



2022 SOUTH DAKOTA WALKABLE COMMUNITIES TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM PRE AND POST COLLABORATION SURVEY EVALUATION

11/29/22

Prepared by Spectrum SD
for the South Dakota Department of Health
Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion

Table of Contents

Background	3
Purpose of Report	3
Executive Summary.....	4
Program Commonalities	5
The Walk Audit Grant Program.....	5
The SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration	5
Participating Communities.....	6
Individual Survey Items.....	6
Knowledge of Active Transportation/Walkability.....	6
Ability to Improve Active Transportation/Walkability.....	7
Community Attitude Toward Active Transportation/Walkability.....	8
Support of Elected Officials for Active Transportation/Walkability	8
Pedestrian Traffic Counting	9
Perception of Nine Areas	9
Complete Streets Policy	14
Pre-Program Expectations	14
Post-Program Perspective.....	15
Summary of Immediate Program Outcomes	16
Acknowledgments.....	18
For More Information/Programmatic Contact	18
APPENDIX.....	19
Walk Audit Grant Pre-Program Survey	19
Walk Audit Grant Post-Program Survey.....	22
SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Pre-Program Survey.....	25
SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Post-Program Survey	28
Programmatic Briefs	31
Links to SDSU Community Reports	33

Background

The South Dakota Department of Health (SD DOH) has supported 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 Walk Audit Grant Program was phased out in 2019, but communities can collaborate with Wellmark Healthy HometownSM – a strong partner of the SD DOH - for walk audit technical assistance. SD DOH continues to support the SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration.

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 South Dakota Statewide Walking Network serves as an advisory team to the South Dakota Walkable Communities Technical Assistance Program.

Purpose of Report

In 2017, a programmatic evaluation of the South Dakota Walkable Communities Technical Assistance Program was conducted. While that report provided valuable insight to the communities that had participated in the program at that time, one drawback was that all of the feedback was collected after the collaboration or walk audit was completed. In some cases, this feedback came a number of years after the completion of the collaboration or walk audit. At that time, it was decided that more immediate feedback would improve the ability to evaluate the program. Additionally, rather than asking respondents to recall their experience prior to the collaboration or walk audit, providing a pre-program survey would allow for direct comparison and understanding of the changes brought to the community by the program.

The result of this observation was a pre- and post-program survey that was delivered to each of the communities that participated in 2018 or later. The original programmatic evaluation was also repeated in 2022, and included a further check in with each of the pre-2017 communities. This report can be considered a supplement to that programmatic report, providing more immediate feedback from the communities. This report concentrates on knowledge, abilities, and community attitudes relative to active transportation and walkability, as well as existence and knowledge of tools like pedestrian traffic counting and complete streets policies. There are also questions regarding the perception of what is needed in different areas related to active transportation and walkability.

Executive Summary

Prior to participating in the program, the communities were asked what they wanted to achieve by participating. While answers did vary by community, there were some common threads that were found in multiple answers. This included improved safety for pedestrians, increased community health, and reducing (or not increasing) vehicle traffic in areas with greater demands for housing, schools, and businesses. Many of the communities also emphasized promoting awareness of active transportation and walkability among community members, as well as developing or improving city-wide transportation plans.

Although the small number of program participants does not lend itself to testing for statistical significance, there were some apparent changes following the participation in the program. Four major areas that are very important for active transportation and walkability are community knowledge, ability, attitudes, and support in the areas of active transportation and walkability. Perceived knowledge of and perceived ability to improve active transportation/walkability both either stayed the same or increased following participation in the program. The case was generally the same for perceived community attitudes toward active transportation/walkability, although one community reported less positive attitudes following the program. In the case of perceived report of elected officials, there were cases where this stayed the same, increased, or decreased following participation in the program. This indicates that the program may have offered an opportunity to more accurately evaluate the support of elected officials for walkability or transportation, rather than actually changed that level of support.

There were two tools that the surveys asked about; these were pedestrian traffic counting tools, and a Complete Streets policy. Pedestrian traffic tools can help cities to accurately measure the current pedestrian traffic; a Complete Streets policy describes the community plan for incorporating features such as sidewalks, bike lanes, etc. into street design. In both cases, knowledge of these tools changed in different ways for different communities, and whether or not these tools existed changed in both directions following the program. This indicates that participating in the program may have simply changed the survey participants' state of knowledge about these tools, rather than that the availability of these tools actually changed. This may be considered a positive result of participating in the program.

There was a survey item addressing nine different areas related to active transportation/walkability, and this item asked the participants to rate the amount of improvement required in each of these areas, if any. While in some cases, the perception of the amount of work required generally stayed the same or increased following the program (e.g., pedestrian safety, policy/city ordinance), there were other areas where the perceptions changed in different directions (e.g., aesthetics/wayfinding and place making). This is likely a result of the program helping to clarify what was needed in each of these areas, and helping the communities to evaluate them with appropriate criteria in mind.

