results of the walk audit are currently being used in the Rapid City community planning and engineering departments as they review applications for new developments along the walk audit routes.

Pierre

Pierre participated in the Walk Audit Grant in order to help enhance trails and multimodal transportation service. Pierre is a "Let's Move City" under an initiative started by former First Lady Michelle Obama to recognize cities that have taken achievable measurable steps to reduce childhood obesity, and also a Playful City USA community (making play a priority to get children active, playing, and healthy). Pierre felt that the Walk Audit Grant was in line with these initiatives and could lead to

improving earlier plans for biking and walking path development and access in particular. With assistance from the Institute for the Built Environment, Pierre conducted a walk audit with focus on sidewalk/path connections and demarcating the sidewalk from the street, along with pedestrian accessibility and safety. Multiple recommendations resulted, some of which had "easy solutions" and others that would require policy shifts, redevelopment approaches, design decisions, code modification and citizen awareness/involvement. Recommendations included focus on revitalized, fully connected Missouri River frontage, and fully connecting the northeast neighborhoods to downtown and to the river. There were two main streets that were considered top-level priorities. Key outcomes from the walk audit for Pierre include the adoption of a Landscape Ordinance, a 2017 Appropriation, New Design Standards, and Improved Citizen Access. The Landscape Ordinance for new businesses requires one tree per 50 feet of frontage, 50+ parking spaces require one tree per 25 interior parking spaces, and a 15' planting strip adjacent to the public street. Pierre intends to use the recommendations as a basis for applying for applications for further grant funding.

Burke

Burke participated in the Walk Audit Grant to assist with the goals of the pre-existing Burke Wellness Coalition, which included creating and sustaining environments that support nutritious food choices, increasing physical activity and healthy lifestyles, and creating environments that support healthy lifestyles for children. Some already-known issues were that additional sidewalks and crosswalks were needed, sidewalks in existence needed replacing, shoulder space needed to be increased for runners/walkers/bikers, and potential safe routes in the community needed to be identified (not only for school and recreational facilities, but also for aging residents who needed access to the local grocery store and City Library from an assisted living facility). Some issues identified in the walk audit included that it was not easy to cross streets, there were often no sidewalks or non-continuous sidewalks, assistive mobility devices couldn't be used on many sidewalks, sidewalks were not often on both sides of the street, and sidewalks that did exist were not free from major pavement condition issues. The next step in their plan is working on a Master Plan for increasing healthy lifestyles (including walkability) over the next 3-5 years while applying for funding opportunities. In addition to the walk audit, which identified many major issues, Burke held an Active Living Workshop for 60+ community participants, held a Burke Lake Path discussion with 45+ community members, and collaborated with a high school senior on a 10,000 Steps project that encouraged walking through the use of pedometers. Burke is also sponsoring "Burke Walks!," a program of bi-monthly 2-mile themed walks. Eventual outcomes should include a pedestrian network, policies that support walking/bicycling, and increased public and financial support for walking/bicycling.

Mobridge

Mobridge participated in the Walk Audit Grant in order to make it safe, easy and fun to choose walking for active transportation for youth and families; this community wanted to identify and create a comprehensive walking path based on walk audits and gain an overall understanding of infrastructure challenges and opportunities. Mobridge also wanted to create a public education campaign about health advantages of physical activity, organize people into informal social groups for walking, and make the city's streets and parks safer and more appealing for walkers and bicyclists. To gain community support, it was important to distinguish this effort from another ongoing trail project in the community, and to clarify that the goal of this project was to create a walking path inside the city. The walk audit revealed that creating new sidewalks and providing ADA ramps were the biggest issues that needed to

be addressed in order to meet this goal. As a result of the walk audit, both the City Council and Zoning Board have supported the walking path to be included in long range plans for infrastructure development and budget.

