

## **Appendix C: Strategic Investment – Estimated Need and Current Spending, State and Local Infrastructure**

### **Introduction**

Identifying statewide pedestrian and bicycle needs is a necessary component of development of the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) and federal authorizing act, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP - 21) require that a minimum 20 year needs analysis be conducted.

This estimate of current spending and long range need is developed for comparison purposes. It reflects a snap shot in time, based on current and historical funding practices. It does not limit one to these practices in the future. For this analysis, staff gathered the best currently available data and historical trend data of state funding. The local system estimates also used the best currently available data, a sample of transportation system plans (TSP) based on a stratification of population that was then factored up to represent the total local system. The information in this document represents 2013 data. If earlier data than 2013 had to be used, it was adjusted to reflect 2013 dollars. Historical data is provided for state expenditures, as the 2013 funding was higher than usual because of the influx of bonded funds related to the Jobs and Transportation Act (2009) and the Oregon Transportation and Investment Acts (2001, 2002, 2003 & 2005).

### **State System Needs Analysis Methodology**

A state pedestrian and bicycle facility inventory was completed in 2012 and it will be updated again in 2015. The estimates for state pedestrian and bicycle facility needs were developed based on the system inventory, applying average unit cost, and engineering judgment. Bikeway needs include bike lanes, multi-use paths, and under certain circumstances, mainly in rural areas where traffic volumes are low, shoulders and shared travel lanes. The estimates take into consideration the type of bicycle facility appropriate for the location. Pedestrian safety crossing need was developed using the same combination of average unit cost depending on the complexity of the crossing type, statewide system facility inventory and engineering judgment.

In urban areas pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure on state facilities consists of sidewalks, ramps, crosswalks, median refuge islands, signals, shared use paths and marked bike lanes. In rural areas, the state highway shoulders often serve as walkways and bikeways. ODOT's focus has been to provide facilities primarily on urban state highways, while maintaining and improving shoulders along rural state highways as opportunity occurs. ODOT's Bicycle and Pedestrian Program also assists cities and counties with pedestrian and bicycle funding and planning. ODOT tracks progress in providing facilities by looking at coverage, it assumes bikeways are needed on 100 percent of the highway system within urban growth boundaries and sidewalks are needed where adjacent development is likely to generate pedestrian activity. ODOT periodically inventories facilities thru a review of state highways within Urban Growth Boundaries. To date, it is estimated that 630 miles, or over sixty percent, of the sidewalk system on state facilities is in place, and that 976 miles, or over sixty percent, of the bicycle system on

state facilities is in place. ODOT’s target is to have bicycle facilities and sidewalks on at least 74 percent of highway roadside mileage in urban areas.

### State System Facility Status

**Table 1 – Roadside Miles of Pedestrian and bicycle Facilities on State Highways in Cities and Urban Areas**

Feature	Total Miles Needed	Miles Completed	% Complete
Bicycle Facilities	1,597	976	61%
Sidewalks	997	630	63%

Source: 2014 State of the System Report

State pedestrian and bicycle facilities are funded through various sources including:

- State Highway Funds
- Federal Funds
- ODOT Maintenance Funds
- ODOT Administered Grant Programs
- Local Government
- Private Development

**Table 2 - 25 Year State Highway Pedestrian and bicycle Facilities Needs (\$Millions 2013 Dollars)**

Bikeways	\$216
Sidewalks	\$748
Pedestrian Safety Crossings	\$67
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1031</b>

\*Based on Roadway Engineering Estimates.

### State System Current Spending

The legal framework for state spending for facilities’ is set forth by Oregon Revised Statute 366.514 *Use of Highway Funds for Footpaths and Bicycle Trails* (also known as the ‘Bike Bill’) passed in 1971. It requires ODOT, cities and counties to install bikeways and walkways whenever a roadway is constructed or reconstructed and to spend reasonable amounts of the State Highway Fund on walkways and bikeways. The state, cities and counties are expected to expend no less than one percent of the highway funds applicable to highway, road or street construction, reconstruction or relocation. The statute allows three exceptions to walkway and bikeway construction:

- Where it would be unsafe;
- Where there is no need; or
- Where the cost is too high in proportion to need.