Finally, after participating in the program, the communities were asked about the realism of implementing the suggestions by the students at SDSU (for the SDSU collaboration participants) or whether the walk audit had resulted in tasks and a follow up plan (Walk Audit Grant participants). Most SDSU communities believed that the suggestions they had been given were realistic, although in some cases might be split into short term/long term goals. There was also recognition among the program participants that some of the recommendations would require buy-in from community stakeholders that had not directly been part of the program. Some of the communities also commented that the work

that had been done would provide guidelines for development of plans that they would be able to work from in the future while working toward meeting city needs in general.

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, tribal representatives, 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 who are differently abled, 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 192,517 residents¹
- 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
- This program ended after 2019 and new communities interested in walk audits are encouraged to collaborate with [Wellmark Healthy HometownSM](#). – a strong partner of the SD DOH

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
- A key deliverable of this collaboration is the final report of recommendations developed by SDSU, that the communities can leverage/use for community engagement, planning for walkability enhancements, and securing grant funds for implementation (reports can be found at links listed in the appendix).
- 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

¹ Source: <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/data.html>

- SDSU students gain hands-on experience working within communities, and are exposed to the multiple benefits of creating walkable communities from the perspective of a Landscape Architect

Participating Communities

There were 7 communities that participated in the SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration since 2017; there were 2 communities that participated in the Walk Audit Grant since 2017. Not all of these communities were able to complete both pre- and post-participation surveys. The communities and the surveys they participated in are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Communities and Survey Participation by Program

Program	Community	Implementation	Pre	Post
SDSU Active Transportation Collaboration	Burke	2018	X	X
	Tripp	2018	X	
	Sioux Falls	2019	X	X
	Harrisburg	2019	X	
	Sturgis	2020	X	X
	Mission	2021	X	X
Walk Audit Grant	Wanblee	2022	X	X
	Hermosa	2018/2019	X	X
	Viborg	2018/2019		

All seven SDSU communities were able to complete the pre-collaboration survey; only five of these were also able to complete the post-collaboration survey. Only one of the Walk Audit Grant communities completed the survey, but did complete it on both occasions. In order to provide perspective on changes that occurred, tables will be created for SDSU communities including those who answered pre- and post-collaboration items only, but the two communities that only answered at pre-implementation will be reflected in the text.

Individual Survey Items

There were seven survey items that appeared on both pre- and post-collaboration/walk audit surveys; there was also one open-ended item that appeared only on the pre-implementation survey, and one open-ended item that appeared only on the post-implementation survey. The following subsections address those nine items.

Knowledge of Active Transportation/Walkability

This question asked “How would you rate your current knowledge of active transportation [walk audits] as a community?” The responses for SDSU communities who responded to both surveys are given in Table 1.

Table 1. SDSU Communities Pre- and Post-Collaboration Responses to Knowledge Item

Pre	Post				
	Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high
Very low	0	0	0	0	0
Low	0	0	1	0	0
Moderate	0	0	2	0	0
High	0	0	0	1	1
Very high	0	0	0	0	0

From Table 1, there was one community that indicated low knowledge pre-collaboration but moderate knowledge afterward; there were two communities that indicated moderate knowledge beforehand and afterward; there was one community that indicated high knowledge beforehand and afterward; and one community that indicated high knowledge beforehand and very high knowledge afterward. All SDSU communities either rated their knowledge higher or the same following the collaboration.

The two SDSU communities that only answered the pre-collaboration survey both rated their knowledge as low.

The Walk Audit Grant community that responded to the survey rated their knowledge moderate prior to the walk audit, and rated it high following the walk audit (an improvement).

Ability to Improve Active Transportation/Walkability

This question asked “How would you rate your current ability to improve active transportation [conduct a walk audit] as a community?” The responses for SDSU communities who responded to both surveys are given in Table 2.

Table 2. SDSU Communities Pre- and Post-Collaboration Responses to Ability Item

Pre	Post				
	Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high
Very low	0	0	0	0	0
Low	0	1	0	0	0
Moderate	0	0	1	2	1
High	0	0	0	0	0
Very high	0	0	0	0	0

From Table 2, there was one community that indicated low knowledge both pre- and post-collaboration, one community that indicated moderate knowledge both pre- and post-collaboration, two communities that rated their knowledge as moderate before and high after, and one community that rated their knowledge as moderate before and very high after. All SDSU communities either rated their knowledge higher or the same following the collaboration.

The two SDSU communities that only answered the pre-collaboration survey both rated their ability as moderate.

The Walk Audit Grant community that responded to the survey rated their ability as high before and after the walk audit (no change).

Community Attitude Toward Active Transportation/Walkability

This question asked “How would you rate your community's attitude toward active transportation [walkability]?” The responses for SDSU communities who responded to both surveys are given in Table 3.

Table 3. SDSU Communities Pre- and Post-Collaboration Responses to Community Attitude Item

Pre	Post			
	Not a priority	Low priority	Moderate priority	High priority
Not a priority	0	0	0	0
Low priority	0	0	0	1
Moderate priority	0	0	1	0
High priority	0	0	1	2

There is one community who rated the attitude as low priority before the collaboration and high priority after, one community who rated it moderate priority before and after, one community that rated it high priority before and moderate priority after, and two communities that rated it high priority both before and after.

