



2022 SOUTH DAKOTA WALKABLE COMMUNITIES TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM STUDY EVALUATION

11/29/22

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

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Background	5
Program Commonalities	5
The Walk Audit Grant Program.....	6
The SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration	6
Participating Communities.....	6
Community Recommendations	8
Walk Audit Grant	8
SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration	9
Coalitions of Community Stakeholders.....	9
Walk Audit Grant	9
SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration	10
Support through (Additional) Funding.....	10
Walk Audit Grant	10
SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration	11
Other Support	11
Walk Audit Grant	11
SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration	12
Community Involvement	13
Walk Audit Grant	13
SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration	14
Impact	15
Walk Audit Grant	15
SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration	16
Continuing Support.....	17
Walk Audit Grant	17
SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration	18
Barriers and Challenges	18
Walk Audit Grant	18
SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration	19
Technical Assistance	20
Walk Audit Grant	20

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration	21
Recommendations	21
Final Considerations and Next Steps	22
Acknowledgments.....	22
For More Information/Programmatic Contact	22
Appendix	23
Walk Audit Grant Program Survey – Post-2017 Communities	23
Walk Audit Grant Program Survey – Pre-2017 Communities (Long-Term Survey)	32
SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey – Post-2017 Communities.....	37
SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey – Pre-2017 Communities (Long-Term Survey)	46
Programmatic Briefs	51
Links to SDSU Community Reports	53

Executive Summary

The South Dakota Department of Health (SD DOH) supports two similar programs related to community walkability and healthy community design, under the heading of the South Dakota Walkable Communities Technical Assistance Program. Those programs are the Walk Audit Grant Program and the South Dakota State University (SDSU) Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration. The Walk Audit Grant Program took place between 2014 and 2019; the SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration has been ongoing since 2012. This is the second evaluation of these programs, and the first took place in 2017. Between the two programs, during this time, there were 22 projects representing 20 communities (two communities participated in both).

A survey was sent to contacts in each of these communities in the summer of 2022, and the SD DOH received 17 responses. Those that had taken the previous 2017 survey were sent a shortened, “long term” version of the survey; these communities are referred to as “pre-2017” communities. The communities that participated in either program after 2017 who only took the most recent version of the survey are referred to as “post-2017” communities. The purpose of this report is to bring together the background, progress, impact, barriers/challenges, and recommendations collected from those 17 communities, and to compare these to the results from the 2017 evaluation.

The following are major successes of the program:

- Identification of community areas that are problematic for walkability/active transportation, and reinforcement and documentation of known problems through organized walk audits
- Uniting groups of community stakeholders with diverse views and abilities to focus on walkability/active transportation issues facing the community
- Realistic recommendations for improvements made through the walk audits/active transportation assessments
- Communication with community members through multiple media channels about walkability/active transportation and active lifestyles in the community
- Changes (and planned changes) in multiple areas to make cities more walkable/active, including pedestrian safety; policy/city ordinances; collaboration on planning; aesthetics, wayfinding, and place making; parking; bike facilities; parks, trails, and paths; public transit; and community wide walking campaigns/programs
- Generating interest in continuing evaluation, improvement, and funding of walkability and active transportation issues

The following are major programmatic findings:

- Communities generally agreed that these projects increased the knowledge/experience of their stakeholder coalition members with respect to walkability and active transportation
- Most communities reported that this project had increased/would increase their funding for active transportation related projects, either from city or outside sources
- Most communities felt that they received the right amount of assistance from SD DOH and, among SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration communities, from the course instructor
- SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration and Walk Audit Grant Program have some differences between them:

- The SDSU communities were less likely to retain their coalitions following the initial one-year time frame of the project
- The Walk Audit communities indicated they may need additional technical assistance with the walk audits, particularly if they have not made a similar effort previously
- Engineering expertise is important for success, along with participation of elected officials/city council
- Under current limitations, collecting data to determine whether there are increases in walkability and other forms of active transportation is out of reach (communities do not regularly collect data on pedestrian traffic)
- Funding remains an issue for follow through in different ways for many communities, as does prioritization by city officials/planners

The following are recommendations for the future. Note that although the Walk Audit Grant program within SD DOH has been dissolved, new, interested communities are referred to their partners at Wellmark Healthy HometownSM. Previous Walk Audit Grant communities can still consider these recommendations:

- 1) SD DOH should continue to provide technical assistance at the current level to all previous program participants
- 2) Pathways for communication across program participants, both previous and current, should be created and emphasized
- 3) SD DOH should continue to provide participants with connections to potential sources of funding (e.g., grants)
- 4) Weather in South Dakota winters can be unpredictable and cause delays for walk audits; communities should plan for one or more backup dates wherever possible, while also acknowledging there are benefits to seasonal audits
- 5) Stakeholder coalitions should include or collaborate with both decision makers (e.g., elected officials) and people who can implement changes (e.g., engineers), along with people who represent the general needs and interests of the communities
- 6) Walk Audit Grant communities would benefit from more guidance with respect to the process of the walk audit (e.g., examples of walk audit forms, data extraction from walk audit, greater discussion of the process of a walk audit)—this may be connected to recommendation 2
- 7) The majority of communities indicated interest in learning more about developing Complete Streets policies, which could be integrated into the technical assistance provided by SD DOH
- 8) Beth Davis/SD DOH should maintain regular communication with the communities to ensure that a community contact is always available and aware of the work that has been done for walkability and active transportation

Background

The South Dakota Department of Health (SD DOH) has supported two similar programs related to community walkability and healthy community design, under the heading of the South Dakota Walkable Communities Technical Assistance Program. The Walk Audit Grant Program (in which SD DOH offered direct financial assistance as well as technical assistance) and the South Dakota State University (SDSU) Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration (in which SD DOH provides oversight and support alongside SDSU landscape architect students and Professor Donald Burger who provide technical assistance). The former has been dissolved under SD DOH, but SD DOH now refers interested communities to their partners at Wellmark Healthy HometownSM. The SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Grant is continuing.

The South Dakota Walkable Communities Technical Assistance Program was launched to provide South Dakota communities with the catalyst for implementation of healthy community design principles. Walkable communities are healthier communities, where residents are more physically active, decreasing the overall burden of chronic disease. The Walk Audit Grant Program and the SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration have provided the opportunity for communities to bring together multi-disciplinary teams, conduct assessments of the built environment, and dialogue with stakeholders and community leaders on next steps toward making improvements. A statewide Active Transportation Advisory Team (ATAT) convened by the SD DOH provided expertise to the programs through 2019; although this was dissolved, there is now a South Dakota State Walking Network that serves as an advisory board. This is comprised of representation from the South Dakota Department of Transportation, AARP South Dakota, Livable 605, SDSU Extension, and the South Dakota Department of Health.

