Bike Friendly Community Committee 2025 Goals

Vision: Little Rock's Bike Friendly Community Committee strives to increase the safety and comfort of bicycling in our community. The following goals are both more narrow (focusing on bicycle transportation over recreation) and broader (considering bicycling in a larger context of car-optional transportation) because they were developed to advise the CLR Sustainability Commission.

Transportation accounts for 32.4% of the Little Rock metro area's carbon emissions, the single largest source of man-made carbon emissions in Central Arkansas and higher than the national average.[1] The Little Rock metro area's vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is **the highest** out of 52 comparable communities.[2] While unfortunate, it is also empowering because it identifies transportation as an area where changes could have relatively large sustainability dividends.

Goal 1: Promote Smart Growth

A smart growth approach to urban development attracts a high quality workforce, business development, and developers with compatible development approaches. In contrast, sprawling development increases municipality costs (utilities, street construction/maintenance, trash pick-up, and emergency response), VMT, and carbon emissions. Much of the Little Rock's workforce lives and continues to settle outside the City.[3] The Little Rock metro area is one of the least dense (persons/sq. mi.) metro areas in the country.[4] Combined with intra-city sprawl westward, this has contributed to our region's extremely high VMT. Any serious effort to reduce our region's transportation carbon footprint must include steps to reduce VMT by addressing our sprawling development.[5]

Goal 2: Create Pedestrian and Light Individual Transportation (LIT) Networks

Among Little Rock residents, the most significant barrier to walking and biking is fear of being struck by a car.[6] Specifically, a lack of infrastructure supporting walking or biking (sidewalks, bike lanes, shared use trails) is the most important single barrier.[7] Encouraging zero or low carbon emissions transportation requires a complete, dense network connecting origins to destinations. This network should be a combination of on-street facilities (i.e. Complete Streets) and a shared-use trail network. This network is a necessary pre-requisite to a major shift in transportation mode use (Goal 3).

Goal 3: Diversify Transportation Modes

Pedestrian and light individual transportation networks are necessary but not sufficient to diversify transportation mode use. This goal includes measures beyond network planning and installation, such as shared micromobilty options, transit options and teaching, to reduce VMT and transportation carbon emissions.

---

[1] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/5601/centralarkansas2050.pdf, pg. 60, Fig. 4-25
[2] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/3141/livabilityindex-brochure.pdf, pg. 5
[3] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/5601/centralarkansas2050.pdf, Fig. 4-3 and Fig. 4-1
[4] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/5601/centralarkansas2050.pdf, pg. 57
[5] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/5601/centralarkansas2050.pdf, Table 4-13 (pg. 60)
[6] https://www.littlerock.gov/for-residents/bikeped-little-rock/why-bikeped/latent-demand/, Table 1
[7] http://arkansashighways.com/Trans_Plan_Policy/biking/Arkansas%20Bike-Ped%20Plan%20-%20FINAL%20-03312017.pdf, pg. A-7 (walking) and A-11 (biking)

Goal 1: Promote Smart Growth

SMART Action Items and Metrics

1.1 Understand Smart Growth Policies: Work with experts within and outside our community to increase awareness of Sustainability Commission, Planning Commission, City Planning and Development, developers, the public, elected officials, and other relevant stakeholders of Smart Growth Policies and how they relate to building a more sustainable urban environment.[8,9]

> **1.1.1 Continuing Education:** City staff members in City Planning and Development required to take complete continuing education credits should take at least one credit in an opportunity relevant to sustainable development/smart growth policies annually.
>
> **1.1.2 Public:** Change is rarely embraced by the public at large unless they understand the needs for and benefits of that change. The City shall plan and implement a public outreach strategy including public/neighborhood association meetings and social media.
>
> **1.1.3 Developers:** The City shall educate developers about a smart growth approach to future development with meetings and a landing webpage within www.littlerock.gov.
>
> **1.1.4 Sustainability Commission:** A presentation relevant to sustainable development/smart growth policies should be presented to the Sustainability Commission annually. This presentation could be from City staff or outside experts.
>
> **1.1.5 Planning Commission:** A presentation relevant to sustainable development/smart growth policies should be presented to the Planning Commission annually. This presentation could be from City staff or outside experts.
>
> **1.1.6 CLR Board of Directors:** A presentation relevant to sustainable development/smart growth policies should be presented to the CLR Board of Directors annually. This presentation could be from City staff or outside experts.
>
> **1.1.7 Conference/Workshop:** Before 2025, CLR should host a conference or workshop relevant to sustainable development/smart growth and invite all local stakeholders and a national keynote speaker.

1.2 Limit Roadway Expansion: Evidence continues to demonstrate that roadway/highway expansion does not reduce congestion in the long run, but rather subsidizes and incentivizes single occupancy vehicular travel, increasing regional vehicle miles traveled and promoting sprawling development.[10] In the short term, highway expansion encourages more and longer trips by motor vehicle (e.g. to big box stores vs. locally-owned stores near homes), increasing pollution. In the long term, highway expansion encourages people to buy homes farther from their places of work. This creates a condition that *requires* our workforce to drive more miles per day, making more permanent the increase in number of vehicle miles per day. Highway expansion also increases the number of motor vehicles moving and parked in the urban areas within which we are attempting to promote alternative transportation modes,

[8] https://www.planning.org/policy/guides/adopted/smartgrowth.htm
[9] e.g. https://ualr.edu/socialchange/2015/05/17/the-sprawling-of-small-cities-of-arkansas-the-case-for-sustainable-urban-planning/
[10] https://www.citylab.com/transportation/2018/09/citylab-university-induced-demand/569455/

reducing the room to create supportive infrastructure, taking away the residential tax base to make infrastructure changes, and directly and indirectly making alternative transportation more dangerous. If we are attempting to encourage a mode shift away from cars to more sustainable transportation modes, this is the elephant in the room. No other intervention will have a stronger impact on reducing sprawl than limiting roadway expansion.