Of the two SDSU communities that only answered the pre-collaboration survey, one rated it low priority and one rated it high priority.

The Walk Audit Grant community that responded to the survey rated the attitude as low priority before the walk audit and moderate priority afterward.

Support of Elected Officials for Active Transportation/Walkability

This question asked “How would you rate the current support of elected officials for active transportation [walkability] in your community?” The responses for SDSU communities who responded to both surveys are given in Table 4.

Table 4. SDSU Communities Pre- and Post-Collaboration Responses to Elected Support Item

Pre	Post			
	Not a priority	Low priority	Moderate priority	High priority
Not a priority	0	0	0	0
Low priority	0	0	0	1
Moderate priority	0	1	2	0
High priority	0	0	1	0

One of the communities indicated this was a low priority before and a high priority after, one indicated it was a moderate priority before and a low priority after, two communities rated it as a moderate priority both before and after, and one rated it as a high priority before and a moderate priority after.

Of the two SDSU communities that only answered the pre-collaboration survey, one rated it low priority and one rated it moderate priority.

The Walk Audit Grant community that responded to the survey rated the elected official support as high priority both before and after the walk audit.

Pedestrian Traffic Counting

This question asked “Are you aware of any pedestrian traffic counting data and/or tools for collecting this data that are available in your community?” The responses for SDSU communities who responded to both surveys are given in Table 5.

Table 5. SDSU Communities Pre- and Post-Collaboration Responses to Pedestrian Traffic Counting Item

Pre	Post	
	No	Yes
No	1	2
Yes	1	1

One of the communities indicated they did not know of pedestrian traffic counting data before or after the collaboration, one knew about them before and after, the collaboration, two did not know about them before but did know about them after, and interestingly, one community knew about them before but did not know about them after.

Of the two SDSU communities that only answered the pre-collaboration survey, one said they were and one said they were not aware of these tools.

The Walk Audit Grant community that responded to the survey indicated that they were not aware of pedestrian traffic counting tools before or after the walk audit.

Perception of Nine Areas

This question asked “Please provide your perception of each of the following areas with respect to encouraging walking and active transportation,” and is followed by nine individual areas that may require improvement. These are treated individually.

- 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

Table 6. SDSU Communities Pre- and Post-Collaboration Responses: Pedestrian Safety

Pre	Post			
	Does not require improvement	Requires a little improvement	Requires a lot of improvement	Don't know
Does not require improvement	0	0	0	0
Requires a little improvement	0	1	2	0
Requires a lot of improvement	0	0	2	0
Don't know	0	0	0	0

The two SDSU communities that only took the pre-collaboration survey both responded with “requires a little improvement.”

The Walk Audit Grant community that took the survey responded with “requires a lot of improvement” both before and after the walk audit.

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

Table 7. SDSU Communities Pre- and Post-Collaboration Responses: Policy/City Ordinances

Pre	Post			
	Does not require improvement	Requires a little improvement	Requires a lot of improvement	Don't know
Does not require improvement	0	0	0	0
Requires a little improvement	0	2	1	0
Requires a lot of improvement	0	0	2	0
Don't know	0	0	0	0

The two SDSU communities that only took the pre-collaboration survey responded with “requires a little improvement” and “don’t know.”

The Walk Audit Grant community that took the survey responded with “requires a little improvement” both before and after the walk audit.

- 3) Collaboration on Planning: incorporation of assessment/audits into city master plan, collaboration with Public Works & DOT, land-use planning, collaboration with land developers

Table 8. SDSU Communities Pre- and Post-Collaboration Responses: Collaboration on Planning

Pre	Post			
	Does not require improvement	Requires a little improvement	Requires a lot of improvement	Don't know
Does not require improvement	0	0	0	0
Requires a little improvement	0	1	2	0
Requires a lot of improvement	0	1	1	0
Don't know	0	0	0	0

The two SDSU communities that only took the pre-collaboration survey both responded with “don’t know.”

The Walk Audit Grant community that took the survey responded with “requires a lot of improvement” before the walk audit and “does not require improvement” after the walk audit.

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

Table 9. SDSU Communities Pre- and Post-Collaboration Responses: Aesthetics, Wayfinding, and Place Making

Pre	Post			
	Does not require improvement	Requires a little improvement	Requires a lot of improvement	Don't know
Does not require improvement	1	0	0	0
Requires a little improvement	0	0	2	0
Requires a lot of improvement	0	0	2	0
Don't know	0	0	0	0

The two SDSU communities that only took the pre-collaboration survey responded with “requires a little improvement” and “requires a lot of improvement.”

The Walk Audit Grant community that took the survey responded with “requires a lot of improvement” before and after the walk audit.

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

Table 10. SDSU Communities Pre- and Post-Collaboration Responses: Parking

Pre	Post			
	Does not require improvement	Requires a little improvement	Requires a lot of improvement	Don't know
Does not require improvement	1	1	0	0
Requires a little improvement	0	0	1	0
Requires a lot of improvement	0	1	1	0
Don't know	0	0	0	0

The two SDSU communities that only took the pre-collaboration survey both responded with “requires a little improvement.”