The goal of this report is to summarize the progress and accomplishments of these programs, largely based on a survey that was recently provided to the community contacts in July 2022. A similar report was written in 2017, based on a survey provided at that time; the communities that finished their projects prior to 2017 were therefore offered a shorter version considered to be a long-term follow up survey.

Program Commonalities

The following points are common to both South Dakota Walkable Communities Technical Assistance Programs:

- Communities convene a team of multi-sectoral partners including representation from elected officials, community/civic leaders, tribal leaders, wellness, public works, zoning, planning, transportation, engineering, parks and recreation, transit authority, walking/bicycling advocacy, schools, historical preservation, local business, economic development, social services, tourism, older adults, youth, childcare, healthcare, , people who are differently abled, law enforcement, main street/downtown associations, and/or other local residents
- Results gear communities toward long- and short-term policy planning, position them for larger grant opportunities, and help them consider complete streets policies and future investments in built environment infrastructure

- Communities in both programs have a diversity of population sizes, with populations ranging from just a few hundred to upwards of 192,517 residents¹
- The long-term goal is that communities become more walkable, which encourages physical activity, ultimately reducing chronic disease burden and increasing quality of life. Activity-friendly routes to everyday destinations is a key, evidence-based strategy for increasing physical activity.

There are also some aspects that are unique to each of the programs:

The Walk Audit Grant Program

- Selected communities receive grants averaging \$5,000
- Communities select or develop a checklist tool for their walk audit
- Communities conduct a local walk audit training event and complete a community walk audit
- Focus is specifically on leveraging support and capacity for walkability, with the ultimate goal of increasing the number of individuals walking for recreation, exercise, and transportation
- This program ended after 2019, however new communities interested in walk audits are referred to [Healthy HometownSM Powered by Wellmark](#) for technical assistance – a key SD DOH partner

The SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

- Selected communities receive assessment assistance from SDSU spring 300 level city planning class taught by Professor Donald Burger; students conduct built environment assessments, develop recommendations for improving the built environments and increasing active transportation, and present results to the community
- Focus is specifically on leveraging support and capacity for active transportation, with the ultimate goal of increasing active transportation through activities such as walking or biking to work, school, grocery stores, and parks

Participating Communities

There are 22 projects across the two programs as of July 2022. Table 1 outlines information about the nine communities who participated in the Walk Audit Grant Program, including when they first participated in their program, the sector of the main contact person, and the name of the person who completed the survey; Table 2 provides similar information for those 13 communities who participated in the SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration.

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

Table 1. Walk Audit Grant Community Summary²

Community	2020 Population	Year of Implementation	Contact Person, Sector	Survey Taker(s)
Sioux Falls	192,516	2014/2015	Mary Michaels, City Prevention Specialist	Mary Michaels/ Mary Michaels
Rapid City	74,703	2014/2015	Sandy Smith, Long Range Planner Sara Hornick, LiveWell Black Hills Coalition Partner Sarah Hanzel, Long Range Planner Kip Harrington, Long Range Planner	Patsy Horton/ Kip Harrington
Pierre	14,091	2014/2015	Tom Farnsworth, Parks & Recreation Bryan Tipton, Parks & Recreation	Tom Farnsworth/ Bryan Tipton
Burke	575	2014/2015	Ann Schwader, SDSU Extension Field Specialist	Ann Schwader/ Anne Schwader
Mobridge	3,261	2015/2016	Christine Goldsmith, City Administrator Heather Beck, CFO/City Administrator	Christine Goldsmith/ NA
Keystone	240	2015/2016	Mike Bender, Engineer Sandi McClain, Town Board Trustee Cassandra Ott, Keystone Finance Officer	Mike Bender/ Cassandra Ott
Lake Andes	710	2016/2017	Samantha Dvorak, SDSU Extension Field Specialist Mary Jo Parker, Retired FACS Leader/Lake Andes Librarian	Samantha Dvorak/ Mary Jo Parker
Hermosa	382	2018/2019	Joan Harris, City Planning & Zoning	Joan Harris
Viborg	814	2018/2019	Heidi Hora, Economic Development Lisa Rudd, Finance Officer	Anne Christiansen

² As reported at <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/data.html>.

Table 2. SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Community Summary³

Community	2020 Population	Year of Implementation	Contact Person, Sector	Survey Taker(s)
Huron	14,263	2013	Ralph Borkowski, City Planner Chad Schroeder, Parks & Recreation	Ralph Borkowski/ NA
Mitchell	15,660	2014	Dusty Rodiek, Parks & Recreation Nathan Powell, Parks & Recreation Joe Schroeder, City Engineer	Nathan Powell/ NA
Salem	1,325	2015	Lori Heumiller, City Finance Officer	Lori Heumiller/ Lori Heumiller
Volga	2,113	2015	Andrew Bremseth, City Administrator Tracy Nelson, Community Wellness Policy Committee Michael Schulte, City Administrator Krista Larson, City Finance Officer	Jameson Berreth/ Michael Schulte
Ft. Pierre	2,115	2016	Gloria Hanson, Mayor	Gloria Hanson/ NA
Crooks	1,362	2017	Jamison Rounds, Mayor Tobias Schantz, City Administrator/Municipal Finance Officer	Jamison Rounds/ Tobias Schantz
Burke	575	2018	Kelsea Sutton, County Commissioner	Kelsea Sutton
Tripp	575	2018	Bryan Bietz, Engineer/Tripp Area Community Foundation	Bryan Bietz
Sioux Falls	192,516	2019	Mary Michaels, City Public Health Prevention Specialist	Mary Michaels
Harrisburg	6,782	2019	David Heinold, Minnehaha County Planner Mike Munzke, Principal, Endeavor Elementary School	NA
Sturgis	7,020	2020	Elizabeth Wunderlich, City Engineer Daniel Ainslie, City Manager	Daniel Ainslie
Mission	1,156	2021	Glen Marshall, Executive Director, Boys & Girls Club of Rosebud	Glen Marshall
Wanblee	674	2022	Phyllis Swift Hawk, Wanblee Community Action Team	Phyllis Swift Hawk

Community Recommendations

Walk Audit Grant

The post-2017 Walk Audit Grant communities were asked about the process of making recommendations for the community following the walk audit. Both of the post-2017 Walk Audit Grant communities had compiled a set of formal or informal findings or recommendations. Both found it easy to interpret their walk audit findings using their selected checklist, but only one found that it was realistic to follow through with recommended changes. Hermosa commented “We need sidewalks and have prioritized the areas needed. We have a six-phase plan. Unfortunately, funding is a problem, we have applied for and received a Technical Assistance (TA) grant for phase one, but by the time we get to

³ As reported at <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/data.html>.

the top of the list costs have increased so much that we can only do a small portion of the approved sidewalks.”