1.3 Identify Locally-Viable Smart Growth Policies: Work with local planning and development stakeholders to determine which smart growth policies are appropriate and achievable in our community.

1.3.1 Promote Dense Grid over Cul-De-Sac Street Layouts: Regular street grids promote walkability and bikeability providing more direct connections between origins and destinations. They also decrease emergency response, trash pick-up, sewer/utility, and other municipal costs. People who live in cul-de-sacs drive 18% more than those living in a dense grid.[11] Cul-de-sac development should be taxed to include increased municipal and carbon emission externalities to encourage street grids and/or prevent street grid development patterns to subsidize cul-de-sac street layouts by charging the falsely equivalent tax rates.

1.3.2 Promote small blocks: Standard block sizes range from walkable 200x200 ft. to unwalkable 600x600 ft. In a California study of 24 cities, doubling block size quadruples the number of fatal collisions.[12] Existing Little Rock parcel sizes allow regular 330x165 ft. or 330x330 ft. blocks; these promote walkability. A 330x165 ft. and 330x330 ft. layout should be encouraged in future developments. Development of larger block sizes that encourage driving over walking/biking should be taxed to capture externalities associated with carbon emissions.

1.3.3 Promote dense development: Density decreases emergency response, trash pick-up, sewer/utility and other municipal costs. Density should be encouraged by taxing expensive sprawling development and using the revenue to subsidize dense development projects.

1.3.4 Promote infill development over dispersed development: Development dispersed from our urban core requires more street construction and maintenance, requires higher costs for emergency response and utilities, and creates more carbon emissions. Encourage infill development over dispersed development by taxing for the costs of these externalities.

1.3.5 Embrace Mixed Use Zoning over Euclidean Zoning: Mixed use zoning encourages car-optional transportation by allowing different types of destinations (residential, work, shopping) to be close together and therefore walkable or bikeable. Euclidean Zoning physically separates land uses, requiring longer (automotive) transportation to link origins to destinations. Zoning and land use planning should zone for mixed vs. separated use to decrease carbon emissions.

1.3.6 Embrace Form-Based Code: Form-Based Code[13] can guide mix-use development to be more walkable and bikeable by making setbacks, transitions between public and private land uses, scaling, and other placemaking elements more welcoming for these transportation modes.

[11] https://www.citylab.com/design/2011/09/street-grids/124/

[12] http://www.xavierdupre.fr/enseignement/projet_data/Garrick%20&%20Marshall_Street%20Network%20Types%20and%20Road%20Safety.pdf

[13] https://formbasedcodes.org/definition/

1.3.7 Limit travel lane widths: Vehicular speeds increase and bicycle and pedestrian safety decreases as travel lanes exceed 10.5 ft.[14] Make 10.5 ft. travel lanes the design standard for all City streets and require exceptions to this lane width be reviewed by a transportation citizen oversight committee.

1.3.8 Abolish Parking Minimums throughout City: Parking minimums in urban development subsidize motor vehicle transportation at the expense of all other transportation modes and tie the hands of developers who may prefer to cater to people moving via other modes.

1.3.9 Consider an Urban Growth Boundary: Urban growth boundaries help limit sprawl through zoning restrictions inside and outside the boundary and limiting or not allowing exceptions to that zoning without a vote to expand the boundary. This creates dense development within the boundary compatible with alternative transportation modes.

1.4 Obtain Smart Growth Policy Grants: Obtain outside funding to plan and develop our community in ways consistent with Smart Growth Policies.

1.5 Discourage Downtown Surface Parking: Surface parking lots are often called missing teeth in a walkable landscape. Surface parking lots discourage walking by creating greater distances between origins and destinations and making the walks less interesting and inviting.

1.7 Promote Dense Development: Incentivize dense, mixed-use development in our urban core and discourage sprawling development.

1.10 Reduce VMT: Reduce VMT by 5% by 2025 from 2019 levels.

[14] https://usa.streetsblog.org/2015/05/27/compelling-evidence-that-wider-lanes-make-city-streets-more-dangerous

Goal 2: Create Pedestrian and Light Individual Transportation (LIT) Networks

2.1 Create a Master Transportation Plan: Our Master Street Plan is the definitive policy and plan for our transportation network, determining how developers construct new streets and how the City resurfaces/reconstructs streets. It currently prioritizes vehicular traffic, resulting in more trips taken by single occupancy vehicles and increasing our vehicle miles traveled and transportation carbon emissions. The Complete Streets Ordinance mandates Complete Streets, but until it is leveraged to promote changes to our Master Plan and decision processes, implementation will stagnate. This is presumably why the 2013 Complete Streets Resolution requested revision to the Master Street Plan.[15] While the Master Bike Plan is an adopted component of the Master Street Plan, its inclusion as a separate element within the Master Street Plan may result in unequal consideration of the bicycle travel mode compared to motor vehicles.[16,17] If so, the impact of a separate Master Pedestrian Plan, even within the adopted Master Street Plan, may be limited.