ODOT monitors compliance with ORS 366.514 through a review of all projects contracted by ODOT, plus the state funded grant programs, administrative and staff costs. The methodology used captures Federal expenditures plus the requisite local match. Federal fund expenditures are monitored, but not included in the State mandated 1 percent expenditure calculations. For 2013, ODOT state expenditures were 1.3 percent, up from 1.04 percent in 2012.

Table 3 summarizes the ODOT administered expenditures by category and type of funds for 2013.

**Table 3 – 2013 State Spending by Category (\$Millions)**

Spending Category	State Share	Federal Share	Local Match	Total
As part of Construction Projects	\$4.1	\$3.6	\$.8	\$8.5
Stand Alone Bike/Pedestrian Projects	\$.2	\$6.7	\$2.4	\$9.3
Preservation Projects	\$.4	\$1.0	\$.04	\$1.4
Sidewalk Improvement Program (SWIP)	\$7.7	-	-	\$7.7
Grants	\$2.5	-	-	\$2.5
Quick Fix	\$1.0	-	-	\$1.0
Administration, publications, etc.	\$.2	-	-	\$.2
<b>Total Annual Spending on State System</b>	<b>\$16.1</b>	<b>\$11.2</b>	<b>\$3.3</b>	<b>\$30.6</b>

2013 expenditures are unusually high for pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The state funding increased due to the passage of the Oregon Transportation and Investment Acts (OTIA), the 2009 Jobs and Transportation Act (JTA), *ConnectOregon*, and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). The infusion of funding helped construct many important transportation projects. As funding for new projects and preservation increased, so did the funding for improvements. However, much of this funding was backed by bonds that have to be repaid. As state and federal transportation revenues drop off overall, so too will funds available for improvements.

Due to the unusually high level of 2013 funding, a nine year average of funds expended was used to better indicate possible future funds. This calculation shows that the average for total (state and federal) spending is \$19.6 million annually. Expenditure data forms the foundation for calculating what may be available for pedestrian and bicycle funds in the future. Discussing

priorities if funding decreases, which could occur when bonds are repaid and as future federal funding may decrease, is an appropriate exercise for the planning process. For instance, in the next State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) cycle, it is assumed that federal funds decrease by 10 percent.

**Table 4 – 2005 -2013 Average Annual Expenditures (\$Millions 2013)**

	Total	State Share	Local Match*	Federal Share
Administration & Publications		\$.2		
<b>Average</b>	\$19.6	\$7.5	\$1.2	\$10.7

Local Match calculation assumes the 10.27 percent minimum required match. Actual local contribution could be, and often is, higher. For instance, the local match in 2013 was 29.4 percent.

It can be difficult to forecast future revenues, as transportation funds frequently come in lumps, and not long term sustainable funding. The key to dealing with lumps of funds may be to have prioritization criteria developed that can help determine the best use of the funds if they become available. The criteria could vary depending on funding level and any stipulation on fund usage.

## **Local Government 25 Year Needs Estimate**

---

### **Methodology**

Oregon’s statewide planning goals, adopted in 1974, established state policies in 19 different areas; Goal 12 addresses transportation. In 1991, the Land Conservation and Development Commission, with the support of ODOT, adopted the TPR to guide local and state implementation of Statewide Planning Goal 12. The TPR requires ODOT to prepare a state transportation system plan (TSP) and identify a system of transportation facilities and services adequate to meet identified state transportation needs. The Oregon Transportation Plan and the adopted mode, topic, and facility plans are the State’s Transportation System Plan. The TPR directs metropolitan planning organizations to prepare regional TSPs that are consistent with the state TSP. In turn, counties and cities must prepare local TSPs which are consistent with the regional plans. Therefore, all regional and local TSPs must be consistent with the OTP and the adopted mode, topic and facility plans.

Oregon has a rich history of transportation planning; data for long-range need was reviewed and calculated using adopted TSPs and Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs). Some jurisdictions had bicycle and/or pedestrian master plans which were reviewed for consistency with the TSP or RTP. In those instances where a jurisdiction’s population was small enough that they were not required to develop a TSP the transportation element of a comprehensive plan was reviewed. A caveat to using these plans is that RTPs are financially constrained (but may include illustrative lists); TSPs are not required to be financially constrained so the total amount of

funding needed for the projects listed therein could outpace the funds those jurisdictions might receive within the TSP planning horizon.