This compares to four out of the seven pre-2017 walk audit communities that previously reported they would be able to follow through with the recommended changes.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

All six post-2017 SDSU communities felt that the recommendations made by SDSU were realistic, and that it was possible to follow through with the recommended changes. A few made qualifications to this, saying that some recommendations were possible to follow and some were not. Some of the specific comments were that bike lanes would be difficult and that they could have used more detailed guidance on phasing in sidewalks; funding, support, staff, and right of way made some of the suggestions difficult; and water usage would have been excessive for some of the efforts. These responses were very similar to those obtained from the six pre-2017 communities who took the previous survey.

Coalitions of Community Stakeholders

Walk Audit Grant

The post-2017 communities were asked several questions regarding their community stakeholder coalition. Both of the post-2017 communities felt that the multi-sector coalition of community stakeholders they established for the project was useful for completion of the audit. One of the communities commented that it gave them the much-needed opinions of many different groups, ages, and other community members. The other said that it gave them a broad spectrum of individuals to work with, and that the stakeholders included engineering, city zoning board members, city parks/recreation board members, school district representatives, and health care representatives. Neither felt they were lacking any specific expertise (which seemed to be an improvement from the previous survey given to the pre-2017 communities, who did report lacking some expertise).

Both post-2017 communities also indicated that they had provided training for the team (e.g., walk audit facilitator training) and that the training tools provided by the SD DOH were helpful in this endeavor (six out of seven of the pre-2017 communities responded this way as well in the previous survey). Both also reported they felt that the team’s knowledge, attitudes, and abilities with respect to community walkability have improved as a result of this grant. Their comments are provided here:

- Hermosa: Two of our greatest resources were the AARP and SDDOH websites. This material gave them background information, on what to look for and why. They went from just thinking about sidewalks for walking to school, to walks and pathways for seniors, along with parks and places to walk pets.
- Viborg: It created more of an awareness of the walkability of our community. We have some areas of the community that are very walkable, and others that are lacking in the ability to safely walk.

Both post-2017 communities also reported that their teams will remain in place in the future. They indicated that this was because of their status as stakeholders and their own desire to remain involved, as well as the usefulness of this team moving forward as they implement changes. This compares to four of the seven pre-2017 communities who previously reported their teams would remain in place.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

The post-2017 SDSU communities were asked several questions regarding their community stakeholder coalition. Five of the six SDSU active transportation communities felt that the multi-sector coalition of community stakeholders was useful for the completion of the assessment. The sixth commented that there was not a broad coalition pushing for completion of projects, and that it was primarily city staff in charge of this; easier projects could be budgeted for but more expensive projects never made it to serious discussion. Some of the other comments from those who felt the coalition was useful indicated that the cross section of individuals was important; that it was important to have decision makers, community members, and school officials involved; and that the group should involve both decision makers (city officials) and people who can carry out the work (like engineers). This was very similar to the responses to the pre-2017 community survey that took place previously, in which five of the six who participated also said the multi-sector coalition was useful.

There were more comments on a lack of expertise for the SDSU respondents than for the Walk Audit Grant respondents; three of the six commented on a lack of elected officials, business leaders, and manpower. Previously, on the pre-2017 SDSU survey, there was also some lack of expertise discussed, but the general comments there were that engineering expertise was missing.

All six SDSU communities felt that the team's knowledge, attitudes, and abilities with respect to active transportation have improved (this compares to five out of six in the previous pre-2017 SDSU survey). Only three of the six teams will remain in place in the future as part of the effort to implement the recommended changes (this compares to two out of six from the previous SDSU survey). One community indicated that this was because of the retirement of a staff member who was overseeing the project, but the other two indicated that there are smaller teams with more interest in individual issues who will continue working together.

Support through (Additional) Funding

Walk Audit Grant

Both pre- and post-2017 communities were asked about additional funding support outside of the amount received from SD DOH.

Both of the post-2017 communities indicated that the walk audit helped (or they believe it would help) them to obtain dedicated city funding. Viborg indicated that this allowed them to complete walkability projects at the same time as the city's water and sewer project. Both also said that the walk audit helped (or they believe it would help) them to obtain funding from a source other than the city. Hermosa indicated that this helped provide a direction and timeline for applying for community and technical assistance grants; although the amount was initially adequate, because of a delay in the funding time frame, the project had to be downsized after it was received.

The pre-2017 communities were asked again about obtaining funding; four of the six said that it had helped them to obtain dedicated city funding, and two of the six said that it had helped them to obtain funding from a source other than the city. The funding was generally used to improve sidewalks, crosswalks, and other pedestrian elements, and all implied that the funding was adequate.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

Both pre- and post-2017 SDSU communities were asked about funding support outside of the active transportation assessment.

Four of the six post-2017 communities indicated that the assessment helped (or they believe it would help) them to obtain dedicated city funding. One of the communities indicated specifically that it helped obtain funding for seating at the city park and would soon support some changes at the city pool. Five of the six also said the assessment helped (or they believe it would help) them to obtain funding from a source other than the city. This included wellness, infrastructure, safety, education, and seating. Burke specifically indicated this had helped with several grants, including a \$100k Wellmark Foundation Grant in 2021.

The pre-2017 communities were asked again about obtaining funding; one of the three said it had helped them to obtain dedicated city funding, and the same community said it helped them to obtain funding from a source other than the city. This funding helped to improve a trail system.

Other Support

Walk Audit Grant

Both pre- and post-2017 Walk Audit Grant communities were asked about support they had received other than funding.

Both of the post-2017 communities indicated they had obtained additional support other than funding by elected officials and others who could make an impact on the community:

- Hermosa: They continue to support our Walk to School day and our annual Earn A Bike program along with our bicycle rodeo.
- Viborg: The city maintenance department was utilized in helping to prep the bike path (i.e. removing trees and old existing sidewalk).

The pre-2017 communities were also asked this question; four of the six said that they had had long term support by elected officials and others:

- Sioux Falls: The walk audit helped keep active transportation at the forefront of conversation, whether at the city department level or with other partners across the city. Active transportation is a major part of the city health department's community health improvement plan.
- Pierre: Commission still values the walkability of the city
- Burke: Burke's City Council members value the walk audit process. It provided them with an increased awareness of the need for active transportation in the community.
- Lake Andes: A new street extending 9th Ave to Highway 50/18/281 to provide an entrance to the new Charles Mix Electric building and it is proposed to connect the walking path along 9th Ave to Lake Street for a more safe way for kids to walk to town or to school.