The Walk Audit Grant community that took the survey responded with “requires a little improvement” before the walk audit and “requires a lot of improvement” after the walk audit.

- 6) Bike Facilities: bike racks, dedicated bike lanes, bike boulevards, education for drivers and cyclists, bike rodeos for youth

Table 11. SDSU Communities Pre- and Post-Collaboration Responses: Bike Facilities

Pre	Post			
	Does not require improvement	Requires a little improvement	Requires a lot of improvement	Don't know
Does not require improvement	0	0	0	0
Requires a little improvement	0	2	1	0
Requires a lot of improvement	0	0	2	0
Don't know	0	0	0	0

The two SDSU communities that only took the pre-collaboration survey responded with “requires a little improvement” and “requires a lot of improvement.”

The Walk Audit Grant community that took the survey responded with “requires a lot of improvement” both before and after the walk audit.

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

Table 12. SDSU Communities Pre- and Post-Collaboration Responses: Parks, Trails and Paths

Pre	Post			
	Does not require improvement	Requires a little improvement	Requires a lot of improvement	Don't know
Does not require improvement	0	0	0	0
Requires a little improvement	0	1	1	0
Requires a lot of improvement	0	0	3	0
Don't know	0	0	0	0

The two SDSU communities that only took the pre-collaboration survey responded with “requires a little improvement” and “requires a lot of improvement.”

The Walk Audit Grant community that took the survey responded with “requires a lot of improvement” both before and after the walk audit.

8) Public Transit: safe access to public transit by foot or bike

Table 13. SDSU Communities Pre- and Post-Collaboration Responses: Public Transit

Pre	Post			
	Does not require improvement	Requires a little improvement	Requires a lot of improvement	Don't know
Does not require improvement	0	0	0	0
Requires a little improvement	0	2	0	2
Requires a lot of improvement	0	0	1	0
Don't know	0	0	0	0

The two SDSU communities that only took the pre-collaboration survey responded with “requires a little improvement” and “requires a lot of improvement.”

The Walk Audit Grant community that took the survey responded with “don’t know” before the walk audit and “requires a lot of improvement” after the walk audit.

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

Table 14. SDSU Communities Pre- and Post-Collaboration Responses: Community Wide Walking Campaigns/Programs

Pre	Post			
	Does not require improvement	Requires a little improvement	Requires a lot of improvement	Don't know
Does not require improvement	1	0	0	0
Requires a little improvement	0	2	0	0
Requires a lot of improvement	0	0	1	1
Don't know	0	0	0	0

The two SDSU communities that only took the pre-collaboration survey responded with “requires a little improvement” and “requires a lot of improvement.”

The Walk Audit Grant community that took the survey responded with “requires a little improvement” both before and after the walk audit.

Complete Streets Policy

This question asked “Does your community have a ‘Complete Streets’ policy (or something similar)?” The question was followed by a description of what a Complete Streets policy is, for clarity. The responses for SDSU communities who responded to both surveys are given in Table 15.

Table 15. SDSU Communities Pre- and Post-Collaboration Responses to Complete Streets Policy Item

Pre	Post		
	No	Yes	I don't know
No	1	0	1
Yes	1	0	0
I don't know	1	1	0

One community said no both before and after, one community said no before and that they didn’t know after, one community said yes before and no after, one community didn’t know before and said no after, and one community didn’t know before and said yes after.

Of the two SDSU communities that only answered the pre-collaboration survey, one responded with yes and one responded with I don’t know.

The Walk Audit Grant community that responded to the survey indicated they did not have this plan before the walk audit, and did have this plan afterward.

Pre-Program Expectations

This item asked “Do you have any comments about what you are hoping to accomplish or learn by participating in this project? What kind of support do you need?” This was an open-ended item, and the responses of the communities are reported verbatim here.

SDSU:

- Seeking for technical assistance for the safety of the community and to encourage healthy habits.
- We want to make our community safer and raise the quality of living for families. Our city park is a vastly underutilized resource, with great potential. Many of our families lack cars, so safe walking is critical.
- Sturgis needs additional housing, and we are planning additional developments. We want to ensure they are incorporated into non-vehicle travel ways. Prioritizing bike path construction. Bicycling is an important recreational activity in Sturgis. We have a bike park for kids, and many miles of mountain bike trails accessible to town.
- My goal would be to continually discuss safe options for traffic, pedestrians and most importantly students approaching school zones. The southern most areas of Sioux Falls are continually developing and expanding with homes, businesses and schools. I believe it is a topic that needs to be continually discussed and monitored for the safety of all constituents.
- As a community, we hope to achieve a high level of awareness promoting walking, bicycling, and riding transit among school-aged children. We need to develop strategies that many organizations and groups can collectively work together to achieve success in getting more kids choosing active transportation modes. The community needs more education in complete streets practices in street design and placemaking that are critical to neighborhood vitality.
- Just excitement to work on developing all of the above-mentioned areas!
- We are looking for all options to make our community better, big or small. The hope is that with your help we can identify projects and place them in a strategic plan if they make sense for Tripp.

Walk Audit Grant:

- My expectations are that upon completion we will have updated town maps, future use maps and a transportation master plan. I feel this can happen with the support of the town board, engineer, and community members.