All counties were reviewed, assessed and included in the calculation. For the cities, a representative sample (based on a stratification of population) were reviewed, assessed and the total adjusted (factored up) to account for those cities not in the sample. It should be noted that in some TSPs local governments included improvements on state highway facilities and assumed they would be done; when it was evident that this was included in their estimates, staff excluded them from the local system total as those needs were already included in the total for the state system.

**Local System**

In urban areas, the local system of pedestrian and bicycle facilities consist of sidewalks, crosswalks, median refuge islands, signals, marked bike lanes, bicycle boulevards, and multi-use paths. In rural areas and areas with low vehicle traffic, roadway shoulders serve as bikeways and walkways. The total number of miles of facilities in local jurisdictions is not readily available.

**Table 5 – 2013 Local Government - 25 Year Needs Estimate (\$Billion)**

<b>Transportation System Plan 25 Year Needs</b>		<b>% Capital</b>	<b>% Total</b>
Roadway Capital	\$19.0	87%	49%
<b>Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Capital</b>	<b>\$ 2.8</b>	13%	7%
Total Capital	\$21.8	100%	56%
<b>Total *</b>	<b>\$39.1</b>		

\*Total - This total is meant to capture all the needs identified in TSPs for the roadway system, including construction, bicycle, pedestrian, maintenance, operations, preservation, administration, etc. It does not capture other transportation needs, such as public transportation. The total needs represent an estimate for both cities and counties.

The twenty-five year needs for estimate from local TSPs is about \$2.8 billion. This equates to an average annual need for local facilities of about \$112 million (2013 dollars).

**Local Government Current Spending**

**Methodology**A total for current infrastructure spending was estimated using the best available data as a basis for calculation. A number of sources were reviewed to develop an estimate of current spending by local jurisdictions on infrastructure. Roadway capital and total expenditures were also estimated for comparison purposes.

- Secretary of State Audits Reports: Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports  
The reports use various categories, including:
  - Street or Road Fund

- Transportation Fund
- Public Works Fund
- Pedestrian and bicycle Fund
- Footpath and Bicycle Trail Fund
- Bicycle Reserve Fund
- Adopted Budgets: Generally used the current adopted budget which provides actuals for the previous year
- Capital Improvement Programs
- Project lists
- Jurisdiction websites

Local pedestrian and bicycle facilities are funded through various types of revenue including:

- State Highway Fund
- ODOT Administered Grant Programs
- Federal Funds
- Local Funds
- System Development Charges
- Private Development

**Table 6 – Local Government Current Roadway Spending (\$Million 2013)**

Expenditure Type		% Capital Spending	%Total Spending
Roadway Capital	\$231.8	91%	33%
<b>Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Capital</b>	<b>\$ 23.0</b>	9%	3%
Total Capital	\$254.8		36%
Total *	\$711.4		

\*Total - This total is meant to capture all the expenditures for the roadway system, including construction, bicycle, pedestrian, maintenance, operations, preservation, administration, etc. It does not capture other transportation expenditures, such as public transportation. The total expenditures represent an estimate for both cities and counties.

Assessing what the local jurisdiction spends on infrastructure may not capture the total spending within each jurisdiction. Cities and counties review land use applications for consistency with local plans. Often developers must either construct or contribute funds to improve roads, streets and sidewalks as a part of their land use approval; these improvements, called “mitigation”, may not be captured in current spending. Mitigations can include improvements to pedestrian and bicycle facilities. If the city or county collects transportation system development charges (SDCs) as part of land use approvals, the money collected from the SDCs may go into a common pool that can be spent to improve the roadway system. These improvements often incorporate elements. SDC funds, where identified, were included in the current spending.

## **Conclusion**

As the needs identified in TSPs are not financially constrained, the TSP-identified need could fit their local vision but may not be reasonably achievable within the plan horizon. The significant disparity between estimated current annual expenditures of around \$23 million and the average annual need from the TSP-based analysis of \$112 million, required the needs identified in TSPs to be moderated. Given that current expenditures are estimated, and recognizing that current revenue is insufficient to achieve their local vision, it was assumed that something like double the current spending would be required to address highest priority projects. To adjust the need closer to likely funding but still recognizing that greater needs exist, the \$23 million in current annual spending by cities and counties was multiplied by the 25 year plan horizon; this equated to just over half a billion dollars. To close the gap between funding and unconstrained needs, a 100 percent increase was projected, making the 25 year total for local government need for pedestrian and bicycle facilities approximately \$1 billion (2013 dollars).