When asked who were the primary supporters necessary to implement the recommended changes from the walk audit, the two post-2017 communities responded:

- Hermosa: The local Town Board must support all phases of our plan in order to accomplish our goals.
- Viborg: City council, economic development and the school district.

Both post-2017 communities indicated they had received the right amount of assistance from Beth Davis and SD DOH for completing and following up on the walk audit grant; one community indicated that they appreciated the many reference websites and feedback as questions were asked.

Five of the pre-2017 communities also indicated they had received the right amount of assistance from Beth Davis and SD DOH; one felt they had received too little assistance (the comment that accompanied this response was “I don’t know what it is for, no information”). The five who found that the assistance was an appropriate amount indicated they appreciated resources, technical assistance, training, having a solid contact, and notification of additional educational opportunities. One contact who had only worked with the project as of completing this survey acknowledged that the project, retrospectively, had likely been very important for bringing some important walkability issues to light.

Of the two post-2017 communities, one indicated that the grant provided other learning opportunities for them around healthy community design principles that they would not have had. This compares to seven out of seven of the respondents to the original 2017 survey.

The pre-2017 communities were also asked if they had pursued any additional efforts toward healthy community design principles that they would not have without this project; four out of the six indicated they had. The efforts are described here:

- Sioux Falls: We (as the Health Department) continued to participate in the city's volunteer bike committee and to insert ourselves into conversations on active transportation, complete streets and health in all policies with other city departments.
- Rapid City: Work with Live Well Black Hills to provide technical assistance on walkability.
- Pierre: looking at upgrading and adding additional paths and trail
- Burke: The Community Walk Audit Grant was a launching pad for Burke to obtain and expand services and resources such as obtaining a fitness center and the facilitation of the city park remodel (2022).

[SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration](#)

Both pre- and post-2017 SDSU communities were asked about support they had received other than funding.

Only one of the six post-2017 communities indicated they had obtained additional support other than funding by elected officials and others who could make an impact on the community:

- Sioux Falls: We have one member of City Council who is very involved in active transportation issues, so he continues to be an advocate. In addition, the city's Health Department has included "active living" as a priority in its Community Health Improvement Plan, and that centers primarily around the built environment. The Health Department is also leading a new "Health in All Policies" team comprised of staff from other city departments.

The pre-2017 communities were also asked this question; one of the three said that they use the document from the project when they plan other projects and incorporate recommendations into those other projects, but the others did not provide positive responses.

When asked who were the primary supporters necessary to implement the recommended changes from the walk audit, there were various responses from five of the post-2017 communities:

- Wanblee: Families Working Together, College, School, Wanblee Community Action Team, and churches
- Burke: State, County, and City Governments, private funders, and grantmakers.
- Mission: The city has been primary; [support from the tribe] would make a great deal more possible
- Tripp: It really feels like getting more buy in from the city to work on these projects would be helpful.
- Sioux Falls: Mayor, Council, Department Directors (especially Planning, Public Works, Parks & Rec , Health); new Health in All Policies team (led by Health Department); community partners working on the health department's CHIP.

All six of the post-2017 communities indicated they had received useful and adequate assistance and support from SDSU professor Donald Burger; four of the six indicated they had received the right amount of assistance from Beth Davis and SD DOH for completing and following up on the walk audit grant, while the remaining two felt they had received too little assistance. One of these two indicated that some of the difficulties were due to COVID-19, but that the SD DOH representative had been available when needed. Communities that did feel they had received the right amount of assistance commented that they appreciated notifications of available grants and other funding sources, and that the accessibility of Dr. Burger and Beth Davis was much appreciated. There was also a comment that it would be helpful if there were more highlights of what other communities have been able to accomplish in active transportation.

Of the three pre-2017 communities, only two responded here, but said that they had received the right amount of assistance from Beth Davis. One of these said that the reminders of educational opportunities and information on what other towns have accomplished had been very helpful.

Four of the six post-2017 communities indicated that this collaboration had provided other learning opportunities for them around healthy community design principles that they would not have had. This compares to five out of six of the respondents to the original 2017 survey.

The pre-2017 communities were also asked if they had pursued any additional efforts toward healthy community design principles that they would not have without this project; one out of the three indicated they had, and one out of the three indicated they had not (the other did not answer). Salem indicated that the Salem Trail System would not have come about without the assessment collaboration.

Community Involvement

Walk Audit Grant

Programmatic Note: All Walk Audit Grantees were required to assemble a multidisciplinary team as part of the grant process and encouraged to conduct a training event.

The post-2017 Walk Audit Grant communities were asked about community involvement. Both of the post-2017 communities reported conducting an educational event focused on walkability for the community (this compares to four of the seven pre-2017 communities on the previous survey). These events are described for each community:

- Hermosa: In May we provided bicycle safety training and interaction and right of ways with walkers. This was reinforced with a Bicycle Rodeo the following week that incorporated road signage.
- Viborg: We conducted community meetings to review the results of the walking audit and to ascertain the feasibility and the amount of community support needed for the walking path.

Both communities indicated they had communicated the results of the walk audit to the community. Table 3 provides a summary of the methods used to communicate information to the community. The additional method of communication listed by Viborg was community meetings.

Table 3. Numbers of Communities Using Methods for Communication with Communities

Method	Number of Post-2017 Communities
Press releases	1
Newsletter articles	1
Social media	2
Official community websites	0
Other	1

Neither of the post-2017 communities had conducted a community survey. When asked about other ways in which community members had been (or would be) encouraged to contribute their voices, here were their comments:

- Hermosa: They are invited to join any and all of our planning meetings.
- Viborg: We also held meetings with the residents on the proposed bike/walking path to find out their support and concerns. The residents were in favor of the project, but had concerns on how much yard space would be comprised and how the path will be cared for.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

Programmatic Note: All SDSU communities were required to convene a group of stakeholders to meet and engage with the students during their visits. Other educational events hosted by the community were optional.

The post-2017 SDSU communities were asked about community involvement. One of the six communities indicated they had held an active transportation educational event for the community, and three indicated they had not yet but planned to (the other two said they had not).

- Wanblee: Currently, we are sort of stuck in the planning stages and not sure where to start.
- Burke: We are holding community engagement events around this topic this fall.
- Mission: Yes, we had good attendance at Sinte Gleska University.

Five out of six communities indicated they had communicated the results of the walk audit to the community, and the remaining community still has plans to do so. Table 4 provides a summary of the methods used to communicate information to the community. The additional methods of communication listed included flyers and an in-person event.