Keystone

Keystone participated in the Walk Audit Grant in order to help meet the challenging demands of creating a walkable infrastructure in a mountain setting; several areas in town had no sidewalks or other means of pedestrian connectivity. The ultimate goal was to provide safe pedestrian access for residents to complete daily tasks, and Keystone wanted to identify the greatest needs, highest priorities, and most efficient projects. A second goal was to educate Keystone citizens about the importance of creating walkable environments for both overall community health and making positive impacts on tourism and business. The walk audit was broken into two segments, and common issues included obstacles, no sidewalk or missing portions of sidewalks, a lack of crosswalks, no places to rest, narrow sidewalks, required maintenance, and confusing path routes. In addition to identifying and better understanding these issues, the walk audits also helped stakeholders develop a common goal and to have open communication about good design. Keystone will be using these results to help guide future decisions for ordinances, project implementation, and pedestrian improvements, and for securing additional funding.

Lake Andes

Lake Andes participated in the Walk Audit Grant in order to help support some of the goals of the Charles Mix County Lake Restoration Organization, whose vision for city improvements included connecting an existing walk path to a new walk path to create a safer route to schools, and a walk path around the lake. There were no sidewalks that extended to school, and the path that existed was around the border of the town, which does not make it accessible for most pedestrian activity. Lake Andes also wanted to use the walk audit to build acceptance and use of walking and bicycling as a transportation mode. Over the course of the grant, Lake Andes had a coalition meeting at least once a month, completed a rural active living assessment, completed a fall walk audit, and conducted a parent survey and a teacher survey about students biking/walking to school. While they did not end up hosting a Safe Routes to School training, they instead held a bike rodeo (in which bikes, helmets and locks were donated to 20 students) and provided training to teach kids to be safer on the road with no sidewalks and how to safely ride a bike. Lake Andes has also held a Fun Run 5k. In the long run, engineer consulting is in the works to help improve walkability, and the completed walk audit will serve as a basis for applying for funding to support construction of safe routes to school.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Communities

Huron

Huron participated in the SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration to accommodate a growing walking and biking community, largely due to a recent influx of Karen refugees; specific concerns included safety and accessibility of pedestrian and bicycle routes. The recommendations from the SDSU student team for Huron included community and policy development (e.g. city beautification and new traffic policies), cultural investments (e.g. a museum and cultural center), parks system development and enhancement, active transportation infrastructure (specifically a trail and bike lane system), continuing to grow the bike share program, and applying for additional funding sources and

initiatives. Following the recommendations of the SDSU student team, Huron hired a consultant to develop a city Master Plan. While not specifically a result of this project, this assessment did spark conversations with regard to Huron's boulevards and street trees, and they are continuing to upgrade crosswalks to make them ADA accessible.

Mitchell

Mitchell participated in the SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration in order to assist with long-range planning for their community's transportation needs. The recommendations from the SDSU student team for Mitchell included overcoming car culture through a combination of approaches used in other cities, creating an active transportation infrastructure by employing bike lines, multiuse trails, and reducing parking, and developing parks system enhancements such as pedestrian scale lighting improvements and emphasis on historic Mitchell. Following the recommendations by the SDSU student team, Mitchell would like to implement bike share recommendations, trail planning, pedestrian bridges, safety patrols, and park enhancements. This community has held ongoing discussion with the Department of Transportation and the mayor has made downtown revitalization a priority, with funding set aside in 2016 for a small downtown plaza.

Salem

Salem participated in the SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration primarily to receive assistance developing a walking/bicycling route to the city's businesses, schools, and recreation areas; of major concern was that pedestrians regularly walk on the streets due to the lack of a connected sidewalk system. The recommendations from the SDSU student team included improvements to pedestrian safety (through crosswalks, lighting, speed reduction, bike lane signage, etc.), creating an active transportation infrastructure through sidewalk implementation, parks system enhancement, additional school parking, downtown improvements (e.g., adding trees, widening sidewalks, attractive signage, etc.), wayfinding efforts, and city ordinances for private property owners. Following the recommendations by the SDSU student team, Salem has used the recommendations and information gathered to apply for grant funding. Salem has chosen to prioritize pedestrian safety in their efforts, and has also gathered funds for a new playground. Salem is continuing to discuss and share the recommendations with residents.