As previously stated this information on current revenue, expenditures and need are provided as a basis for discussion on funding for the plan horizon (25 years). The estimate for planned infrastructure by local governments could be on the higher end of the scale, as local TSPs are not required to be constrained. In reviewing the budgets of local governments, it was noted that those in smaller, more rural areas, are often less given limited resources, many of the small jurisdictions have to accumulate funds over time to finance a project; funding for many of them is limited to State Highway Funds. In some of the smallest jurisdictions, the funds have to be used simply to maintain the system. This was not always true for the larger metropolitan areas as they have more local funds to leverage.

This information should be used by staff and consultants in developing the various funding scenarios for discussion by the committee. The estimates were developed using the best available data and current policy. The information can help inform recommendations about future policies and practices.

To accompany this analysis, a matrix of potential funding sources that local governments have the authority to assess and, at their discretion, use on transportation infrastructure, is provided in Table 7. This list is illustrative and does not infer that local governments use these funds for the system.



Table 7: Revenue Funding Mechanisms Reviewed

Description	Example(s)	Eligible Projects	Resource(s)
<b>BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN RELATED FUNDING</b>			
<b>System Development Charge</b>			
System Development Charges (SDC) are a one-time fee on new developments, and redevelopments, to recover a portion of the costs from the impact of those developments.	<a href="#">Oregon City, Oregon</a>	Transportation SDCs can be used for both on- and off-street facilities bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	Resource to calculate SDCs: <a href="#">Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual</a>  <a href="#">Oregon Revised Statute 223.297–223.314</a>  <a href="#">The League of Oregon Cities SDC Survey Report, 2013</a>
<b>Local Improvement District</b>			
Local Improvement Districts (LIDs) are formed by a group of property owners working together to share the cost of needed local capital improvements.	<a href="#">City of Bend, Oregon</a>  <a href="#">Portland Bureau of Transportation</a>	LIDs can be used for local bicycle and pedestrian projects, including: street improvements, bike infrastructure, curb maintenance, and sidewalk infill, etc.	<a href="#">Oregon Revised Statute 223.112–223.132</a>
<b>Urban Renewal Areas/Tax Increment Financing</b>			
Urban Renewal Areas (URAs) earmark a portion of property tax revenues to improve poorly or underdeveloped areas.	<a href="#">City of Salem, Oregon</a>	Tax revenues can be used for curb repair, sidewalk infill, installation of lighting and other right of way improvements.	<a href="#">Oregon Revised Statute 457.010 (1)(e)</a>
<b>Value Capture</b>			

<p>Value capture is the process by which all, or a portion, of land value increments, are recouped by the public sector. The mechanisms actually employed to collect funds may include tax increment financing, local improvement districts and other forms of financing.</p>	<p><a href="#">TriMet MAX Yellow Line Portland, Oregon (pages 1-6)</a></p>	<p>Value capture revenues can be used for projects that improve access to transit, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities and infrastructure.</p>	<p><a href="#">Federal Highway Administration Non-Road Pricing Revenue Resources</a> <a href="#">Methods for Financing Transportation Infrastructure</a></p>
<b>Reimbursement District</b>			
<p>Reimbursement Districts allow developers to recover a portion of development costs, when making improvements to the transportation system that benefit the general public.</p>	<p><a href="#">City of Woodburn, Oregon Ordinance 2237</a></p>	<p>Development eligible for reimbursement can include sidewalk, curb, pedestrian crossing enhancements and other transportation system improvements.</p>	<p><a href="#">Methods for Financing Transportation Infrastructure</a></p>
<b>General Obligation Bonds</b>			
<p>General obligation bonds are a traditional source of funding for capital projects, and must be voter approved.</p>	<p><a href="#">City of Eugene, Oregon</a></p>	<p>Bond revenues can only be issued for investments with a life expectancy of more than one year, and are secured by the full faith credit of the issuing municipality. Eligible projects include municipal roadway improvements, and bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.</p>	<p><a href="#">Oregon Revised Statute 287A.001</a></p>
<b>Local Gas Tax</b>			