Table 4. Numbers of Communities Using Methods for Communication with Communities

Method	Number of Post-2017 Communities
Press releases	4
Newsletter articles	2
Social media	5
Official community websites	3
Other	2

One of the six post-2017 communities had conducted a community survey; two still had plans to and one did not answer. When asked about other ways in which community members had been (or would be) encouraged to contribute their voices, here were their comments:

- Wanblee: Primarily through community meetings.
- Mission: ... We have done lots of community surveys for grants, but I don't remember doing one specifically around the ATA [Active Transportation Assessment]. We are getting Community Coaching for community engagement around ATA this fall in collaboration with AARP, Dakota Resources, Wellmark, and possibly SD Community Foundation.
- Tripp: This is an area we need to do more.
- Sioux Falls: The city is engaging some of its citizen boards/committees like the bike committee and pedestrian committee to become more engaged in overall active transportation issues.

Impact

Walk Audit Grant

The Walk Audit Grant communities were asked about 10 areas in which they may have made changes, or are planning to make changes, as a result of the Walk Audit Grant Program. Table 5 provides the number of communities who indicated they had, had not, or were planning to make changes in those 10 areas. These questions were asked to both pre- and post-2017 communities. Between the two sets of communities, pedestrian safety was a high priority area (6 out of the 8 total communities said they had made changes in this area, and an additional community plans to do so). Policy/city ordinances was also a common area to make changes, with 5 out of the 8 total communities having made changes here, and one more planning to do so. Both post-2017 communities indicated they had made “other” changes; although Viborg did not describe this change, Hermosa added a designated pickup and drop-off at school and bike racks at ball fields, school, and the library.

Table 5. Numbers of Walk Audit Grant Communities Making Changes in 10 Areas

Area	Pre-2017 Communities			Post-2017 Communities		
	Yes	No	Not Yet	Yes	No	Not Yet
Pedestrian Safety	4	1	1	2	0	0
Policy/City Ordinances	4	1	1	1	1	0
Collaboration on Planning	3	1	2	0	1	1
Aesthetics, Wayfinding, & Place Making	3	2	1	0	0	2
Parking	3	3	0	0	2	0
Bike Facilities	3	2	1	2	0	0
Parks, Trails, and Paths	4	2	0	0	1	1
Public Transit	2	3	1	1	1	0
Community Wide Walking Campaigns/Programs	2	3	1	0	2	0
Other changes	0	2	3	2	0	0

The post-2017 communities were also asked if they had made changes to their “city wide master plan” or similar document based on the community walk audit. Viborg’s responses indicated they were not aware of this document, but Hermosa indicated that these changes had been made. This compares to 2 of the 7 pre-2017 communities who had made changes to their plans.

The post-2017 communities were similarly asked if they currently had a Complete Streets or similar policy. Neither of the two communities were aware of this plan, although Hermosa indicated they would be interested in learning more and possibly creating a Complete Streets policy for their community, based on the results of their current work. The pre-2017 communities were asked if they had formalized a walkability plan or something similar; three said that it was still in progress, and three said that they had not.

Finally, the two post-2017 communities were asked if they had utilized any form of traffic counting tools to measure pedestrian activity; neither had.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

The SDSU communities were asked about 10 areas in which they may have made changes, or are planning to make changes, as a result of the assessment collaboration. Table 6 provides the number of communities who indicated they had, had not, or were planning to make changes in those 10 areas. These questions were asked to both pre- and post-2017 communities. Between the two sets of communities, parks, trails, and paths were a high priority area (six out of the total of nine communities had already made changes here and the remaining three plan to do so). Pedestrian safety was also popular, although five of the communities who plan to make changes had not done it yet. Areas that were less popular for this group were parking (eight out of the nine communities had not made changes here and had no plans to), and other (none of the nine communities had plans for other changes).

Table 6. Numbers of SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Communities Making Changes in 10 Areas

Area	Pre-2017 Communities			Post-2017 Communities		
	Yes	No	Not Yet	Yes	No	Not Yet
Pedestrian Safety	1	0	2	2	0	3
Policy/City Ordinances	0	3	0	1	2	3
Collaboration on Planning	1	1	1	2	3	1
Aesthetics, Wayfinding, & Place Making	1	1	1	4	0	2
Parking	0	3	0	1	5	0
Bike Facilities	0	1	2	3	1	2
Parks, Trails, and Paths	2	0	1	4	0	2
Public Transit	0	2	1	0	3	2
Community Wide Walking Campaigns/Programs	0	3	0	1	2	3
Other changes	0	3	0	0	3	0

The post-2017 communities were also asked if they had made changes to their “city wide master plan” or similar document based on the community walk audit. One said they had, two said they had not, two said they were not aware of this plan, and one said not yet. This compares to two that had made changes, two who were not aware of this plan, and two who had not yet made changes among the pre-2017 communities in the previous survey.

The post-2017 communities were similarly asked if they currently had a Complete Streets or similar policy. One of the communities said they had this plan, one said they were not sure, and four said they did not (although all four of these said they would be interested in learning more and possibly creating one). None had made changes to this plan. The pre-2017 communities were asked if they had formalized a walkability plan or something similar; one said they had, one said that it was still in progress, and one said that they had not.

Finally, the six post-2017 communities were asked if they had utilized any form of traffic counting tools to measure pedestrian activity; none of them had.

Continuing Support

Walk Audit Grant

The post-2017 Walk Audit Grant communities were asked for their thoughts on continuing support. Of the two post-2017 communities, neither had any specific requests for continuing support, but Hermosa commented that they would be open to suggestions.

In response to an item asking about the usefulness of a future plan of action characterizing short, mid, and long-term goals, the responses were:

- Hermosa: That is exactly what we have done. And yes it is very helpful.

- Viborg: Developing a goals for expansion of the bike/walking path around the city.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

The post-2017 SDSU communities were asked for their thoughts on continuing support. Their answers are:

- Wanblee: Some training
- Burke: I would love more follow up on the things like Complete Streets and Pedestrian Plans mentioned on previous page. We don't have any of these things. It would also really help to have more data about why these things increase safety and are good for economic development.
- Mission: Continued partnership from Prairey and Ron.
- Tripp: Examples of other communities improvements would be helpful. Keep the emails on funding sources coming!
- Sioux Falls: The city is looking at combining some of its issue-specific committees (bike, ped, etc.) into a more prominent Active Transportation Advisory Board that would be Mayor-appointed and would be better positioned to make recommendations to decision-makers. There might be an opportunity for those involved to access your resources to compile good talking points for use in advocating for this change.

