



## Stride Forward – Regional Transportation Plan

# Online Survey #1 Results Report

### Introduction

Stride Forward is MetroPlan’s mandated update to the regional transportation plan. This plan is unique coming on the heels of a City of Flagstaff declared climate emergency and subsequent Carbon Neutrality Plan (CNP). The CNP calls for the maintenance of vehicle miles travelled at 2019 levels.

Stride Forward will include a robust public involvement plan including online surveys such as this one. Some of the questions delve into public attitudes toward various vehicle miles travelled reduction strategies including increased density and shifting modes away from single occupancy car travel.

### Survey Outreach & Respondent Demographics

The survey was issued in February and March 2022 using the City of Flagstaff Community Forum. 640 responses were received from 862 site visitors. It is composed of 11 survey questions, many multi-part in nature, and 9 demographic questions. An opportunity to leave comments is provided after several questions. An announcement was made to the 3000+ registered site users at the beginning and near the end of the open period. Also, the 230+ *Stride Forward* stakeholder were encouraged by email to take the survey and encourage their constituents and/or members to do so as well. A media release summarizing the results was issued at the survey close.

It is important to note that this is not a random sample survey, that results are not statistically valid, and that results reported here have not been normalized to reflect a more normal distribution across demographic characteristics of the region. Offered here is a comparison of the demographics of the online survey compared to the random sample survey:

<b>Demographic or Characteristic</b>	<b>Online Survey</b>	<b>Random Sample Survey</b>	<b>Online Skew</b>
Primary Travel Mode Bike	14%	5%	Strong bike
Transportation system service Somewhat well / Not well	84%	63%	Strong neutral
Age 55+	38%	24%	Strong older
Education Bachelor / Post Graduate	82%	74%	Strong more educated
Income Over \$100k	40%	29%	Strong wealthier
Race White	87%	80%	Moderately white
City / County City	84%	61%	Strong City

**Survey Overview**

This first online survey makes a closer examination of responses received to several random sample survey questions. These are:

- Satisfaction with various aspects of the transportation system
- Reasons why driving a car is viewed as a necessity
- Reasons why driving a car is viewed as more safe than other modes
- Reasons why a person may or may not be more willing to move to a more dense community
- Reasons why a person may be motivated to switch from driving to another means of travel.

Some of the questions from the random sample survey were repeated for comparison purposes.

**How This Information Will Be Used**

Survey results will be used to shape proposed development patterns, particularly in the Upward scenario, and the transportation facilities, services and programs to serve them. In addition, it will be used to understand public support or opposition to those proposals and respond to public questions about them. For instance, knowing the public’s attitude toward multi-story, multi-family homes may result in scenario alternatives with more acceptable levels of such development. Conversely, if meeting carbon neutrality goals requires more multi-story housing than is publicly acceptable, we can legitimately say we listened, heard, and tried to avoid this outcome. Likewise, knowing preferences and deterrents to different travel modes allows us to design systems that capitalize and mitigate accordingly and then to explain that to the public and decision-makers.

**Round 1 Analysis and Findings**

Comparisons are generally made to several Title VI relevant groups including Minority, Low Income (or low to moderate), Age 65 and older, and Disabled. Comparisons are also made to residents of the region to residents of the County within the region.

Analysis Group	N = Number of respondents
All	640
Minority	64
Low and Moderate Income (<\$49,900 annual)	71
Low Income (<\$25,000 annual)	35
Age 65 and older	125
Disabled	111
County Resident	100

Q1 On a typical day, what is your primary means of travel? (select one)  
 65% of respondents selected Driving compared to 88% in the random sample survey. Comparatively, 14% and 5% selected Bicycling in the respective surveys. Low income respondents are much more like to walk or take transit. County residents and those over 65 are far more likely to drive.

Total excludes skipped or Don't know. Highlighted boxes indicate deviation from "All".

Question 1. Primary Means of Travel (percent of respondents)							
	All	Minority	Low Mod	Low	65+	Disability	County
Walk	10	11	11	23	10	11	0
Bus	3	8	6	14	1	4	2
Drive	65	70	67	46	82	74	89
Bike	18	8	14	14	4	7	9
Total	96	97	98	97	97	96	100

Q2 The transportation system in the Flagstaff area consists of roads, buses, sidewalks, bike lanes, and the Flagstaff Urban Trail System. Overall, how well does the current transportation system meet your travel needs?