Volga

Volga participated in the SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration due to rapid growth and increased awareness of the need for safe transportation within the city, especially safe and active transportation from school. The recommendations from the SDSU student team included pedestrian safety (through provision of safe crossings, implementation of traffic calming solutions, and improving street lights), improvement of active transportation infrastructure (e.g., developing bike and pedestrian pathways and providing connected sidewalks), parks system enhancements, and downtown and city-wide improvements (such as added pedestrian amenities and improved wayfinding). Following the recommendations by the SDSU team, Volga implemented a bike lane, restricted some parking to accommodate more pedestrian activity, and has actively discussed improved wayfinding and improvement to main streets. The residents of Volga are interested in and support improvements to sidewalks, and the SDSU presentation brought ideas and more justification for the city council for these efforts. Volga is currently engaged in discussions regarding sidewalk ordinances, which they do not currently have.

Fort Pierre participated in the SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration in order to create a strategy to improve and create active transportation routes, to create a positive economic impact, improve the overall community connectedness, and create a better quality of life for the city's residents. The primary goal was to connect the existing walking/biking trails into the city, and overall to create a connection between the northern and the southern parts of town. The recommendations provided by the SDSU student team included expanding the multi-use bike trail, introducing bike lanes on key roads, adopting a phased sidewalk implementation plan, improving a livestock sale area, enhancing the parks system, adopting the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design program in parks (to reduce vandalism), and improving signage. Following the recommendations by the SDSU team, Fort Pierre installed 23 signs for wayfinding, extended a grant in order to resurface trails, acquired a grant to improve a memorial, and convened a community-wide committee to start discussing a trail of historical figures.

Crooks

Crooks participated in the SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration having experienced recent residential growth, and felt that the active transportation assessment project would help to create interaction and synergy in the community by encouraging healthy, alternative modes of travel and nurturing a healthy lifestyle. Crooks noted that residents view as a weakness the many pedestrian and vehicular traffic conflicts within the city's boundaries, particularly as there is not a traditional downtown district and amenities are scattered throughout the city. The goal was to develop a bike/walking trail system to lessen these traffic conflicts. The recommendations from the SDSU student team included building and enhancing an active transportation structure (primarily through sidewalks, crosswalks, and bike lanes), implementing a comprehensive wayfinding system, updating and completing the parks system, creating a community "heart" to improve Crooks' sense of identity, and hiring a part-time grant writer to pursue additional funding. Following the recommendations by the SDSU student team, Crooks has plans for a wellness center, a pool in the park, a trail and community improvement projects. Crooks is also sponsoring a community event that includes flag football, and prior to the event will have covered bridges in place on a new walking and bike path.

Walk Audit Grant Program Survey

HEALTHY5D.GOV Community Walk Audit Grant Survey

Your Contact Information

What is your first and last name?

What community are you representing?

HEALTHY5D.GOV Community Walk Audit Grant Survey

Walk Audit Outcomes

Question 1. After the completion of your community walk audit, did you compile a formal or informal set of findings and/or recommendations?

○ Yes

○ No

Question 1.a. If you answered yes to Question 1, did you find it easy or difficult to interpret your walk audit findings using your selected checklist?

○ Easy

○ Difficult

Question 1.b. If you answered yes to Question 1, were the findings you gathered from the walk audit realistic to address? In other words, is it possible to follow through with any recommended changes?

○ Yes

○ No

1

Question 1.c. If you indicated in Question 1.b. that the findings were not realistic to address, which recommendations were not realistic and why? Reasons may include lack of expertise to implement, lack of government support, lack of funding, lack of time, changes not viewed as necessary, difficulty prioritizing projects, etc.

HEALTHYSD.GOV	Community Walk Audit Grant Survey

Multi-Disciplinary Team

Question 1. Was the multi-sector coalition of community stakeholders established for the project useful for completion of the audit and/or following up on recommendations from the audit?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Question 1.a. What is the primary reason for your answer to the previous question?

Question 1.b. What expertise did your team lack (for example: engineering, planning, elected official, etc.)?

Question 1.c. Did you conduct any type of training for your team (for example: walk audit facilitator training)?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Question 1.d. If yes to the previous question, were the training tools provided by the South Dakota Department of Health (SDDOH) helpful?

