



AMPO GIS Working Group  
Quarterly Webinar  
March 27, 2019  
2-3 PM Eastern

Q&A

Q: Do you crowdsource data or rely exclusively on data provided by local governments?

A: Data is mainly provided from local jurisdictions and counties, but it has also been collected data from local knowledge. In the past we have looked at other online map sources online or events like Bike to Work Day. DRCOG adds data when necessary by looking at the latest imagery. Volunteer geographic information collection methods have not been used at DRCOG but doing so is a possibility for the future.

Q: What are some examples of data restrictions (e.g. location, ownership) that you've encountered?

A: We have encountered home owner association private paths and trail that are gated for public use that jurisdictions will call as facilities. Other things such as segments with stairs or running paths that don't state bikes are allowed, but we have been notified that the jurisdiction doesn't want those to be shown as a valid facility. One of our jurisdictions recently notified us that they do not want any of their data shared.

Q: Do you use a standard symbology guide (from FHWA or elsewhere) for mapping/web mapping different bike facility types?

A: We do not use a standard symbology guide for mapping. We use an internal symbology for data processing and visualization.

Q: What's the advantage of using Postgres to do data processing before migrating over to SQL Server?

A: This decision is mostly based on comfort-level between PostgreSQL and SQL Server, especially as it relates to spatial processing. We typically perform data processing in Postgres, and then move finalized datasets in to our GIS enterprise environments which is stored in SQL Server.

Q: You have 'multi-use sidewalk' paths, which I haven't heard of before. Do people get confused that a sidewalk could allow bike travel (since usually most people assume that sidewalks are for peds only)?

A: This is a facility type we had in our old dataset and it was confusing! In our new schema, we wanted to be more strategic in our facility type definitions, so the better aligned with industry standards. Multi-use sidewalks are now categorized as sidepaths (a subset of shared use paths), so long as they meet the 8' minimum width and allowance of two-way bicycle and pedestrian travel (typically through signage).

Q: How has or will this inventory effort help improve your active transportation planning process?

A: Our updated bicycle facility inventory will allow us to work with our planning partners in a more efficient manner and our data will be more user-friendly and accessible to folks that use the information (within and outside of DRCOG). Once we populate some of the new fields, it will allow us to track the state of our bicycle network – whether reporting the miles of bicycle lanes or the growth in the high-comfort network. In the future, we hope to be able to perform more robust analyses, like level of traffic stress analysis regionwide, using our robust and user-friendly dataset. At a minimum, it helps us and our partners speak the same language when referring to bicycle facilities – this, in and of itself, is extremely helpful in the regional active transportation planning process.

Q: How is this data helping you in terms of identifying the need for wayfinding signage?

A: We have not conducted a regionwide wayfinding analysis, but this process (and the overall ATP process) has illuminated the need to look at developing regional wayfinding standards. This data has potential to be used for such a process, by looking at gaps and locating facilities that carry multiple names/identifiers.

Q: How are you handling existing facilities that need improvements? In terms of status classification?

A: Our local government partners are responsible for identifying specific project-level improvements and where communities have done so, we will include planned and proposed facilities in our inventory, looking to the “status” field to tell us what is existing vs planned/proposed. Typically, this information (planned/proposed) comes from local or county-level bicycle plans, but some communities also maintain “future” networks that we can incorporate as well.

Q: It was interesting to hear that you use PostgreSQL and PostGIS. Why that DB and not others?

A: We use SQL Server to store our enterprise geodatabases. We use PostgreSQL for data processing and to store our externally accessible GIS data (through web maps and our [Regional Data Catalog](#)). PostgreSQL/PostGIS is very robust and performs very well, especially for larger datasets.

Q: Any plans to integrate into a topological network for future analysis? i.e.: isochrone maps, first mile/last mile gaps, etc.?

A: We do not have immediate plans to integrate the bicycle facility data to a topological network, but this may be something we do in the future.

Q: Can you comment further on the role of your active transportation committee or task force? Participants?

A: For the development of the Active Transportation Plan, DRCOG convened an Active Transportation Stakeholder Committee, a group of local government representatives, advocacy organizations and other regional partners (like RTD, CDOT, etc). One of the implementation items from the ATP was to continue the regional discussion of specific active transportation-related topics, like micromobility. DRCOG worked with local partners to identify those interested in participating in that discussion, and as others arise (perhaps wayfinding or other topics) will certainly tap into our ATSC.