Local gas taxes range from 1 cent per gallon, to 5 cents per gallon.	<a href="#">City of Cornelius, Oregon</a>	Gas tax revenues can be used for sidewalk improvements, streetlight installation and roadway surface repair and preservation.	<a href="#">Implementing local Gas Taxes: A Survey on City Gas Tax Ordinances</a>  <a href="#">Relevant State Laws</a>  <a href="#">Inventory of Statewide Gas Tax Ordinances</a>
<b>Expanded Parking Pricing</b>			
Expanded Parking Pricing affects when and where public parking facilities (such as on-street parking) are priced.	<a href="#">City of Portland, Oregon</a>	Parking revenue can be used for Transportation Demand Management (TDM) related efforts including bicycle and pedestrian improvements.	
<b>Transportation Utility Fee</b>			
Transportation Utility Fees (TUFs) are assessed on utility bills of water and sewer customers.  These fees are also known as Street Utility, Road User or Street Maintenance Fees.	<a href="#">City of Corvallis, Oregon</a>  <a href="#">City of Ashland, Oregon</a>	Fee revenues are designated for city transportation infrastructure projects, primarily for road maintenance. Depending on the local city code, revenues can also be dedicated to sidewalk repair, ADA improvements, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities.	<a href="#">TUF Solutions for Local Street Funding: A Survey on Transportation Utility Fees</a>
<b>General Fund</b>			
General fund revenues can be allocated by cities to pay for transportation investments through the Capital Improvement Program.	<a href="#">City of Springfield, Oregon</a> (page 11)	General funds can be used for transportation maintenance and improvements, including sidewalk infill, lighting and street preservation and maintenance.	
<b>Vehicle Registration Fee</b>			
Counties can levy a vehicle registration fee, in addition to state registration fees.	<a href="#">Multnomah County, Oregon</a>	Fee revenues are predominantly used for roadway maintenance and preservation.	<a href="#">Oregon Revised Statutes 801.041</a>

<b>Hotel Tax</b>			
Hotel Taxes implement a transient lodging tax to fund tourism, economic development and limited transportation improvements.	<a href="#">City of Roseburg, Oregon</a>	Tax revenues fund programs that enhance tourism, including signal, sidewalk, and streetlight improvement programs.	<a href="#">Oregon Revised Statutes 320.300</a>
<b>Dedicated Property Taxes</b>			
A portion of property tax revenues can be dedicated to transportation improvements.	<a href="#">Washington County, Oregon</a>	Tax revenues can be used for multimodal improvements, including: street, sidewalk, bridge, bikeway and transit facility improvements.	
<b>Transportation Management Associations</b>			
Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) are non-profit organizations providing transportation services in a geographic area. They are generally public-private partnerships, consisting of area businesses with local government support.	Washington County, Oregon Transportation Management Association: <a href="#">GO LLOYD</a>  Swan Island, Oregon Transportation Management Association: <a href="#">Get Here</a>	Revenues can be used for bicycle and pedestrian transportation system improvements.	TMAs help large businesses comply with Oregon's <a href="#">Employee Commute Options Rule</a>
<b>Community Development Block Grant</b>			
Community Development Block Grants (CDBGs) are city-managed federal funds that can be used to make improvements in low and moderate income neighborhoods, eliminate barriers for people with disabilities, create jobs, and provide affordable housing.	<a href="#">Clackamas County, Oregon</a>	Grant funds can be used for projects that benefit accessibility for people with disabilities, or improve quality of life or economic development in low income communities.	Infrastructure Finance Authority: <a href="#">Community Development Block Grant Program</a>
<b>Oregon Parks and Recreation Local Government Grants</b>			