Post-Program Perspective

This item was different for the SDSU communities and the Walk Audit Grant community. The SDSU communities were asked “Are the recommendations provided to you by the SDSU team realistic? Which are not realistic, and why not?” The Walk Audit Grant community was asked “What changes would you like to implement in your community following participation in the Walk Audit Grant, and what progress has been made toward these changes?” These were open-ended questions, and the responses of the communities are reported verbatim here.

SDSU:

- The recommendations were realistic. We need training, planning, seek for funding sources for the projects that were addressed and to develop a concrete plan.
- Many are realistic, some long-term, some short-term. A few were not as realistic as the rest, things like a roundabout for traffic are probably not going to be applicable in our community.

At the Sinte Gleska University meeting we tried to focus on the most applicable recommendations, and all attendees voted on what seemed most important to them.

- A few of the recommendations would need buy in by other agencies and may not be feasible. Sturgis will treat the recommendations as an idea book.
- Yes, the traffic calming around school zones recommendations are very realistic for expanding school zones, adding crosswalks, and narrowing travel lanes. The addition of more destinations for people in the neighborhood will take buy-in from private individuals, but is possible with incremental investment through quick demonstration projects that lead to capital investment in safe streets. The 10th/11th Street corridor presents a challenge because we may have to deal with DOT standards in reducing lane widths, etc. Overall, I am satisfied with the student work and greatly appreciate their assistance even in the winter months. Thank YOU!
- Yes, but I'm a dreamer!

Walk Audit Grant:

- The Walk Audit Grant gave our community the opportunity to develop an active transportation plan, now we will start to put it in action!

Summary of Immediate Program Outcomes

- With respect to overall knowledge of active transportation/walkability, slightly more than half of the programs felt their knowledge improved, and the other half felt their knowledge stayed the same following the collaboration or grant.
- With respect to ability to improve active transportation/walkability, half of the programs felt their knowledge improved, and the other half felt their knowledge stayed the same following the collaboration or grant.
- With respect to the community attitude toward active transportation/walkability, for roughly half of the communities this did not change following the collaboration or grant; for two communities, this improved, and for one community this decreased. Although we do not know the reason for this, it's possible for the one community where the attitude decreased, the collaboration did not cause the decrease, but allowed for a more realistic assessment of the community attitude.
- With respect to the perceived elected official support for active transportation/walkability, for half of the communities, this stayed the same; for two communities, perceived support decreased, and for one community perceived support increased. Again, although we do not know the reason for this, it's possible that the collaboration did not cause this decrease, but allowed for a more realistic assessment of elected official support.
- With respect to knowledge of pedestrian counting tools in the community, two communities did not have knowledge before or after, one community had knowledge before and after, two communities did not know about this before but did know after, and one community did know about this before but did not know about it after. For this final community, it is not clear if these traffic tools stopped being used during this time period, or if they simply became aware that these tools were not actually in use following the collaboration.
- With regard to the level of improvement required for the nine different areas, here is a summary of each area:

- Pedestrian safety: The communities' perspectives on the improvement required for pedestrian safety either stayed the same or increased following the walk audit or collaboration.
- Policy/city ordinance: The communities' perspectives on the improvement required in the area of policy/city ordinance either stayed the same or increased following the walk audit or collaboration.
- Collaboration on planning: The communities' perspectives on the improvement required for collaboration on planning change in different ways (some thought it required more improvement, some less improvement) after the walk audit or collaboration, and some stayed the same.
- Aesthetics/wayfinding and place making: The communities' perspectives on the improvement required for aesthetics/wayfinding and place making either stayed the same or increased following the walk audit or collaboration.
- Parking: The communities' perspectives on the improvement required for collaboration on planning change in different ways (some thought it required more improvement, which was more common, although one community thought it required less improvement) after the walk audit or collaboration, and some stayed the same.
- Bike facilities: The communities' perspectives on the improvement required for bike facilities either stayed the same (most communities) or increased following the walk audit or collaboration.
- Parks, trails, and paths: The communities' perspectives on the improvement required for parks, trails, and paths either stayed the same or increased following the walk audit or collaboration.
- Public transit: The communities' perspectives on the improvement required for public transit stayed the same for some communities before the walk audit or collaboration, but in some cases (particularly for the SDSU communities) changed to "don't know" after the collaboration (perhaps this aspect of active transportation was not evaluated in detail for these communities).
- Community wide walking campaigns/programs: The communities' perspectives on the improvement required for walking campaigns stayed the same for most communities, but in one case changed to "don't know" after the collaboration.
- With regard to knowledge of a complete streets policy, there were many different patterns of response to this item, and it seems that there was likely a lot of confusion for each community about what this policy refers to and whether or not they had one.

The first open ended item asked the communities to address what they wanted to achieve by participating in the program as they were preparing to participate. Some of the issues that were mentioned by multiple communities included a desire for increased safety of pedestrians, community health, reducing (or not increasing) vehicle traffic in areas requiring new housing, schooling, and business developments, promoting awareness of active transportation and walkability among community members, and developing or improving city-wide transportation plans.