In response to an item asking about the usefulness of a future plan of action characterizing short, mid, and long-term goals, the responses were largely “yes,” although there was one community that said they were not sure and one that did not answer. The more specific answers were:

- Mission: Not sure. But we are glad to have the continued support of SDSU Extension (especially Prairey and Ron) as we move ahead.
- Tripp: I would like to think that if there would have been facilitation with the stakeholder group on what actions could be taken to implement would be helpful. It would also be good to ask the question of how the group would implement and what the priorities for the community would be.
- Sioux Falls: Yes - we didn't really have that follow-through piece put together that would have helped with some "after-action" items following the assessment.

Barriers and Challenges

Walk Audit Grant

Both pre- and post-2017 Walk Audit Grant communities were asked about barriers and challenges that affected their walk audit related progress. The question was asked about barriers and challenges specifically related to the COVID-19 pandemic and otherwise.

The two post-2017 communities indicated that there had not been any specific challenges due to the COVID-19 pandemic; one indicated that if anything, walking had increased during this time. Four of the six pre-2017 communities offered the following comments on the effects of COVID-19:

- Sioux Falls: COVID didn't create challenges to making changes - and it did provide an opportunity to provide more promotion around being active outdoors.

- Rapid City: We struggled to hire/retain staff during the pandemic, so all resources were allocated to day-to-day operations.
- Burke: The structured "Burke Walks" walking program ended due to Covid. Post Covid, I'm observing increased individuals walking throughout the day in small groups outdoors and individually inside the public Burke Civic Center gym.
- Lake Andes: The amount of tax taken in by the city which is the funding source for many improvements to the city including sidewalks did take a hit during the pandemic. I felt that more people did get out and walk, just because that was a safe activity.

Outside of the COVID-19 pandemic, the post-2017 communities made the following comments:

- Hermosa: the length of time to implement and fund any changes, naturally, the slow progress is not a motivational tool.
- Viborg: Raising the matching funds.

Five of the six pre-2017 communities had the following comments regarding barriers other than the COVID-19 pandemic:

- Sioux Falls: Specific to the walk audit we did, there are many different players involved in implementing changes - from Downtown Sioux Falls, the individual businesses and residents downtown, and the City - both elected officials and city departments. So, there are challenges to get all of those entities to agree on what changes could/should be made and then how to fund those and plan them out (both dollars and length of time tend to be frustrations).
- Rapid City: Coordination between departments, lack of funding, lack of staffing.
- Pierre: Lack of funding available.
- Burke: Keeping the team and community motivated has been very challenging. City government continues to be slow to change policy, and in general, there is the perception that our small, rural community has safe streets just as they are.
- Lake Andes: The 500 year flood which did a lot of damage to our walking path from the YST [Yankton Sioux Tribe] housing unit outside of town, and also the flooding of the Lake which kept many roads into town underwater.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

Both pre- and post-2017 SDSU communities were asked about barriers and challenges that affected their walk audit related progress. The question was asked about barriers and challenges specifically related to the COVID-19 pandemic and otherwise.

Four of the six post-2017 communities offered the following comments on the effects of COVID-19, three of which indicate that it either increased interest in walking or did not affect community walking:

- Getting people together. We still have issues with the dog population.
- I notice a lot more people interested in walking and the outdoors since Covid.
- Relative non-factor in the area of walking, in my view.
- COVID didn't really create challenges - and it did present opportunities to do more promotion around getting outdoors to be active.

The three pre-2017 communities indicated that they were not aware of any challenges the outcomes of the assessments.

Outside of the COVID-19 pandemic, four of the post-2017 communities made the following comments:

- Wanblee: All of the above [getting appropriate people and departments on board, the length of time to implement policy changes, lack of funding to implement changes, keeping the team motivated, etc.]
- Burke: Getting the right people the right knowledge and on board and lack of funding. This is often also about how it saves infrastructure or salary money longterm.
- Mission: Funding is a challenge. The current Mission city council has a good desire to enhance the city park and city pool, along with town improvements - working now to secure grant funding.
- Sioux Falls: Funding is always a challenge - whether that is successfully advocating for city funding or for having dedicated people that can look for outside funding sources.

The three pre-2017 communities had the following comments regarding barriers other than the COVID-19 pandemic:

- Crooks: Establishing a long-term plan and securing the funding for the projects; developing closer relationships with stakeholders; maintaining interest in pursue more walkability.
- Volga: Challenges for changes in transportation mainly come down to funding and limited budgets.
- Salem: Long-term challenges are typically revolve around dollars available.

Technical Assistance

Walk Audit Grant

All communities were asked about the quality of technical assistance. When asked about how the assistance could be improved, the two post-2017 communities did not have specific suggestions (although Hermosa indicated that the most difficult part of the project was convincing the town engineer to do some pro-bono work as the funds were not enough to pay engineering costs).

The pre-2017 communities provided the following comments:

- Sioux Falls: The program works well - from an application process that is easy to understand, to the valuable technical assistance that is available after receiving a grant
- Rapid City: Assistance with funding opportunities and grant programs.
- Burke: I don't know that the walk audit grant process can be improved. Beth Davis did a fantastic job providing support in numerous ways. Variables such as Burke's 2019 tornado and 2020-2021 Covid slowed motivation for active transportation in the community. Groups like the Burke Wellness Coalition continue to meet to discuss and plan methods for improving active transportation in the Burke community.
- Keystone: Updates when finance officers retire. So new finance officers have some idea of what is going on.

- Lake Andes: I am not sure if there had been other grant surveys, but maybe not waiting 5 years for a survey on completed work to be completed. If someone in the grant process leaves the job where is grant was instituted a replacement be found immediately, so work can continue.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration

All communities were asked about the quality of technical assistance. When asked about how the assistance could be improved, the five of the six post-2017 communities had the following comments:

- Wanblee: The group can assist our group in moving forward. We need assistance with the planning, development, and implementation of the assessment plan.
- Burke: It's difficult to remember now. I enjoyed the experience. I think the tiered goals would have been helpful, as well as access to sample planning docs for rural communities.
- Mission: Maybe follow up with help for funding? If possible.
- Tripp: Facilitating a meeting of the stakeholders to put in place an implementation plan or long term strategy would be helpful.
- Sioux Falls: I think the process works well. I do think the students do a good job trying to present realistic recommendations given the short time they have for the program - just continue to have them present a range of recommendations (from no cost on up) as well as resources they may be aware of that can help with funding, etc.

The three pre-2017 communities provided the following comments:

- Crooks: N/A; never actively participated in the assessment was done by previous mayor/officials.
- Volga: Connect funding resources to the city.
- Salem: I believe if there are any pertinent changes or new information on funding or other aspects of new studies it would be great to receive some of those findings - even if through a newsletter we could place with our plan.