We propose that the City work with an outside consultant to repeal the Master Street Plan and replace it with a Master Transportation Plan integrating the needs of all travel modes. We understand that some roads should prioritize efficient movement of motor vehicles; we propose some streets should prioritize bicycle movement while retaining vehicular access (e.g. bicycle boulevards[18]).

> **2.1.1 Integrate Master Trail Plan:** The Master Trail Plan was created to envision a separated, shared-use trail network within Little Rock.[19,20] Like other Master Plans, seeing the entire network concept helps to understand the utility of smaller projects as they are implemented. The Master Transportation Plan should consider motor vehicle connectivity via existing and proposed streets in the Master Street Plan and bicycle and pedestrian connectivity via existing and proposed streets *and* trails. Just as developers are currently required to build streets contained within the current Master Street Plan to accommodate motor vehicle traffic relevant to their development, developers shall also be required to build trails to accommodate alternative transportation modes within the current Master Trail Plan (which will be integrated into the Master Transportation Plan).
>
> **2.1.2 Bicycles/LIT - Revise and Integrate Master Bike Plan:** Our Master Bike Plan is a proposed bicycle network we developed and were ultimately successful in incorporating into the City Board-adopted Master Street Plan. It has been an important and useful step toward including LIT considerations in our transportation network, but it has limitations. First, it has not undergone a comprehensive review by City staff; several proposed routes are considered unrealistic. Second, national bike planning experts have not helped to make the proposed network/facilities sufficiently dense, direct, and separated. The City will contract with a consultant to revise the Master Bike Plan in partnership with City staff and residents so that it is

[15] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/5652/completestreetsresolution_13675.pdf
[16] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/3889/master-street-plan-3-26-2018.pdf, Sections 4 and 5
[17] https://maps.littlerock.state.ar.us/webapps/LR_Transportation_Plans_Viewer/ (choose "Master Bike Plan" layer)
[18] https://jenniferdill.net/2019/06/27/a-case-for-bike-boulevards/
[19] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/1753/master-trail-plan-document-final.pdf
[20] https://maps.littlerock.state.ar.us/webapps/LR_Transportation_Plans_Viewer/ (choose "Master Trail Plan" layer)

a more actionable document going forward. This will include an audit of the currently installed LIT network, a prioritized list of projects to complete, and, for all proposed on-street LIT infrastructure, specify the type of facility (e.g. conventional, buffered, or protected LITlane).

2.1.2.1 Include LIT Infrastructure as Design Standard: The Complete Streets Ordinance states that bicycles should be accommodated on all road types (except expressways) unless one of five exceptions are met. Therefore, typologies with bicycle infrastructure should be the Design Standard and typologies not including bicycle infrastructure should be "Other Design Options".

2.1.2.2 Make LIT Infrastructure Context-Dependent: FHWA, NACTO, and others have been publishing several resources for bike infrastructure best practices, the appropriate context of different types of infrastructure, and how to measure and prioritize completion of networks. Our typologies should reference and reflect these resources.[21,22]

2.1.3 Pedestrians: We do not yet have a Master Pedestrian Plan. Sidewalk repair is often haphazard; primarily driven by residential requests rather than a systematic, proactive approach to improving our sidewalk network. Pedestrian transportation needs within the Master Transportation Plan will be considered by creating an inventory of the presence and condition of sidewalks and crosswalks and creating a prioritized list of projects based on creating continuous corridors, pedestrian demand, and equity.

2.1.3.1 Require Sidewalks on Both Sides of Collector and Residential Streets: Currently, sidewalks are only required on one side of these streets, increasing the number of street crossings (and thereby increasing pedestrian risk) required by pedestrians to move about the city.

2.1.3.2 Plant Street Trees: Street trees can increase walkability by reducing vehicular speeds, physically protecting pedestrians, and reducing ambient temperature.[23] They have the additional benefits of carbon sequestration, storm water management, and increase home value (and tax revenue); both providing revenue and decreasing municipal costs.[24]

2.1.4 ADA: The City of Little Rock has created an ADA Transition Plan to increase mobility, accessibility, and independence for all residents. Implementation of this plan will reduce the necessity of motor vehicle transportation for these residents. This plan should be folded into the Master Transportation Plan.

2.1.5 Mission Statement: Section 2 of the Master Street Plan includes the closest thing to a transportation mission statement found in the Master Street Plan. It should be revised in the Master Transportation Plan to reflect a Complete Streets approach. The "Traffic Calming"

[21] https://www.littlerock.gov/for-residents/bikeped-little-rock/resources/street-design/
[22] https://www.littlerock.gov/for-residents/bikeped-little-rock/resources/network-planning/
[23] http://www.walkable.org/download/22_benefits.pdf
[24] https://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/pubs/journals/pnw_2010_donovan001.pdf

subsection is a good nod to placemaking but can be improved. "Bike Boulevards" should be added as a traffic calming option.[25]

2.1.6 Include Level of Service Metrics for All Transportation Modes: Level of service (LOS) is a metric typically applied to determine how efficiently a street moves motor vehicles through a corridor given a defined traffic volume with a rating from A to F. If this is the sole measure of the success of a street design, as it often is, then streets will continue to be designed to maximize this measure. Perhaps in an attempt to level the playing field with other traffic modes, LOS calculations have been developed for bicycles and pedestrians.[26] Include LOS as an evaluation criterion for all traffic modes within the Master Transportation Plan weighted with the priority of each traffic mode for specific corridors.