Question 2. System Meets Needs							
	All	Minority	Low Mod	Low	65+	Disability	County
Very well	13	20	14	14	18	20	12
Somewhat	61	53	63	63	53	53	51
Not well	24	23	19	17	27	25	31
Not at all	2	3	4	6	2	3	6
Total	100	99	100	100	100	101	100

Around three-quarters of residents find the system meets their needs somewhat well or very well. This holds true for all groups except the County where only 63% of residents rated the system that highly. 6% of Low income and County residents selected "Not at All", considerably more than other groups.

Q3 Please rate your satisfaction with these different aspects of the transportation system and your daily travel

People are generally satisfied with the distance to goods, services and access to the highway ranging around 65%. Satisfaction with transit services and bicycle and pedestrian facilities is much lower, around 38%, with the exception of transit frequency at 22%. Important variations exist for County residents who are considerably more dissatisfied with transit services and minority and low income individuals who are typically more satisfied with transit services. It is noteworthy that many people selected “Don’t Know” when it came to transit service as indicated by the totals below 100.

<b>Distance – goods</b>							
	All	Minority	Low Mod	Low	65+	Disability	County
Very dissatisfied	2	2			2	2	4
Dissatisfied	12	11	17	23	15	19	16
Neutral	20	19	17	20	19	24	29
Satisfied	45	50	43	40	33	30	32
Very Satisfied	20	16	21	17	28	23	19
Total	99	98	98	100	97	98	100
<b>Distance – work</b>							
	All	Minority	Low Mod	Low	65+	Disability	County
Very dissatisfied	2	5	1	3	1	1	6
Dissatisfied	7	8	6	3	6	11	15
Neutral	17	21	24	29	20	18	25
Satisfied	35	32	27	23	22	26	31
Very Satisfied	30	28	35	31	24/25	30/13	23
Total	91	94	93	89	49	56	100
<b>Transit - frequency</b>							
	All	Minority	Low Mod	Low	65+	Disability	County
Very dissatisfied	6	6	9	9	6	5	16
Dissatisfied	17	17	19	21	16	21	22
Neutral	26	22	25	33	25	31	40
Satisfied	15	31	14	20	11	13	11
Very Satisfied	7	9	9	6	10	7	11
Total	71	85	76	89	68	77	100
<b>Transit – proximity</b>							
	All	Minority	Low Mod	Low	65+	Disability	County
Very dissatisfied	11	9	10	11	15	16	34
Dissatisfied	15	19	18	23	18	13	26
Neutral	19	27	17	17	13	27	17
Satisfied	23	17	17	29	16	19	13
Very Satisfied	15	16	13	9	17	12	9
Total	83	88	75	89	79	87	99

County residents expressed higher levels of dissatisfaction with road conditions and the number of sidewalks and road crossings. Minority respondents were nominally more satisfied with the number of bike lanes and trails.

<b>Road - condition</b>							
	All	Minority	Low Mod	Low	65+	Disability	County
Very dissatisfied	12	14	12	9	11	12	31
Dissatisfied	30	28	27	29	30	27	22
Neutral	25	25	25	31	26	29	26
Satisfied	25	23	28	23	26	24	16
Very Satisfied	7	8	7	9	5	7	4
Total	99	98	99	101	98	99	99

  

<b>Access - Interstates &amp; highways</b>							
	All	Minority	Low Mod	Low	65+	Disability	County
Very dissatisfied	2	2	0	9	1	1	4
Dissatisfied	7	11	7	20	11	6	14
Neutral	16	16	17	23	18	18	20
Satisfied	39	38	33	34	29	33	28
Very Satisfied	33	30	35	11	40	34	34
Total	97	97	92	97	99	92	100

  

<b>Number - lanes/trails</b>							
	All	Minority	Low Mod	Low	65+	Disability	County
Very dissatisfied	17	14	21	14	14	13	17
Dissatisfied	28	20	24	29	26	24	30
Neutral	17	23	21	23	16	17	23
Satisfied	20	27	16	14	24	20	18
Very Satisfied	14	11	14	17	14	21	12
Total	96	95	96	97	94	95	100

  

<b>Number - sidewalks/crossings</b>							
	All	Minority	Low Mod	Low	65+	Disability	County
Very dissatisfied	10	9	13	14	9	11	16
Dissatisfied	29	30	26	20	26	24	23
Neutral	23	17	23	20	24	28	30
Satisfied	25	23	25	26	26	22	20
Very Satisfied	11	16	11	17	10	12	11
Total	98	95	98	97	95	97	100

Q4. Please feel free to add a comment to your selection.