◯ Yes

◯ No

2

Question 2. Do you feel that the team's knowledge, attitudes, and abilities with respect to community walkability have improved as a result of this grant?

○ Yes

○ No

Question 2.a. If yes to the previous question, in what ways?

```



```

Question 3. Will the team remain in place in the future?

○ Yes

○ No

Question 3.a. If yes to the previous question, do you believe it will continue to be useful and how? If not, why not?

```



```

| HEALTHYSD.GOV | Community Walk Audit Grant Survey |

Funding

Question 1. Has the walk audit helped (or do you believe it will help) your community to obtain dedicated city funding to address audit concerns and recommendations?

○ Yes

○ No

Question 1.a. If yes to the previous question, what is the funding meant to address, and is the amount adequate?

```



```

3

Question 2. Has the walk audit helped (or do you believe it will help) your community to obtain funding from a source *other* than the city?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Question 2.a. If yes to the previous question, what is the funding meant to address, and is the amount adequate?

[ ]

Other Support

Question 1. Aside from funding, what kind of support has been given (or promised) to the walk audit and follow-up by elected officials and others who can help to make an impact on the community?

[ ]

Question 2. Who do you believe are the primary supporters necessary to implement any recommended changes (completed, in progress, or planned)?

[ ]

Question 3. Relative to your needs, how useful have communication, new resources, and support from Beth Davis and the South Dakota Department of Health (SDDOH) been for completing and following up on the walk audit grant?

◯ Too little assistance

◯ The right amount of assistance

◯ Too much assistance

4

Question 3.a. Specifically, what aspects of this support have been helpful? What aspects have not been helpful?

```

```

Question 3.b. Has this grant provided other learning opportunities for you around healthy community design principles that you would not have had?

◯ Yes

◯ No

| HEALTHYSD.GOV | Community Walk Audit Grant Survey |

Communication with the Community

Question 1. Has the team conducted an educational event focused on walkability for the community?

◯ Yes

◯ No

◯ Not yet but we plan to

Question 1.a. If yes to the previous question, briefly describe the event, and if it has already taken place, whether you feel it was successful or not (and why)?

```

```

Question 2. Have the findings of the walk audit been communicated to the community?

◯ Yes

◯ No

◯ Not yet but we plan to

5

Question 3. What methods were used/will be used to communicate information to the community?

☐ Press releases

☐ Newsletter articles

☐ Social media

☐ Official community websites

☐ Other

Other (please specify)

[   ]

Question 4. Has a community survey been conducted?

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet but we plan to

Question 5. In what other ways, if any, has the community been encouraged (or will they be encouraged) to contribute their voices?

[   ]

| HEALTHYSD.GOV | Community Walk Audit Grant Survey |

Ultimate Impact on Walkability

To determine what changes have been made in your community based on your walk audit findings and recommendations, please indicate whether or not you have made changes by selecting "Yes", "No", or "Not yet but we plan to", in response to each of the categories below. You do not need to indicate specific changes within each category.

Question 1. **Pedestrian Safety**: safer crosswalks and intersections, sidewalks, curb enhancements, reduced speed zones, pedestrian signals, Safe Routes to School strategies, school siting discussions that encourage active transportation

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet but we plan to

6

Question 2. **Policy/City Ordinances**: sidewalk and landscaping, mixed-use zoning, complete streets policy discussion, street design policy

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet but we plan to

Question 3. **Collaboration on Planning**: incorporation of assessment/audits into city master plan, collaboration with Public Works & Department of Transportation, land-use planning, collaboration with land developers

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet but we plan to

Question 4. **Aesthetics, Wayfinding, & Place Making**: trees, benches, lighting, art, signage, landmarks such as statues, creation of public places to gather, shade facilities

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet but we plan to

Question 5. **Parking**: de-incentivize parking, reduction of parking spaces to encourage pedestrian activity, safer parking design

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet but we plan to

Question 6. **Bike Facilities**: bike racks, dedicated bike lanes, bike boulevards, education for drivers and cyclists, bike rodeos for youth

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet but we plan to

7

Question 7. **Parks, Trails & Paths**: creation of more green spaces, crime prevention tactics, shared-use paths, trails enhancements, playgrounds