2.1.7 Project Selection and Prioritization: Projects have traditionally been selected based on perceived residential need (Infrastructure Request), City staff expertise, and Ward Director decisions. The Master Transportation Plan will propose and prioritize projects based on the holistic needs of the network, including but not limited to connecting piecemeal walking/biking facilities to complete bicycle and pedestrian networks, creating Safe Routes to Schools, Safe Routes to Parks, increasing transportation equity, increasing safety, creating street connections to trails, creating connectivity to transit routes, and completing high demand sections.[27] The Master Transportation Plan should propose a transparent project selection process, informed by the priorities articulated in community outreach efforts, City staff input, consultant expertise, and other relevant inputs that considers the holistic needs of the network and include citizen oversight of this process via a City Commission.

2.3 Institute Community Master Transportation Plan Oversight: The Complete Streets Ordinance, Section 5, calls for Complete Streets implementation on all new, reconstructed, or resurfaced road unless one of five exceptions is met. This language should be expanded to include other elements of the Master Transportation Plan (e.g. trail installation) and a City Commission should oversee Master Trail Plan implementation and any exceptions granted.

2.4 Adopt NACTO: The National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) has a set of design guidelines that may, at times, be more appropriate than the currently used American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) guidelines. The City should officially become a NACTO City to justify the use of these urban-specific transportation guidelines.[28]

2.5 Improve On-Street Bicycle Infrastructure

2.5.1 Improve Installation Pace: During the duration of Road to 2020, the City installed approximately 1.4 miles of bike lanes per year. Over the course of the Road to 2025, we will install 2.1 miles of bike/micromobility lanes per year.

2.5.2 Conduct Connectivity Analyses: Bike network connectivity is important to encourage ridership by completely connecting origins to destinations. FHWA's Measuring Multimodal

[25] https://nacto.org/publication/urban-bikeway-design-guide/bicycle-boulevards/
[26] http://onlinepubs.trb.org/Onlinepubs/hrr/1971/355/355-001.pdf
[27] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/3801/measuring_multimodal_network_connectivity.pdf
[28] https://nacto.org/2018/12/20/annual-report/

Network Connectivity defines five connectivity analyses.[29] Over the course of Road to 2025, we will improve these measures by an average of 25% of 2019.

2.5.3 Install Protected Bike/Micromobility Lanes: FHWA's Bikeway Selection Guide states that streets with greater than 7K vehicles per day or with vehicles traveling at speeds greater than 30 mph should have physically protected bike lanes.[30] The City should install at least one protected bike lane in the duration of the Road to 2025.

2.5.4 Decrease Perceived Risk: When asked "What keeps you from biking more often?" the top answer of Little Rock residents was a lack of bicycle facilities. 83% of respondents said this. By 2025, ask the same question and reduce this response by at least 5%.[31]

2.6 Improve Sidewalk Network: From 2012-2017, the City has built or contracted the building of approximately 2 miles of sidewalk per year and repaired approximately 1.5 miles of sidewalk per year. Sidewalk construction and repair is haphazard.

2.6.1 Prioritize Plan Implementation: We must prioritize our limited resources to improve our pedestrian network. Projects may be prioritized to high pedestrian use corridors, corridors with demonstrated pedestrian safety concerns, to maximize transportation equity, or to link disconnected pedestrian infrastructure. Our Master Pedestrian Plan will only be as useful as it is used.

2.6.2 Construct Three Miles of Sidewalks per Year from Master Ped Plan: Between 2020-2025, construct an average of three miles of sidewalk per year from the prioritized project list in the Master Pedestrian Plan, in addition to whatever sidewalk projects are done on-demand or in the context other, larger projects (e.g. 12th Street Jump Start).[32]

2.6.3 Repair Two Miles of Sidewalks per Year from Master Ped Plan: Between 2020-2025, repair an average of two miles of sidewalk per year from the prioritized project list in the Master Pedestrian Plan, in addition to whatever projects are done on-demand or in the context of other projects.

2.7 Install Wayfinding Signage: Installing wayfinding signage helps pedestrians and cyclists navigate the city and legitimizes these traffic modes to all road users. The downtown area has recently installed pedestrian wayfinding signage.[33] The City should install wayfinding signage for cyclists along installed on-street bicycle routes (e.g. MUTCD D1-2c) and along shared-use trails (e.g. Arkansas River Trail) to better utilize them as bicycle transportation highways.

2.8 Install "Bicycles May Use Full Lane" signage: Stop installing "Share the Road" (MUTCD W16-1P) signage. It's unclear to all road users whether the sign is intended to address motorists or cyclists and what specific behaviors are being encouraged/discouraged. Instead install "Cyclists May Use Full Lane" (MUTCD R4-11) when appropriate.