The second open ended item asked the communities that participated in the SDSU collaboration if the recommendations given by the team were realistic. The majority of respondents indicated that most of the recommendations were realistic, although some of them were perhaps more doable in the short

term and others were more doable in the long term. There were also mentions of outside organizations or stakeholder who would have to provide buy-in in order for some of the recommendations to be met. Several also indicated that the recommendations would be treated as guidelines or as the opportunity to develop a plan that they would be able to work from in the future.

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 *2022 South Dakota Walkable Communities Technical Assistance Program Pre and Post Collaboration Evaluation*.

For More Information/Programmatic Contact

For more information, please contact Beth Davis:

Beth A. Davis, BS, CHES
Healthy Community Consultant
Healthology Works, LLC
Beth2022@pie.midco.net
(605)280-2429

APPENDIX

Walk Audit Grant Pre-Program Survey

Walk Audit Grant Pre-Collaboration Survey

Introduction

Thank you for your time spent answering this brief survey, which will help us to gauge your community's current level of awareness, abilities, and priorities with respect to walkability. This survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Walkable communities benefit everyone. Walk audits are simple assessments that communities can utilize to launch walkability improvement efforts. Walkability-related 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 walkability also improves community aesthetics, enhances the economy of a community, and improves overall community connectedness and quality of life.

Please click "NEXT" to continue the survey.

Walk Audit Grant Pre-Collaboration Survey

1. What is your first and last name?

2. Which community do you represent?

3. How would you rate your current knowledge of walk audits as a community?

Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high
<input type="radio"/>				

4. How would you rate your current ability to conduct a walk audit as a community?

Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high
<input type="radio"/>				

5. How would you rate your community's attitude toward walkability?

Not a priority	Low priority	Moderate priority	High priority
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. How would you rate the current support of elected officials for walkability in your community?

Not a priority	Low priority	Moderate priority	High priority
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. Are you aware of any pedestrian traffic counting data and/or tools for collecting this data that are available in your community?

Yes
 No

8. Please provide your perception of each of the following areas with respect to encouraging walking and active transportation.

	Does not require improvement	Requires a little improvement	Requires a lot of improvement	Don't know
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	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Policy/City Ordinances: sidewalk and landscaping, mixed-use zoning, complete streets policy discussion, street design policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Collaboration on Planning: incorporation of assessment/audits into city master plan, collaboration with Public Works & DOT, land-use planning, collaboration with land developers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Aesthetics, Wayfinding, & Place Making: trees, benches, lighting, art, signage, landmarks such as statues, creation of public places to gather, shade facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parking: de-				

incentivize parking, reduction of parking spaces to encourage pedestrian activity, safer parking design	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bike Facilities: bike racks, dedicated bike lanes, bike boulevards, education for drivers and cyclists, bike rodeos for youth	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parks, Trails, & Paths: creation of more green spaces, crime prevention tactics, shared-use paths, trails enhancements, playgrounds	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public Transit: safe access to public transit by foot or bike	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Wide Walking Campaigns/Programs: established walking groups, facilitated walks, identification of safe routes for walkers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. Does your community have a "Complete Streets" policy (or something similar)? 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.

- Yes
 No
 I don't know

10. Do you have any comments about what you are hoping to accomplish or learn by participating in this project? What kind of support do you need?

Thank you for your participation in this survey. Please click "Done" to submit your answers when you are ready.

Walk Audit Grant Post-Program Survey

Walk Audit Grant Post-Collaboration Survey

Introduction

Thank you for your time spent answering this brief survey, which will help us to gauge your community's current level of awareness, abilities, and priorities with respect to walkability. This survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Walkable communities benefit everyone. Walk audits are simple assessments that communities can utilize to launch walkability improvement efforts. Walkability-related 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 walkability also improves community aesthetics, enhances the economy of a community, and improves overall community connectedness and quality of life.

Please click "NEXT" to continue the survey.

Walk Audit Grant Post-Collaboration Survey

1. What is your first and last name?

2. Which community do you represent?

3. How would you rate your current knowledge of walk audits as a community?

Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high
<input type="radio"/>				

4. How would you rate your current ability to conduct a walk audit as a community?

Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high
<input type="radio"/>				

5. How would you rate your community's attitude toward walkability?

Not a priority	Low priority	Moderate priority	High priority
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. How would you rate the current support of elected officials for walkability in your community?

Not a priority	Low priority	Moderate priority	High priority
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. Are you aware of any pedestrian traffic counting data and/or tools for collecting this data that are available in your community?

- Yes
- No

8. Please provide your perception of each of the following areas with respect to encouraging walking and active transportation.