262 people left comments. About 50% referenced bicycles, 20% transit, 20% crossings or sidewalks, 10% safety and 10% related to traffic. The bicycle comments were distributed around gaps in the system, specific facilities, and the need to maintain lanes and trails, particularly in the winter. Most transit comments focused on lack of service to outlying

communities or neighborhoods on the edge of the City. Comments regarding crossings and sidewalks can generally be linked to safety concerns.

Q5 Do you ever consider driving a car a necessity (pick one)?

Necessity was selected by drivers in the random sample survey as the most highly valued aspect of driving. Here we explore the reasons why. 89% of respondents replied yes, they sometimes consider driving a necessity. People over 65 and those in the County were higher at 94% and 96%, respectively, and Low-Moderate income individuals lower at 82%.

Q6 Please rate how frequently these reasons make a car trip a necessity for you

Distance (“too far”) is cited as the largest reason driving is a necessity, notable when paired with general satisfaction with distance from goods, work and the highway. Excessive packages and multiple stops at 21% and 24% are the next highest at may be interrelated. Multiple people and children are relatively low factors and in keeping with known vehicle occupancy rates of around 1.4. Lack of access to transit is also low. Notably, 14% of low income individuals listed disability as a very frequent reason for driving, well above the 8% for all.

Driving as a Necessity: Very frequent reason	Percentage
Multiple people	14%
Children in car seat	13%
Disability	8%
Too far	40%
Packages	21%
Multiple stops	24%
No transit	18%

Despite transits relative low rating, it received the most comments, about 45% of the 137 received. Again, these focused on lack of service to outlying areas or the distance to walk to the nearest stop, About 12% of comments each were made regarding the need of a car to do errands, the need for bike routes (from outlying areas), and bad weather.

Q7 Do you ever drive for safety reasons (pick one)?

In the random sample survey, drivers rate safety as a valued aspect of driving. In this follow up question, 68% of all respondents indicated they sometimes drive for safety reasons. For minority respondents that figure is considerably lower at 55% and at 62% for low income individuals. These two groups checked “I don’t drive” at 14% and 20%, respectively, compared to 3% of the entire group.

Q8 From your perspective, rate the factors that make traveling by car safer than other means of travel

Participants were offered several potential reasons why traveling by car is perceived to be safer than traveling by other modes. They were asked to rate them from Not Very to Very Important.

Driving for Safety Reasons: Very Important	Percentage
Children	24%
Seatbelt/Airbag	24%
Fear of bike crash	41%
Fear of walk crash	20%
Risk of assault	15%
Weather	35%

Fear of a bike crash and risks posed by the weather are rated a much more important than other factors. Though 15% of all respondents rated risk of assault while walking or biking as very important, 45% of low-income individuals did.

Of the 107 comments received about 50% were related to biking in traffic and 50% related to risks during winter conditions when snow or cinders are not cleared from bike lanes and sidewalks. There are a few comments related to issues with transients and concerns about traveling at night in a dark sky city.

Q9/Q10 Would you consider moving to a community like this?

“This” is a community where houses are smaller and closer together with shopping and restaurants within walking distance, a question also asked in the random sample survey. The 24% of respondents who answered no were directed to the next question. 23% of respondents indicated they already lived in such a community. There was great variation between groups on this question.

Low to Moderate Income and Low-income individuals are much more inclined to change their community type while those who are older or live in the County are much less willing to do so.

Q9 Consider changing community type							
	All	Minority	Low Mod	Low	65+	Disability	County
Yes	53	51	68	80	42	51	35
Maybe	23	14	18	14	26	21	24
No	24	35	14	6	32	29	40
Already Live	23	41	37		18	31	3

For the 76% of respondents selecting yes or maybe, they were asked to react to potential characteristics of this new community and how they might influence their decision to move.

Q12 Which of the following did or would influence your choice to move to a community like this? Please rate them.

NOTE: This question was misnumbered in the survey.

Large, multi-family buildings were a strong deterrent for all groups, though not as strong for minorities and lower income groups. Not listed in the table, smaller multi-family structures like townhomes and four-plexes were viewed favorably by 44% of respondents. Other favorably consider factors included parks and well-landscaped streets and the presence of transit, transit being particularly attractive to lower income groups and of less interest to those living in the County. Having police or fire within 2 miles was viewed favorably by 45%. Of interest is that 31% of minorities viewed would be less likely to choose such a neighborhood. Regrettably, this does not indicate if they view this as too far or too close.