2.9 Implement Road Diets: A road diet is a way to change how people move about on a roadway (often by narrowing or reducing the number of vehicular traffic lanes) to increase safety for all road users and create space for bicycle and pedestrian traffic modes.[34]

---

[29] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/3801/measuring_multimodal_network_connectivity.pdf
[30] https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/tools_solve/docs/fhwasa18077.pdf, pg. 23
[31] https://www.littlerock.gov/for-residents/bikeped-little-rock/why-bikeped/latent-demand/, Table 1
[32] https://www.littlerock.gov/!userfiles/editor/docs/planning/statistics/JumpStart_ExecSummaryActionPlan_FINAL%20v3.pdf
[33] https://www.littlerock.gov/for-residents/bikeped-little-rock/projects/midline/wayfinding/
[34] https://www.littlerock.gov/for-residents/bikeped-little-rock/projects/road-diets/

2.9.1 Systematically Evaluate All Four-Lane Roads for Road Diets: Operations on four lane roads are particularly dangerous, which is why one FHWA strategy to promote safety is to systematically evaluate all four lane roads for road diets.[35,36]

2.9.2 Implement At Least Three Road Diets from 2020-2025

2.10 Close the Arkansas River Trail Loop: The Arkansas River Trail (ART) is the region's premiere walking and biking recreational facility. While building and expanding other trails is important, creating a complete ART Loop that has been sought for over ten years is the foundation to advance local walking and biking goals. Walking and biking for recreation along the ART can be a gateway to walking and biking for transportation. The ART also serves as a bicycle and pedestrian transportation "highway". However, the great majority of riders do not and will not use the entire loop until it separates users from vehicular traffic over its entirety.[37] Bicycle transportation, and thereby sustainability, would be greatly served by completing the entire loop to a standard that serves users of all ages and abilities.[38]

2.10.1 Close ART at Riverfront Drive: The City is improving this section of ART from the Titus Trail to Cedar Hill Dr., but the rest of it must be improved to meet the standards of a separated, shared-use facility appropriate for all ages and abilities.[39]

2.10.2 Close ART at North Cantrell: There is no trail facility from the eastern terminus of the Titus Trail to the West Terminus.[40] The City is working with ArDOT in the context of their replacement of the Cantrell Bridge to create some of this section of ART. The City must improve the ART to meet the separated, shared-use facility appropriate for all ages and abilities.

2.10.3 Close ART at Cantrell: There is no trail facility from the West Terminus to the new UP bridge.[41] The City must improve the ART to meet the separated, shared-use facility appropriate for all ages and abilities. Widening the sidewalk along Cantrell Rd. is not a design appropriate for the Arkansas River Trail due to the perceived safety risks of using a trail immediately adjacent to a state highway with 25K vehicles per day and a posted speed of 40 mph and an even higher operational speed.

2.10.4 Close ART at Medical Mile Ramp: There is no connection from the western terminus of the Medical Mile to the new UP Bridge, rendering half of the Medical Mile useless. The City has secured $1.6M in Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) funding to shore up the erosion at this location and create a ramp to create this ART connection.[42]

2.10.5 Close ART at Rivermarket: While the ART from the Clinton Presidential Bridge to the start of the Medical Mile is mostly separated from vehicular traffic, the trail loses identity and

[35] https://www.littlerock.gov/for-residents/bikeped-little-rock/projects/road-diets/road-diets-and-safety/
[36] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/2513/fhwa_roaddiet_systemically_identifying_candidate_road_diet_locations.pdf
[37] https://www.littlerock.gov/for-residents/bikeped-little-rock/why-bikeped/latent-demand/, Figs. 2 and 4, Table 1
[38] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/3502/nacto_designing-for-all-ages-abilities.pdf
[39] https://www.littlerock.gov/for-residents/bikeped-little-rock/projects/art-riverfront-drive/
[40] https://www.littlerock.gov/for-residents/bikeped-little-rock/projects/art-west-terminus/
[41] https://www.littlerock.gov/for-residents/bikeped-little-rock/projects/art-up-bridge/
[42] https://www.littlerock.gov/for-residents/bikeped-little-rock/projects/art-medical-mile-ramp/

therefore ridership in this section (especially behind Rivermarket). The City must improve the ART to be an easily identified shared-use facility appropriate for all ages and abilities.

2.11 Southwest Trail: The Southwest Trail will be a primarily recreational trail connecting Little Rock to Hot Springs, however within Little Rock it will very much serve a transportation function.[43] The City of Little Rock has been awarded Phase 1 of a three phase project to create the Southwest Trail from the ART to Central High (dubbed the Central High Corridor).

2.11.1 Secure the Slide/Build the Ramp: Phase 1 FLAP funding must be used by the end of 2020.

2.11.2 Seek FLAP Phase 2 Funding: FLAP Phase 2 will secure the necessary ROW for the Central High Corridor, create a strong connection between the ART and the Southwest Trail, and create the Southwest Trail/Central High Corridor from the ART to the Capital Mall.

2.11.3 Implement Phase 2: If funded, we will need to construct FLAP Phase 2 by 2023.

2.11.4 Seek FLAP Phase 3 Funding: If FLAP Phase 2 is funded, we will seek FLAP Phase 3 funding in 2022. This funding would construct the trail from the Capital Mall to Central High.