◯ Yes

◯ No

◯ Not yet but we plan to

Question 8. **Public Transit**: safe access to public transit by foot or bike

◯ Yes

◯ No

◯ Not yet but we plan to

Question 9. **Community Wide Walking Campaigns/Programs**: established walking groups, facilitated walks, identification of safe routes for walkers

◯ Yes

◯ No

◯ Not yet but we plan to

Question 10. **Other Changes**

◯ Yes

◯ No

◯ Not yet but we plan to

Other (please specify)

[   ]

Most cities have a "city wide master plan" that supports walkability principles. This plan may have different names in different communities, including "pedestrian plan", "master plan", "walkability plan", "bike safety plan", etc.

Question 11. Have changes been made to this plan in your community as a result of this grant?

◯ Yes

◯ No

◯ Not yet

◯ I am not aware of this plan

8

Question 11.a. If yes to the previous question, what changes have been made?

[text box]

A "Complete Streets" policy formalizes a community's intent to plan, design, and maintain streets so they are safe for users of all ages and abilities. This policy directs transportation designers and engineers to consistently design and construct the right-of-way to accommodate all anticipated users including pedestrians, bicyclists, public transportation users, motorists, and freight vehicles.

Question 12. Does your community currently have a "Complete Streets" or similar policy?

◯ Yes

◯ No

◯ I am not sure

Question 12.a. If yes to the previous question, were changes made to this policy based on the results of the walk audit?

◯ Yes

◯ No

◯ Not yet

Question 12.b. If no to Question 12, would you be interested in learning more and possibly creating a Complete Streets policy for your community based on the results of your current work?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Question 13.   Have you utilized any form of traffic counting tools to measure pedestrian activity?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Question 13.a.   If yes to the previous question, please describe what type and how you have used these tools?

[text box]

Continuing Support

Question 1. What follow-up would you like to have in order to continue to improve the walkability of your community?

Question 2. Would a future plan of action characterizing short, mid, and long-term goals have been helpful as you completed your walk audit?

HEALTHYSD.GOV Community Walk Audit Grant Survey

Barriers and Challenges Experienced

Question 1: What were (or do you anticipate will be) the biggest challenges experienced with respect to making changes based on the walk audit? Examples might include getting appropriate people and departments on board, the length of time to implement policy changes, lack of funding to implement changes, keeping the team motivated, etc.

HEALTHYSD.GOV Community Walk Audit Grant Survey

Improvements

Question 1. How could the assistance offered by the SDDOH Community Walk Audit Grant Program be improved? Consider the entire process of the grant project.

10

End of Survey

Please click DONE! You have completed this survey! Thank you for your participation. Your responses are greatly appreciated and will help to improve the quality and delivery of our programs to improve the health of South Dakotans.

11

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

HEALTHY5D.GOV — SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

Your Contact Information

What is your first and last name?

What community are you representing?

HEALTHY5D.GOV — SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

Active Transportation Recommendations

Question 1. Were the recommendations made by the SDSU student team following the active transportation assessment realistic? In other words, is it possible to follow through with any recommended changes?

○ Yes

○ No

Question 1.a. If not, which recommendations were not realistic, and why? Reasons may include lack of expertise to implement, lack of government support, lack of funding, lack of time, changes not viewed as necessary, difficulty prioritizing projects, etc.

HEALTHY5D.GOV — SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

Multi-Disciplinary Team

1

Question 1. Was the multi-sector coalition of community stakeholders established for the project useful for completion of the assessment and/or following up on recommendations from the assessment?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Question 1.a. What is the primary reason for your answer to the previous question?

[   ]

Question 1.b. What expertise did your team lack (for example: engineering, planning, elected official, etc.)?

[   ]

Question 2. Do you feel that the team's knowledge, attitudes, and abilities with respect to active transportation have improved as a result of this assessment?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Question 2.a. If yes to the previous question, in what ways?

[   ]

Question 3. Will the team remain in place in the future?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Question 3.a. If yes to the previous question, do you believe it will continue to be useful and how? If not, why not?