Recommendations

The following are recommendations for the future of the programs:

- 1) SD DOH should continue to provide technical assistance at the current level to all previous program participants
- 2) Pathways for communication across program participants, both previous and current, should be created and emphasized
- 3) SD DOH should continue to provide participants with connections to potential sources of funding (e.g., grants)
- 4) Weather in South Dakota winters can be unpredictable and cause delays for walk audits; communities should plan for one or more backup dates wherever possible, while also acknowledging there are benefits to seasonal audits
- 5) Stakeholder coalitions should include or collaborate with both decision makers (e.g., elected officials) and people who can implement changes (e.g., engineers), along with people who represent the general needs and interests of the communities

- 6) Walk Audit Grant communities would benefit from more guidance with respect to the process of the walk audit (e.g., examples of walk audit forms, data extraction from walk audit, greater discussion of the process of a walk audit)—this may be connected to recommendation 2
- 7) The majority of communities indicated interest in learning more about developing Complete Streets policies, which could be integrated into the technical assistance provided by SD DOH
- 8) Beth Davis/SD DOH should maintain regular communication with the communities to ensure that a community contact is always available and aware of the work that has been done for walkability and active transportation

Final Considerations and Next Steps

SD DOH continues to provide follow-up and ongoing technical assistance to all 22 communities who have participated in either program under the South Dakota Walkable Communities Technical Assistance Program - the Walk Audit Grant Program or the SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration. While the Walk Audit Grant Program has now been phased out, as funds allow, the SD DOH will continue to add new communities to the SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration. Whereas each community is at different stages of consideration and implementation of healthy community design principles that best fit their community, technical assistance and encouragement on the development of a Complete Streets policy for each community remains a priority.

A highlight of the South Dakota Walkable Communities Technical Assistance Program has been the community engagement that occurs in each community throughout this process, and the relationships that develop when having conversations around creating more walkable, socially connected, and vibrant communities. Most if not all residents can support and advocate for walkable communities and the benefits thereof, regardless of what sector or agenda each individual brings to the conversation.

Acknowledgments

The SD DOH wishes to thank all of the community contacts who not only completed this survey, but participated in the programs identified. Also, thank you to all of the stakeholders within each community who came together with a vision and continue to discuss improvements to walkability. A special thank you to Professor Donald Burger at SDSU and students for the work completed in each of the Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Communities. Finally, thank you to Spectrum Health Policy Research for compiling, analyzing, and producing the *2022 South Dakota Walkable Communities Technical Assistance Program Study Evaluation*.

For More Information/Programmatic Contact

For more information, please contact Beth Davis:

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

Appendix

Walk Audit Grant Program Survey – Post-2017 Communities

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey
Your Contact Information
What is your first and last name?
<input type="text"/>
What community are you representing?
<input type="text"/>

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey
Walk Audit Outcomes
Question 1. After the completion of your community walk audit, did you compile a formal or informal set of findings and/or recommendations?
<input type="radio"/> Yes
<input type="radio"/> No
Question 1a. If you answered yes to Question 1, did you find it easy or difficult to interpret your walk audit findings using your selected checklist?
<input type="radio"/> Easy
<input type="radio"/> Difficult
Question 1b. If you answered yes to Question 1, were the findings you gathered from the walk audit realistic to address? In other words, is it possible to follow through with any recommended changes?
<input type="radio"/> Yes
<input type="radio"/> No
Question 1c. If you indicated in Question 1b that the findings were not realistic to address, which recommendations were not realistic and why? Reasons may include lack of expertise to implement, lack of government support, lack of funding, lack of time, changes not viewed as necessary, difficulty prioritizing projects, etc.
<input type="text"/>

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey

Multi-Disciplinary Team

Question 1. Was the multi-sector coalition of community stakeholders established for the project useful for completion of the audit and/or following up on recommendations from the audit?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Question 1a. What is the primary reason for your answer to the previous question?

Question 1b. What expertise did your team lack (for example: engineering, planning, elected official, etc.)?

Question 1c. Did you conduct any type of training for your team (for example: walk audit facilitator training)?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Question 1d. If yes to the previous question, were the training tools provided by the South Dakota Department of Health (SDDOH) helpful?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Question 2. Do you feel that the team's knowledge, attitudes, and abilities with respect to community walkability have improved as a result of this grant?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Question 2a. If yes to the previous question, in what ways?

Question 3. Will the team remain in place in the future?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Question 3a. If yes to the previous question, do you believe it will continue to be useful and how? If not, why not?

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey

Funding

Question 1. Has the walk audit helped (or do you believe it will help) your community to obtain dedicated city funding to address concerns and recommendations made in that assessment?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Question 1a. If yes to the previous question, what is the funding meant to address, and is the amount adequate?

Question 2. Has the walk audit helped (or do you believe it will help) your community to obtain funding from a source **other** than the city?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Question 2a. If yes to the previous question, what is the funding meant to address, and is the amount adequate?

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey

Other Support

Question 1. Aside from funding, what kind of support has been given (or promised) to the walk audit and follow-up by elected officials and others who can help to make an impact on the community?

Question 2. Who do you believe are the primary supporters necessary to implement any recommended changes (completed, in progress, or planned)?

Question 3. Relative to your needs, how useful have communication, new resources, and support from Beth Davis and the South Dakota Department of Health (SDDOH) been for completing and following up on the walk audit grant?

- ☐ Too little assistance
- ☐ The right amount of assistance
- ☐ Too much assistance

Question 3a. Specifically, what aspects of this support have been helpful? What aspects have not been helpful?

Question 3b. Has this grant provided other learning opportunities for you around healthy community design principles that you would not have had?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey

Communication with the Community

Question 1. Has the team conducted an educational event focused on walkability for the community?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 1a. If yes to the previous question, briefly describe the event, and if it has already taken place, whether you feel it was successful or not (and why)?

Question 2. Have the findings of the walk audit been communicated to the community?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 3. What methods were used/will be used to communicate information to the community?

- ☐ Press releases
- ☐ Newsletter articles
- ☐ Social media
- ☐ Official community websites
- ☐ Other

Question 4. Has a community survey been conducted?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No but we plan to

Question 5. In what other ways, if any, has the community been encouraged (or will they be encouraged) to contribute their voices?

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey

Ultimate Impact on Active Transportation

To determine what changes have been made in your community based on your walk audit findings and recommendations, please indicate whether or not you have made changes by selecting "Yes," "No," or "Not yet but we plan to" in response to each of the categories below. You do not need to indicate specific changes within each category.