2.11.5 Implement Phase 3: If funded, we will need to construct FLAP Phase 3 by 2026.

2.12 Midline: The Midline is a proposed east-west bicycle/micromobility corridor approximately along the I-630 corridor.[44] By 2025, we should have a complete Midline with all sections separated from vehicular traffic at least by conventional bike lanes or mixed with vehicular traffic in bike boulevards.

2.13 Kanis to Boyle: Boyle Park's extensive network of paved, shared use trails are a great recreational resource, but building a relatively short trail connection to Kanis Park could leverage them into an important north-south bicycle/micromobility corridor. By 2025, we should have funding in place to complete an off-street shared use trail from Kanis to Boyle Parks.

2.14 Southeast Trail: The Southeast Trail is currently a road route from the Clinton Library to Terry Lock and Dam. The intention is to create a separated, shared-use trail facility providing the same connectivity. While this would primarily expand the Arkansas River Trail to provide a recreation function, it would also connect downtown to the airport and to the Port Authority for a transportation function. By 2025, the City should have funding in place to complete the Southeast Trail from the Clinton Library to the Little Rock Airport.

2.15 Improve Pedestrian and LIT Network Funding: Our transportation grid is currently built to move motor vehicles. Substantial, sustained investment is required to create infrastructure to retrofit our grid to accommodate multiple transportation modes and decrease carbon emissions.

2.15.1 Dedicated Proportion of 2020 Street Fund to Alternative Transportation Modes: We propose the City dedicates a percentage of the street fund to exclusively fund projects prioritized by the Master Transportation Plan for alternative transportation modes. This would not limit the remainder of the Street Fund to be spent exclusively on motor vehicle

[43] https://www.littlerock.gov/for-residents/bikeped-little-rock/projects/southwest-trail/
[44] https://www.littlerock.gov/for-residents/bikeped-little-rock/projects/midline/

infrastructure, but would provide a steady stream of funding to implement high priority projects identified in the Master Transportation Plan.

2.15.2: Better Fund Trail Construction: To date, shared use trails have been considered a largely recreational resource, to be funded by City of Little Rock Parks and Recreation and outside grants. This approach has limited the pace of new trail construction. One way to improve trail funding would be to acknowledge their benefits for both recreation and transportation. Folding the Master Trail Plan into the Master Transportation Plan is a step in that direction. Another step might be to employ a full-time crew to install a shared-use trail transportation network, as done in Fayetteville.[45]

2.15.3 Grant Match Funds: Much of the bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is currently funded by outside grants. The City once had a pool of money from which City staff motivated to fulfill their missions could draw for required grant matches. This insured that opportunities for the City to seek federal and other outside funding would not be lost because individual departments did not budget matches. Recently that pool of money has disappeared and its absence has directly resulted in the City not seeking specific grant opportunities. While the City has budget concerns, addressing those concerns by taking away opportunities to secure additional money for the City is unwise. The City should reinstate that pool of money, at least for alternative transportation.

[45] https://www.fayetteville-ar.gov/1261/Trail-Construction-Program

Goal 3: Diversify Transportation Choice and Use SMART Goals

3.1 Offer Shared Micromobility: The shared micromobility market has been volatile, especially within the past three years, but one constant is its potential to offer a more sustainable transportation option. With bikeshare, e-scooters, and/or other shared micromobility options, commuters can park their cars for the day and move within the micromobility coverage area with ease. As micromobility coverage areas expand, and as residents move closer to their places of employment, more Little Rock residents will be able to use these systems as commuting options from home to work as well.

3.1.1 Launch Bikeshare: The City has contracted to provide a fleet of 200 pedal-assist bicycles in Spring 2020. A pedal-assist bikeshare fleet will encourage use by reducing barriers of entry.

3.1.2 Launch New E-Scooter System: The City will select a long-term e-scooter vendor and launch with their system in Spring 2020.

3.1.3 Expand Micromobility: Depending on local usage, local satisfaction, and national trends, expand the coverage area of a micromobility option(s) into Little Rock residential neighborhoods. Aim for at least 600 units by 2025 and inclusion of downtown, East Little Rock, Pettaway, Hanger Hill, Central High, Capital View/Stifft Station, Hillcrest, Heights, Capitol Hill, Pine to Woodrow, Stephens Area Faith, Hope, Love, Midtown neighborhood associations, War Memorial Park, and the Central High Corridor.[46,47]

3.1.4 Pass Appropriate Micromobility Ordinance(s) and Educate Residents: Shared micromobility provides a promise of a reduced carbon footprint but also a challenge for where these devices should be stored and operate. The City will pass a micromobility ordinance(s), benefiting from national best practices developed through the successes and failures in other communities, detailing where devices should be stored and operated.

3.1.5 Allocate All Micromobility Revenue for BikePed Projects: Shared micromobility is more widely used when infrastructure provides separation from vehicular traffic.[48] Any revenue provided by micromobility companies for the use of our ROW should be locked into BikePed improvement projects, including but not limited to installing the alternative transportation network.

3.1.6 Review and Improve Micromobility System: Using usage data and other data provided by our micromobility vendors, annually review system performance. Based on that evidence, make any necessary changes to maximize system performance.