[   ]

HEALTHYSD.GOV   SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

Funding

2

Question 1. Has the active transportation assessment helped (or do you believe it will help) your community to obtain dedicated city funding to address concerns and recommendations made in that assessment?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Question 1.a. If yes to the previous question, what is the funding meant to address, and is the amount adequate?

[ ]

Question 2. Has the active transportation assessment helped (or do you believe it will help) your community to obtain funding from a source *other* than the city?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Question 2.a. If yes to the previous question, what is the funding meant to address, and is the amount adequate?

[ ]

| HEALTHYSD.GOV | SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey |

Other Support

Question 1. Aside from funding, what kind of support has been given (or promised) to the active transportation assessment and follow-up by elected officials and others who can help to make an impact on the community?

[ ]

3

Question 2. Who do you believe are the primary supporters necessary to implement any recommended changes (completed, in progress, or planned)?

Question 3. Was the technical assistance, support, oversight, and follow-up provided by SDSU Professor Donald Burger useful and adequate for the collaboration?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Question 4. Relative to your needs, how useful have communication, new resources, and support from Beth Davis and the South Dakota Department of Health (SDDOH) been for completing and following up on the active transportation assessment?

◯ Too little assistance

◯ The right amount of assistance

◯ Too much assistance

Question 4.a. Specifically, what aspects of this support have been helpful? What aspects have not been helpful?

Question 4.b. Has this assessment collaboration provided other learning opportunities for you around healthy community design principles that you would not have had?

◯ Yes

◯ No

HEALTHYSD.GOV   SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

Communication with the Community

4

Question 1. Has your stakeholder team conducted an active transportation educational event for the community?

◯ Yes

◯ No

◯ Not yet but we plan to

Question 1.a. If yes to the previous question, briefly describe the event, and if it has already taken place, whether you feel it was successful or not (and why)?

```

```

Question 2. Have the findings of the active transportation assessment been communicated to the community?

◯ Yes

◯ No

◯ Not yet but we plan to

Question 3. What methods were used/will be used to communicate information to the community?

☐ Press releases

☐ Newsletter articles

☐ Social media

☐ Official community websites

☐ Other

Other (please specify)

```

```

Question 4. Has a community survey been conducted?

◯ Yes

◯ No

◯ Not yet but we plan to

Question 5. In what other ways, if any, has the community been encouraged (or will they be encouraged) to contribute their voices?

Ultimate Impact on Active Transportation

To determine what changes have been made in your community based on your active transportation assessment findings and recommendations, please indicate whether or not you have made changes by selecting "Yes", "No", or "Not yet but we plan to", in response to each of the categories below. You do not need to indicate specific changes within each category.

Question 1. **Pedestrian Safety**: safer crosswalks and intersections, sidewalks, curb enhancements, reduced speed zones, pedestrian signals, Safe Routes to School strategies, school siting discussions that encourage active transportation

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet but we plan to

Question 2. **Policy/City Ordinances**: sidewalk and landscaping, mixed-use zoning, complete streets policy discussion, street design policy

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet but we plan to

Question 3. **Collaboration on Planning**: incorporation of assessment/audits into city master plan, collaboration with Public Works & Department of Transportation, land-use planning, collaboration with land developers

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet but we plan to

6

Question 4. **Aesthetics, Wayfinding, & Place Making**: trees, benches, lighting, art, signage, landmarks such as statues, creation of public places to gather, shade facilities

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet but we plan to

Question 5. **Parking**: de-incentivize parking, reduction of parking spaces to encourage pedestrian activity, safer parking design

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet but we plan to

Question 6. **Bike Facilities**: bike racks, dedicated bike lanes, bike boulevards, education for drivers and cyclists, bike rodeos for youth

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet but we plan to

Question 7. **Parks, Trails & Paths**: creation of more green spaces, crime prevention tactics, shared-use paths, trails enhancements, playgrounds

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet but we plan to

Question 8. **Public Transit**: safe access to public transit by foot or bike

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet but we plan to

Question 9. **Community Wide Walking Campaigns/Programs**: established walking groups, facilitated walks, identification of safe routes for walkers

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet but we plan to

7

Question 10. **Other Changes**

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet but we plan to

Other (please specify)

[   ]

Most cities have a "city wide master plan" that supports active transportation principles. This plan may have different names in different communities, including "pedestrian plan", "master plan", "walkability plan", "bike safety plan", etc.