	Does not require improvement	Requires a little improvement	Requires a lot of improvement	Don't know
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	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Policy/City Ordinances: sidewalk and landscaping, mixed-use zoning, complete streets policy discussion, street design policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Collaboration on Planning: incorporation of assessment/audits into city master plan, collaboration with Public Works & DOT, land-use planning, collaboration with land developers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Aesthetics, Wayfinding, & Place Making: trees, benches, lighting, art, signage, landmarks such as statues, creation of public places to gather, shade facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parking: de-				

incentivize parking, reduction of parking spaces to encourage pedestrian activity, safer parking design	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bike Facilities: bike racks, dedicated bike lanes, bike boulevards, education for drivers and cyclists, bike rodeos for youth	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parks, Trails, & Paths: creation of more green spaces, crime prevention tactics, shared-use paths, trails enhancements, playgrounds	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public Transit: safe access to public transit by foot or bike	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Wide Walking Campaigns/Programs: established walking groups, facilitated walks, identification of safe routes for walkers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. Does your community have a "Complete Streets" policy (or something similar)? 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.

- Yes
 No
 I don't know

10. What changes would you like to implement in your community following participation in the Walk Audit Grant, and what progress has been made toward these changes?

Thank you for your participation in this survey. Please click "Done" to submit your answers when you are ready.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Pre-Program Survey

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Pre-Collaboration Survey

Introduction

Thank you for your time spent answering this brief survey, which will help us to gauge your community's current level of awareness, abilities, and priorities with respect to active transportation. This survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Active transportation integrates physical activity into daily routines such as walking or biking to destinations such as 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.

Please click "NEXT" to continue the survey.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Pre-Collaboration Survey

1. What is your first and last name?

2. Which community do you represent?

3. How would you rate your current knowledge of active transportation as a community?

Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high
<input type="radio"/>				

4. How would you rate your current ability to improve active transportation as a community?

Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high
<input type="radio"/>				

5. How would you rate your community's attitude toward active transportation?

Not a priority	Low priority	Moderate priority	High priority
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. How would you rate the current support of elected officials for active transportation in your community?

Not a priority	Low priority	Moderate priority	High priority
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. Are you aware of any pedestrian traffic counting data and/or tools for collecting this data that are available in your community?

- Yes
- No

8. Please provide your perception of each of the following areas with respect to encouraging active transportation.

	Does not require improvement	Requires a little improvement	Requires a lot of improvement	Don't know
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	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Policy/City Ordinances: sidewalk and landscaping, mixed-use zoning, complete streets policy discussion, street design policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Collaboration on Planning: incorporation of assessment/audits into city master plan, collaboration with Public Works & DOT, land-use planning, collaboration with land developers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Aesthetics, Wayfinding, & Place Making: trees, benches, lighting, art, signage, landmarks such as statues, creation of public places to gather, shade facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parking: de-				

incentivize parking, reduction of parking spaces to encourage pedestrian activity, safer parking design	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bike Facilities: bike racks, dedicated bike lanes, bike boulevards, education for drivers and cyclists, bike rodeos for youth	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parks, Trails, & Paths: creation of more green spaces, crime prevention tactics, shared-use paths, trails enhancements, playgrounds	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public Transit: safe access to public transit by foot or bike	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Wide Walking Campaigns/Programs: established walking groups, facilitated walks, identification of safe routes for walkers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. Does your community have a "Complete Streets" policy (or something similar)? 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.

- Yes
 No
 I don't know

10. Do you have any comments about what you are hoping to accomplish or learn by participating in this project? What kind of support do you need?

Thank you for your participation in this survey. Please click "Done" to submit your answers when you are ready.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Post-Program Survey

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Post-Collaboration Survey

Introduction

Thank you for your time spent answering this brief follow-up survey, which will help us to gauge your community's current level of awareness, abilities, and priorities with respect to active transportation, following your work with your SDSU student team. This survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Please click "NEXT" to continue the survey.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Post-Collaboration Survey

1. What is your first and last name?

2. Which community do you represent?

3. How would you rate your current knowledge of active transportation as a community?

Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high
<input type="radio"/>				

4. How would you rate your current ability to improve active transportation as a community?

Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high
<input type="radio"/>				

5. How would you rate your community's attitude toward active transportation?

Not a priority	Low priority	Moderate priority	High priority
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. How would you rate the current support of elected officials for active transportation in your community?

Not a priority	Low priority	Moderate priority	High priority
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. Are you aware of any pedestrian traffic counting data and/or tools for collecting this data that are available in your community?

- Yes
- No

8. Please provide your perception of each of the following areas with respect to encouraging active transportation.

	Does not require improvement	Requires a little improvement	Requires a lot of improvement	Don't know
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	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Policy/City Ordinances: sidewalk and landscaping, mixed-use zoning, complete streets policy discussion, street design policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Collaboration on Planning: incorporation of assessment/audits into city master plan, collaboration with Public Works & DOT, land-use planning, collaboration with land developers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Aesthetics, Wayfinding, & Place Making: trees, benches, lighting, art, signage, landmarks such as statues, creation of public places to gather, shade facilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parking: de-incentivize parking, reduction of parking spaces to encourage pedestrian activity, safer parking design	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bike Facilities: bike racks, dedicated bike				

lanes, bike boulevards, education for drivers and cyclists, bike rodeos for youth	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parks, Trails, & Paths: creation of more green spaces, crime prevention tactics, shared-use paths, trails enhancements, playgrounds	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Public Transit: safe access to public transit by foot or bike	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Wide Walking Campaigns/Programs: established walking groups, facilitated walks, identification of safe routes for walkers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. Does your community have a "Complete Streets" policy (or something similar)? 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.