3.1.7 Coordinate with Little Rock campuses: In the absence of City of Little Rock bikeshare, campuses have contracted with their own bikeshare providers to provide intra-campus transportation.[49,50] With the launch of bikeshare and our new e-scooter systems, these independent systems may begin to represent lost opportunities. The City will lose the potential

[46] https://maps.littlerock.state.ar.us/webapps/LR_Neighborhood_Associations_Viewer/
[47] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/1863/little-rock-southwest-trail-proposal-jan-6-2017.pdf
[48] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/2329/nacto_equitable-bike-share.pdf
[49] http://bike.zagster.com/dfj/
[50] https://ualr.edu/sustainability/bikeshare/

to expand its overall system by creating and expanding upon micromobility nodes at these campuses and the campuses will lose the ability to allow their micromobility systems to provide transportation alternatives to and from their campuses. The City shall lead a program to coordinate its micromobility systems with independent Little Rock campuses or even smaller businesses.

3.2 Improve Bike/Micromobility Parking: An important obstacle to bicycle and micromobility parking is the availability and distribution of parking opportunities. We will improve our bike parking network by:

3.2.1 Provide Guidance: The City will create a bike parking guide that will help businesses select and place racks within their properties or within public ROW.

3.2.2 Leverage Micromobility: A successful station-based bikeshare system requires bike racks strategically-placed into a network that puts users closest to sought destinations. This network, and the planning required, is the same work required to make an impactful network of bicycle racks for non-bikeshare bikes. We will work with our bikeshare provider to allow shared use of bike racks in their station network within their coverage area.

3.4 Seek Renewal/Improvement of Bike Friendly Community Designation: The City of Little Rock achieved League of American Bicyclists (LAB) Bike Friendly Community status (Bronze) in 2016. We will seek Bike Friendly Community Status in 2020. We will also use LAB's 2016 and 2020 guidance to bicycle transportation a more viable alternative in Little Rock.[51] The City has followed through with most of LAB's Key Steps to Silver; 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 identify those Key Steps that continue to require the most attention.

3.4.1 Create a signature bicycling-related event: The example given is an Open Streets event, in which a public street is closed off to vehicular traffic. There may be potential to leverage the recent passage of the Rivermarket Entertainment District to this end.[52]

3.4.2 Business outreach: A good process through which to do this is to offer technical assistance to businesses applying for LAB's Bike Friendly Business designation.

3.5 Seek Walk Friendly Community Designation: The self-assessment and feedback provided by LAB's Bike Friendly Community process has proven invaluable. The Walk Friendly Communities program offers a similar opportunity for improving pedestrian considerations.[53] By the end of 2020, the City of Little Rock will submit an application for Walk Friendly Community status. We will use the feedback provided by the process to improve the walkability of Little Rock moving forward.

3.6 Adopt Vision Zero: The fear of being struck by a motor vehicle is the most significant barrier to biking in Little Rock and among the most significant barriers to walking in Little Rock.[54] Mode shifts toward walking and biking require a substantial increase in perceived and actual safety of those activities. Adopting Vision Zero will justify and guide the necessary steps to promote walking and biking transportation.[55] ArDOT has already adopted a version of Vision Zero in its Toward Zero Death

[51] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/3817/bfc_spring_2016_reportcard_little_rock_ar_2.pdf
[52] https://www.arkansasonline.com/news/2019/jul/23/letter-lawyer-little-rock-fraternal-order-police-o/
[53] www.walkfriendly.org
[54] https://www.littlerock.gov/for-residents/bikeped-little-rock/why-bikeped/latent-demand/, Table 1
[55] https://visionzeronetwork.org/resources/vision-zero-cities/

Initiative.[56] As one of the most dangerous metro areas in the country for vehicle vs. pedestrian collisions, it's time we did the same.[57]

3.6.1 Decrease 2020-2025 Bicycle Crash Rates by 5% vs. 2005-2015 rates

3.6.2 Decrease 2020-2025 Bicycle Severe Injury/Fatality rates by 10% vs. 2005-2015 rates

3.6.3 Decrease 2020-2025 Pedestrian Crash Rates by 5% vs. 2005-2015 rates

3.6.4 Decrease 2020-2015 Pedestrian Severe Injury/Fatality rates by 10% vs. 2005-2015 rates

3.7 Increase Bicycle Parking: Little Rock bicycle parking is rare and sporadic. A strategically-placed network of bicycle parking can encourage ridership. Launch of bikeshare may be an opportunity to create this bicycle parking network.

3.8 Improve Transit Options: A car-optional transportation system throughout Little Rock requires quality pedestrian, bicycle, and transit options (for short, medium, and long trips). Encouraging transit as a transportation solution requires increasing its convenience. Only when the time required to take trips by transit begins to approach the time required to take trips by car will transit become a widely-adopted transportation solution of choice. All of the interventions below have the potential to increase transit convenience, but some may be much more impactful per dollar than others. The City should work with the transportation experts at Metroplan[58] and transit experts at Rock Region Metro[59] to consider what suite of interventions would maximize transit ridership.[60]

3.8.1. Increase Bus Frequency? Increasing the frequency with which buses come to a stop can increase convenience because trips do not have to be planned around route schedules.

3.8.2 Extend System Hours of Operation? Limited hours can make transit only a sometimes choice or, even worse, cause a user to become stranded. Either of these can reduce transit as an automatic transportation solution of choice.