Question 11. Have changes been made to this plan in your community, as a result of this collaboration?

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet

○ I am not aware of this plan

Question 11.a.   If yes to question 11, what changes have been made?

[   ]

A "Complete Streets" policy formalizes a community's intent to plan, design, and maintain streets so they are safe for users of all ages and abilities. This policy directs transportation designers and engineers to consistently design and construct the right-of-way to accommodate all anticipated users including pedestrians, bicyclists, public transportation users, motorists, and freight vehicles.

Question 12. Does your community currently have a "Complete Streets" or similar policy?

○ Yes

○ No

○ I am not sure

Question 12.a. If yes to the previous question, were changes made to this policy based on the results of the walk audit?

○ Yes

○ No

○ Not yet

Question 12.b. If no to Question 12, would you be interested in learning more and possibly creating a Complete Streets policy for your community based on the results of your current work?

○ Yes

○ No

Question 13.   Have you utilized any form of traffic counting tools to measure pedestrian activity?

○ Yes

○ No

Question 13.a.   If yes to the previous question, please describe what type and how you have used these tools?

HEALTHYSD.GOV   SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

Continuing Support

Question 1. What follow-up would you like to have in order to continue to improve active transportation in your community?

Question 2. Would a future plan of action characterizing short, mid, and long-term goals have been helpful as you completed your active transportation assessment?

HEALTHYSD.GOV   SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

Barriers and Challenges Experienced

9

Question 1: What were (or do you anticipate will be) the biggest challenges experienced with respect to making changes based on the active transportation assessment? Examples might include getting appropriate people and departments on board, the length of time to implement policy changes, lack of funding to implement changes, keeping the team motivated, etc.

_____

| HEALTHY SD.GOV | SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey |

Improvements

Question 1. How could the assistance offered by the Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration (SDDOH, SDSU Student Team, SDSU Professor) be improved? Consider the entire process of the active transportation assessment.

_____

| HEALTHY SD.GOV | SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey |

End of Survey

Please click DONE! You have completed this survey! Thank you for your participation. Your responses are greatly appreciated and will help to improve the quality and delivery of our programs to improve the health of South Dakotans.

10

Community Walk Audit Grant Program
South Dakota Department of Health

The South Dakota Department of Health provides funding and technical assistance to SD communities interested in healthy community design policy, systems and environmental strategies that improve walkability for all residents. The primary community expectations of this grant program are to convene a multi-disciplinary team of community leaders, conduct a local walkability/walk audit training event, and complete a community walk audit.

Walk audits are an easy, doable assessment that communities can utilize as an education and advocacy tool to spark both short and long term policy planning efforts. Walk audit assessment data can position communities for larger grant opportunities, launching complete street policy efforts that enhance the built environment and improve walkability. Enhancing walkability increases the number of individuals walking for recreation, exercise, and/or transportation leading to the reduction of chronic disease risk and burden.

Communities selected convene a multi-sector coalition of community stakeholders. Representation may include Elected Officials, Community/Civic Leaders, Wellness, Public Works, Zoning, Planning, Transportation, Engineering, Parks and Recreation, Transit Authority, Walking/Bicycling Advocacy, Schools, Historical Preservation, Local Business, Economic Development, Social Services, Tourism, Older Adults, Youth, Childcare, Healthcare, People with Disabilities, Law Enforcement, Main Street/Downtown Associations, and other residents.

Potential action items to result from community walk audits include, but are not limited to:

Short Term – Small Street-Scale Built Environment Enhancements, Expanded Assessments, Mayoral Directives to Improve Walkability, Healthy Community Design Resolution, Planning for Model Ordinances that support walkability, Positioning for Larger Funding Opportunities, Safe Routes to Schools

Long Term – Integration into City Master Planning, Development of City-Wide Walkability Plan, Adoption of Model Ordinances that support walkability, Complete Streets Policy Development and Adoption, Built Environment Infrastructure Investments

Lake Andes, Keystone, Mobridge, Burke, Pierre, Rapid City, and **Sioux Falls** received funds for walk audits in their communities and are at varying stages of planning, implementation, and next steps. The grant cycle is one year, typically with a July – June grant period but each grant year may vary. Communities are selected through a competitive application process, with an average grant award of $5000.00. Community leaders who are interested in applying should have the support of their elected city administration. The application, when announced, can be found at http://healthysd.gov/fundingopportunities/.