Q12 Factors influencing change of community type												
	All (n=640)			Minority (n=64)			Low-Mod			Low		
	Less likely	Very less likely	Combined	Less likely	Very less likely	Combined	Less likely	Very less likely	Combined	Less likely	Very less likely	Combined
3-4 stories	13	46	59	14	35	49	18	34	52	21	21	42
5-6 stories	12	59	71	9	55	64	14	56	70	12	35	47
Emerg.Srv. nearby	12	5	17	22	9	31	9	8	17			
	More likely	Much more likely	Combined	More likely	Much more likely	Combined	More likely	Much more likely	Combined	More likely	Much more likely	Combined
Parks	29	55	84	19	50	69	28	60	88	15	65	80
Transit	29	40	69	19	50	69	28	53	81	27	47	74

NOTE: 65+ 34/26 more likely with Emergency Services nearby and Disability 32/26

Q12 Factors influencing change of community type									
	65+			Disability			County		
	Less likely	Very less likely	Combined	Less likely	Very less likely	Combined	Less likely	Very less likely	Combined
3-4 stories	9	61	70	13	40	53	7	63	70
5-6 stories	8	76	84	11	52	63	7	73	80
Emerg.Srv. nearby									
	More likely	Much more likely	Combined	More likely	Much more likely	Combined	More likely	Much more likely	Combined
Parks	34	48	82	30	48	78	29	38	67
Transit	31	39	70	28	41	69	29	30	59



Nearly 40% of the 152 comments received supported walkable neighborhoods. Several noted the expense of downtown and incomplete set of services that made driving remain a necessity. About 20% expressed no interest in urban living or a preference for suburban or rural locations. Another 20% made comment directly or implying that high density urbanization was the wrong direction for Flagstaff. About 10% commented on affordability. Other less frequent comments referenced aging in place, a desire for dog parks, and suggesting that 2 stories be the maximum height.

Q13 In our recent survey, many residents said in ten years they'd prefer to switch their primary means of travel from driving alone to another means like transit or riding a bike. Would you consider switching?

62% of all respondents expressed a willingness to switch modes. Minority, Low-to-moderate income, and County residents were six to nine percentage points lower or less willing.

Q14 What would motivate you to switch? Please rate the following reasons.

All of the factors offered were rated positively by those willing to switch with the exception of the availability of an electric bike (ebike). When asked what would motivate them to switch 78% of respondents rated safer and more convenient bike lanes as motivating. This was less the case for those over 65, the disabled, and County residents. Living closer to work and shopping (68%), access to transit (67%), and the availability of secure bike storage (65%) followed. Quality transit was notably more motivating for older individuals and those with disabilities. Access to an ebike was viewed as motivating or very motivating by a small majority (56%) of minorities and low-moderate income individuals.

Clearly, Health (in the survey as "Improve personal health &/or reduce my carbon footprint") rates the highest. Unfortunately, this was presented as a "double-barreled" question so it is not possible to discern the balance between health and carbon footprint.

Q14 Motivation to Switch									
	All			Minority			Low-Mod		
	Motivating	Very Motivating	Combined	Motivating	Very Motivating	Combined	Motivating	Very Motivating	Combined
Bike lanes	19	59	78	21	53	74	21	53	74
Closer	30	38	68	35	38	73	35	38	73
Transit	24	43	67	21	47	68	21	47	68
Ebike	18	25	43	29	27	56	29	27	56
Bike rack	32	33	65	38	29	67	38	29	67
Health	30	55	85	35	53	88	35	33	68

Q14 Motivation to Switch									
	65+			Disability			County		
	Motivating	Very Motivating	Combined	Motivating	Very Motivating	Combined	Motivating	Very Motivating	Combined
Bike lanes	18	46	64	13	52	65	14	57	71
Closer	34	32	66	36	32	68	25	42	67
Transit	33	45	78	36	39	75	25	38	63
Ebike	11	26	37	20	29	49	13	32	45
Bike rack	30	30	60	36	27	63	30	34	64
Health	30	53	83	38	41	79	30	55	85

66 comments were made regarding switching modes and no pattern emerged. There were a few more comments regarding health and environment motivations, the need for better bicycle system connectivity including access to store fronts, and a few about weather conditions. Most of the others were one-off comments.

#### Closing comments

People were also invited to make closing comments of which 171 were received. Around 20% pertained to bicycling – facility needs to Kachina, safety, and lane maintenance. Around 10% are dedicated to walking facilities and crosswalks. Another 10% address the need for better roads, bypasses or the Lone Tree Overpass. At about 8% are comments supporting complete streets or equitable treatment for all modes. A similar number speak to call for better transit service. A small percentage of comments address poor Downtown parking, over-reach of government, favoritism toward NAU and other topics. Finally, about 8% said “Thank you” for listening to their concerns.