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

10. Are the recommendations provided to you by the SDSU team realistic? Which are not realistic, and why not?

Thank you for your participation in this survey. Please click "Done" to submit your answers when you are ready.

Community Walk Audit Grant Program South Dakota Department of Health

From 2014-2019, the South Dakota Department of Health (SDDOH) provided 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 one-year grant cycle program were to convene a multi-disciplinary team of community leaders, conduct a local walkability/walk audit training event, and complete a walk audit. Following the walk audit, leaders were encouraged to develop actionable strategies.

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 convened a multi-sector coalition of stakeholders. Representation included Elected Officials, Community/Civic Leaders, Tribal Entities, 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 Differently Able, Law Enforcement, Main Street/Downtown Associations, and other residents.

Potential action items resulting from community walk audits included, but were 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, Pop-Up Projects, Bike Events

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

Hermosa, Viborg, 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 implementation of the goals set forth through their walk audit process. Communities were selected through a competitive application process, with an average grant award of \$5000.00. The SDDOH now partners with [Healthy Hometown Powered by Wellmark™](#) for walk audit community technical assistance as part of Wellmark's Eat Well, Move More, Feel Better Initiative.

For more information, contact:

Beth Davis, BS, CHES
Healthy Community Consultant
Healthology Works, LLC
(605) 280-2429 – Beth2022@pie.midco.net
10/2022



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

The South Dakota Department of Health (SDDOH) provides one SD community (or two communities as an inter-community project) with technical assistance on launching healthy community design principles by conducting active transportation assessments. The technical assistance is provided by South Dakota State University Landscape Architect (SDSU-LA) students as part of their spring 300 level City Planning class. The students, under the guidance of Professor Donald Burger, conduct built environment assessments, develop recommendations to increase safe, accessible active travel to everyday destinations, and present their findings to the community. Each community received a detailed report of recommendations presented by the students. A highlight of this collaboration is the community stakeholder/student engagement.

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. Creating activity-friendly routes to everyday destinations is an evidence-based strategy to increase physical activity, as are active transportation policies and practices in community design, land use, and facility access. 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, available each January at www.healthysd.gov. No funds are awarded to communities, however, the end deliverable to each community is a comprehensive final report with designs, sketches, maps and recommendations. 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.

Communities selected convene a multi-sector coalition of community stakeholders. Representation includes Elected Officials, Community/Civic Leaders, Tribal Entities, 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 Differently Able, Law Enforcement, Main Street/Downtown Associations, and other residents.

The following communities have participated in this collaboration and are at varying stages of consideration and/or implementation of the recommendations: 2013 Huron, 2014 Mitchell, 2015 Volga and Salem, 2016 Ft. Pierre, 2017 Crooks, 2018 Burke and Tripp, 2019 Sioux Falls/Harrisburg as a joint application, 2020 Sturgis, 2021 Mission and 2022 Wamblee. All communities receive ongoing support, technical assistance and follow-up provided by the SDDOH as part of this partnership.

For more information, contact:
Beth Davis, BS, CHES
Healthy Community Consultant
Healthology Works, LLC
(605) 280-2429 - Beth2022@pie.midco.net
10/2022



Links to SDSU Community Reports

Huron	https://www.dropbox.com/s/8kyvbk6pxa28elf/HURON%20EXECUTIVE%20DOCUMENT.pdf?dl=0
Mitchell	https://www.dropbox.com/s/odwkvacw4iamryc/Final%20DocMitchell.pdf?dl=0
Salem	https://www.dropbox.com/s/082fol96fbmqfl/Salem%20Recommendations%20w%20logo.pdf?dl=0
Volga	https://www.dropbox.com/s/3gbvozrf4j2zmj0/Volga%20Executive%20Document.pdf?dl=0
Ft. Pierre	https://www.dropbox.com/s/ej6muz379qd7tls/Fort%20Pierre%20Executive%20Document.pdf?dl=0
Crooks	https://www.dropbox.com/s/94ndbh8bpht3wxj/Crooks%202017%20Executive%20Document.pdf?dl=0
Burke	https://www.dropbox.com/s/rq447wp2y5mybkw/Burke%20Executive%20Document%20Final.pdf?dl=0
Tripp	https://www.dropbox.com/s/im7hk4208kub44g/Tripp%20Executive%20Document%20Final.pdf?dl=0
Sioux Falls and Harrisburg	https://www.dropbox.com/s/cixadrt9653litm/Sioux%20Falls%20and%20Harrisburg%20Active%20Transportation%20Recommendations.pdf?dl=0
Sturgis	https://www.dropbox.com/s/p3k3an81u513b3v/Sturgis%20Active%20Transportation%20Recommendations.pdf?dl=0
Mission	https://www.dropbox.com/s/161mznk95jbxko6/Mission%20Active%20Transportation%20Recommendations.pdf?dl=0
Wanblee	https://www.dropbox.com/s/w1st7rfssmyk2qz/Wanblee%20Active%20Transportation%20Recommendations%20%281%29.pdf?dl=0