For more information, contact:
Beth Davis
Physical Activity Practitioner in Public Health
Physical Activity Coordinator
South Dakota Department of Health
(605) 280-2429 - Beth2022@pie.midco.net

HEALTHYSD.GOV
Live better. Grow stronger.

9/2017

Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration
South Dakota Department of Health, SDSU, and SD Communities

The South Dakota Department of Health provides one SD community (or two communities as an inter-community active transportation project) with technical assistance on launching healthy community design principles through conducting active transportation assessments. The technical assistance is provided by SDSU Landscape Architect students as part of their spring 300 level City Planning class. The students, under the guidance of Professor Donald Burger, conduct varied built environment assessments, develop recommendations for improving the built environment to increase active transportation within that community or joint communities, and present their findings to the community. A highlight of this collaboration is the community stakeholder engagement with the students throughout the process.

Active transportation is the integration of physical activity into daily routines such as walking or biking to destinations like work, school, grocery stores, or parks. Active transportation policies and practices in community design, land use, and facility access have been proven effective to increase physical activity. Improving the built environment conducive to active transportation also improves community aesthetics, enhances the economy of a community, and improves overall community connectedness and quality of life.

Communities are selected through a competitive application process. Applications are made available at www.healthysd.gov in late fall, for a winter/spring grant period. This is a no-cost opportunity for the selected community. By engaging in the assessment process, communities can position themselves for larger funding opportunities to support short-term healthy community design enhancements, or long-term complete streets policy implementation and infrastructure investments. Selected communities convene a multi-sector coalition of community stakeholders with representation from Elected Officials, Community/Civic Leaders, Wellness, Public Works, Zoning, Planning, Transportation, Engineering, Parks and Rec, Transit Authority, Walking/Bicycling Advocacy, Schools, Historical Preservation, Local Business, Economic Development, Social Services, Tourism, Seniors, Youth, Childcare, Healthcare, People with Disabilities, Law Enforcement, Main Street/Downtown Associations, and other local residents.

The following communities have participated in this collaboration and are at different stages of consideration and/or implementation of the recommendations: **2013 Huron**, **2014 Mitchell**, **2015 Volga and Salem**, **2016 Ft. Pierre, and 2017 Crooks**. All communities receive ongoing support, technical assistance and follow-up provided by the SDDOH as part of this project. All SDSU community reports can be found on each of the city's websites or at http://goodandhealthysd.org/about/key-data/.

For more information, contact:

Beth Davis
Physical Activity Practitioner in Public Health
Physical Activity Coordinator
South Dakota Department of Health
(605) 280-2429
Beth2022@pie.midco.net

9/2017

Links to SDSU Community Reports

Huron	http://services1.arcgis.com/PwrabBhZHUggYYSp/arcgis/rest/services/CommRprts1_17_17/FeatureServer/0/52/attachments/10
Mitchell	http://services1.arcgis.com/PwrabBhZHUggYYSp/arcgis/rest/services/CommRprts1_17_17/FeatureServer/0/14/attachments/22
Salem	http://services1.arcgis.com/PwrabBhZHUggYYSp/arcgis/rest/services/CommRprts1_17_17/FeatureServer/0/60/attachments/29
Volga	http://services1.arcgis.com/PwrabBhZHUggYYSp/arcgis/rest/services/CommRprts1_17_17/FeatureServer/0/6/attachments/30
Ft. Pierre	http://services1.arcgis.com/PwrabBhZHUggYYSp/arcgis/rest/services/CommRprts1_17_17/FeatureServer/0/27/attachments/47
Crooks	https://www.dropbox.com/s/eed2hf8ijg56sde/Crooks%202017%20Executive%20Document.pdf