<p>Oregon Parks and Recreation Local Government Grants are administered through an annual competitive grant program for the acquisition, development, and major rehabilitation of public outdoor park and recreation areas and facilities.</p>	<p><a href="#">City of The Dalles, Oregon</a></p>	<p>Grant funds can be used for roadway improvements, parking, multimodal facilities and recreational paths and trails.</p>	<p>Oregon Parks and Recreation Department: <a href="#">Grants Program</a></p>
<p><b>Payroll and Self-Employment Tax</b></p>			
<p>The Payroll and Self-Employment Tax provides revenue for mass transit, are administered and collected by the Oregon Department of Revenue and imposed directly on the employer.</p>	<p><a href="#">Lane Transit District</a></p>	<p>Tax revenues are typically used to fund operational and capital transit improvements. It is unknown as to whether any municipalities are using these funds directly for bicycle and pedestrian improvements.</p>	<p><a href="#">Oregon Revised Statutes 253</a></p>
<p><b>PUBLIC HEALTH RELATED FUNDING</b></p>			
<p><b>Healthy Communities Program</b></p>			
<p>The Healthy Communities Program works through local, state, territory, and national partnerships to prevent chronic diseases and reduce health gaps.</p>	<p><a href="#">Sumter County, Alabama</a></p>	<p>Funding can be used for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and facilities that increase physical activity, i.e. walking paths.</p>	<p>Centers for Disease Control: <a href="#">Healthy Communities Program</a></p>
<p><b>Communities Putting Prevention to Work</b></p>			
<p>The Communities Putting Prevention to Work program supports communities working to reduce obesity and tobacco use.</p>	<p><a href="#">Multnomah County, Oregon</a></p>	<p>Funding can be used for bicycle and pedestrian outreach and education (i.e. Safe Routes to School), and other facilities and infrastructure improvements.</p>	<p>Centers for Disease Control: <a href="#">Communities Putting Prevention to Work</a></p>
<p><b>State and Local Public Health Actions to Prevent Obesity, Heart Disease, and Stroke</b></p>			

<p>The State and Local Public Health program supports work in state and large city health departments to prevent obesity, diabetes, heart disease, and stroke in adults.</p>	<p><a href="#">City of Los Angeles, California</a></p>	<p>Funding supports community prevention strategies focused on high-risk adults, including the implementation of policy, system, and environmental change strategies to support safe and walkable streets to increase exercise. Eligibility of bicycle and pedestrian related projects is still to be determined.</p>	<p><a href="#">Leveraging Health Funding for Active Transportation Investments</a></p>
<p><b>Partnership to Improve Community Health</b></p>			
<p>The Partnership to Improve Community Health uses evidence—and—practice based strategies to create environments that make it easier for people to make healthy choices.</p>	<p><a href="#">Broward County, Florida</a></p>	<p>Funding can be used for programs and projects that increase physical activity and improve access to programs for preventing and managing chronic diseases.</p>	<p><a href="#">Leveraging Health Funding for Active Transportation Investments</a></p>
<p><b>Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health (REACH)</b></p>			
<p>Focuses on building capacity and implementing policy and environmental improvements in racial and ethnic communities experiencing health disparities.</p>	<p><a href="#">City of Montgomery, Alabama</a></p>	<p>Efforts to increase physical activity, including implementing community design components, Safe Routes to School, and increasing access to local parks and schools through joint-use agreements.</p>	<p><a href="#">Leveraging Health Funding for Active Transportation Investments</a></p>
<p><b>A Comprehensive Approach to Good Health and Wellness in Indian County</b></p>			
<p>The Good Health and Wellness program supports chronic disease prevention and health promotion associated with risk factors affecting American Indian tribes and Alaska Native villages.</p>		<p>Funding is used for programs that improve physical activity. Active transportation as a means to increase physical activity suggests an opportunity for partnership; however, eligibility of bicycle and</p>	<p><a href="#">Leveraging Health Funding for Active Transportation Investments</a></p>

		pedestrian related projects is still to be determined.	
<b>Programs to Reduce Obesity in High-Obesity Areas</b>			
<p>Programs to Reduce Obesity in High-Obesity Areas awards funding to land grant universities in states with counties that have more than 40% prevalence of adult obesity.</p>	<p><a href="#">2nd Sunday, Kentucky</a></p>	<p>Funding is used for programs to improve physical activity (i.e. Open Streets Initiative). Bicycling and walking as a means to improve physical activity suggests opportunity for partnership; however, eligibility of broader bicycle and pedestrian related projects is still to be determined.</p>	<p><a href="#">Leveraging Health Funding for Active Transportation Investments</a></p>