3.8.3 Increase Coverage Density? The great majority of points within the City limits fall within ¾ of a mile of a transit route,[61] but what is the distance from origin/destination points to the nearest transit *stop*? Consider the impact of increasing route density and/or stop frequency.

3.8.4 Addressing the first and last mile problems: Walkability? "Increase Coverage Density" above speaks to the fact that transit users must close the distance from their origin to a transit stop and another transit stop to their destination as part of their trip. One way to increase the convenience of this is to increase coverage density. Another way is to ensure that there are safe and welcoming pedestrian corridors from to and from transit stops by prioritizing that pedestrian connectivity.

[56] http://www.tzdarkansas.org/
[57] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/5046/dangerous_by_design_2019.pdf
[58] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/5601/centralarkansas2050.pdf, pg. 89-92
[59] https://rrmetro.org/move/
[60] We will work with Rock Region Metro and Metroplan directly to better target these goals.
[61] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/5601/centralarkansas2050.pdf, Fig. 4-21, pg. 55

3.8.5 Addressing the first and last mile problems: Light Individual Transportation? Potential transit users are reluctant to walk a distance to/from a transit stop of more than ½ a mile. Facilitating the use of light individual transportation to solve the last mile can increase transit usage. Rock Region Metro has already installed 2-bike capacity bike racks on all of their buses. Other interventions could include increasing bike parking opportunities at stops and hubs, increasing shared mobility solutions at stops and hubs, and increasing LIT infrastructure (Goal 2).

3.8.6 Employ vans over buses in low ridership routes? The cost, and carbon emissions, of a transit system can be reduced if the vehicles used are appropriately targeted to the expected ridership.

3.8.7 Choose neighborhood-based vs. sprawl-based development: Transit works best when it connects neighborhoods.[62] Transit struggles to function effectively in the context of a sprawling development pattern. Goal 1: Promote Smart Growth also promotes transit utility.

3.8.8 Light Rail I-630 Route?: Much of the motor vehicle commuting *within* Little Rock is from residents of west Little Rock working downtown (why ArDOT is widening I-630 and thereby incentivizing motor vehicle commuting). A light rail system approximately along the I-630 corridor would offer a car-free alternative to this commute.[63] It would also offer a way to get to and from the airport without renting a motor vehicle or parking a motor vehicle at the airport.

3.8.9 Bus Rapid Transit? Bus Rapid Transit is a term typically used to describe dedicated lanes, traffic signal priority or dedicated signals, and protective bus stops with ADA curbs. Bus Rapid Transit can be an effective transit addition with the understanding that the total costs of these interventions can approach or exceed a light rail route.[64]

3.9 Continue the Friendly Driver Program: The Friendly Driver Program is a two-hour certification program by the City of Little Rock to teach drivers to better drive around bicyclists and pedestrians and their associated infrastructures. The program was developed and implemented through grant funding, has been well received by its participants, and has strong efficacy.[65,66] The Friendly Driver Program encourages mode shift directly (58% of participants more comfortable walking or biking as a result of the course) and indirectly (increasing safety for bike and pedestrian modes).

3.10 Automatic Counters: SMART goals must be measurable, but measuring bicycle and pedestrian use is challenging. Every year, we rely on volunteers to complete two bicycle and pedestrian counts on a Tuesday and a Saturday in mid-September.[67] This is both extremely valuable as the only window to bicycle and pedestrian use and extremely limited spatially and temporally. The City should seek to acquire mobile and permanent automatic bicycle and pedestrian counters in order to assess the efficacy of interventions intended to increase bicycle and pedestrian activity and prioritize future interventions. In cooperation with Rock Region Metro, consider the possibility of installing automatic bicycle counters on their bus bicycle racks.

---

[62] Duany et al., Suburban Nation, 2000
[63] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KqB8RwnmZb4&fbclid
[64] Speck, Walkable City, 2012, pg. 156
[65] www.littlerock.gov/FriendlyDriver
[66] https://www.littlerock.gov/media/5596/apha-2019-poster-april-30-2019.pdf
[67] https://www.littlerock.gov/for-residents/bikeped-little-rock/bikeped-count/

3.11 Increase Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety: One of the most significant disincentives for bicycle and pedestrian transportation is the fear of being struck by an automobile. National advocacy consultants such as Smart Growth America, the League of American Bicyclists, and People for Bikes have considered the current state of bicycle- and pedestrian-friendliness in Little Rock and consistently rank increasing safety as a top priority. When ArDOT asked Little Rock residents what would encourage you to walk or bike more, increasing safety tops the list.

3.11.1 Smart Growth America's Dangerous by Design: By 2025, Little Rock should no longer be among the 20 most dangerous metropolitan places to walk. We should decrease our Pedestrian Danger Index of 135 from the 2019 Dangerous by Design report.

3.11.2 League of American Bicyclists Bike Friendly Community Report Card: Crashes per 10K commuters should decrease from the 2016 and 2020 report cards. Fatalities per 10K commuters should decrease from the 2016 and 2020 report cards.

3.11.3 People for Bikes Safety Rating: In 2019, the People for Bikes safety rating for Little Rock is 1.9. This number should increase by 2025.

3.12 Mode Shift: Increase the number and proportion of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit trips taken by 10% each by 2025. A network of automatic counters (Goal 3.7) would be the strongest way to evaluate this goal.