Question 1. **Pedestrian Safety:** safer crosswalks and intersections, sidewalks, curb enhancements, reduced speed zones, pedestrian signals, Safe Routes to School strategies, school siting discussions that encourage active transportation

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 2. **Policy/City Ordinances:** sidewalk and landscaping, mixed-use zoning, complete streets

policy discussion, street design policy

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 3. **Collaboration on Planning:** incorporation of assessment/audits into city master plan, collaboration with Public Works & Department of Transportation, land-use planning, collaboration with land developers

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 6. **Bike Facilities:** bike racks, dedicated bike lanes, bike boulevards, education for drivers and cyclists, bike rodeos for youth

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 8. **Public Transit:** safe access to public transit by foot or bike

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 10. **Other Changes**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

If yes, please specify:

Most cities have a "city wide master plan" that supports walkability principles. This plan may have different names in different communities, including "pedestrian plan," "master plan," "walkability plan," "bike safety plan," etc.

Question 11. Have changes been made to this plan in your community, as a result of this grant?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet
- ☐ I am not aware of this plan

A "Complete Streets" policy formalizes a community's intent to plan, design, and maintain streets so they are safe for users of all ages and abilities. This policy directs transportation designers and engineers to consistently design and construct the right-of-way to accommodate all anticipated users including pedestrians, bicyclists, public transportation users, motorists, and freight vehicles.

Question 12. Does your community currently have a "Complete Streets" or similar policy?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I am not sure

Question 12a. If yes to the previous question, were changes made to this policy based on the results of the walk audit?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet

Question 12b. If no to Question 12, would you be interested in learning more and possibly creating a Complete Streets policy for your community based on the results of your current work?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Question 13. Have you utilized any form of traffic counting tools to measure pedestrian activity?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Question 13a. If yes to the previous question, please describe what type and how you have used these tools?

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey

Continuing Support

Question 1. What follow-up would you like to have in order to continue to improve the walkability of your community?

Question 2. Would a future plan of action characterizing short, mid, and long-term goals have been helpful as you completed your walk audit?

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey

Barriers and Challenges Experienced

Question 1: Did the COVID-19 pandemic pose any challenges to making changes based on the walk audit, and if so, in what way or how? Were there any ways in which the pandemic sparked new opportunities to promote walking outdoors and overall health?

Question 2: Other than the COVID-19 pandemic, what were (or do you anticipate will be) the biggest challenges experienced with respect to making changes based on the walk audit? Examples might include getting appropriate people and departments on board, the length of time to implement policy changes, lack of funding to implement changes, keeping the team motivated, etc.

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey

Improvements

Question 1. How could the assistance offered by the SDDOH Community Walk Audit Grant Program be improved? Consider the entire process of the grant project.

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey

End of Survey

Please click DONE! You have completed this survey! Thank you for your participation. Your responses are greatly appreciated and will help to improve the quality and delivery of our programs to improve the health of South Dakotans.

Walk Audit Grant Program Survey – Pre-2017 Communities (Long-Term Survey)

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey 2

Please respond to all items in this survey with regard to the time period *since 2017*.

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey 2

Your Contact Information

Please respond to all items in this survey with regard to the time period *since 2017*.

What is your first and last name?

What community are you representing?

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey 2

Funding

Question 1. Did the walk audit help your community to obtain dedicated city funding to address concerns and recommendations made in that assessment?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Question 1a. If yes to the previous question, what was the funding meant to address, and was the amount adequate?

Question 2. Did the walk audit help your community to obtain funding from a source **other** than the city? (yes/no)

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Question 2a. If yes to the previous question, what was the funding meant to address, and was the amount adequate?

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey 2

Other Support

Question 1. Aside from funding, what kind of long-term support has been given to the walk audit and follow-up by elected officials and others who can help to make an impact on the community?

Question 4. Relative to your needs, how useful have communication, new resources, and support from Beth Davis and the South Dakota Department of Health (SDDOH) been to the long-term outcomes of the walk audit grant?

- ☐ Too little assistance
- ☐ The right amount of assistance
- ☐ Too much assistance

Question 4a. Specifically, what aspects of this support have been helpful for long-term success? What aspects have not been helpful?

Question 4b. Have you pursued any additional efforts toward health community design principles that you would not have, if you had not participated in the Community Walk Audit Grant?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Question 4c. If you answered yes to the previous question, please describe these efforts.

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey 2

Ultimate Impact on Active Transportation

To determine what changes have been made in your community based on your walk audit findings and recommendations, please indicate whether or not you have made changes by selecting "Yes," "No," or "Not yet but we plan to" in response to each of the categories below. You do not need to indicate specific changes within each category.

Question 1. **Pedestrian Safety:** safer crosswalks and intersections, sidewalks, curb enhancements, reduced speed zones, pedestrian signals, Safe Routes to School strategies, school siting discussions that encourage active transportation

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 3. **Collaboration on Planning:** incorporation of assessment/audits into city master plan, collaboration with Public Works & Department of Transportation, land-use planning, collaboration with land developers

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 6. **Bike Facilities:** bike racks, dedicated bike lanes, bike boulevards, education for drivers and cyclists, bike rodeos for youth

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 8. **Public Transit:** safe access to public transit by foot or bike

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 10. **Other Changes**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

If yes, please specify:

Question 11. As a result of the walk audit grant, has your community formalized a 'walkability plan' or something similar to address ongoing work and improvements in this area?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ It is still in progress

Barriers and Challenges Experienced

Question 1: Did the COVID-19 pandemic pose any challenges to making changes based on the walk audit, and if so, in what way or how? Were there any ways in which the pandemic sparked new opportunities to promote walking outdoors and overall health?

Question 2: Other than the COVID-19 pandemic, what were the biggest long-term challenges experienced with respect to making changes based on the walk audit? Examples might include getting appropriate people and departments on board, the length of time to implement policy changes, lack of funding to implement changes, keeping the team motivated, etc.

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey 2

Improvements

Question 1. How could the long-term assistance offered by the Community Walk Audit Grant be improved?

Community Walk Audit Grant Survey 2

End of Survey

Please click DONE! You have completed this survey! Thank you for your participation. Your responses are greatly appreciated and will help to improve the quality and delivery of our programs to improve the health of South Dakotans.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey – Post-2017 Communities

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

Your Contact Information

What is your first and last name?

What community are you representing?

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

Active Transportation Recommendations

Question 1. Were the recommendations made by the SDSU student team following the active transportation assessment realistic? In other words, is it possible to follow through with any recommended changes?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Question 1a. If not, which recommendations were not realistic, and why? Reasons may include lack of expertise to implement, lack of government support, lack of funding, lack of time, changes not viewed as necessary, difficulty prioritizing projects, etc.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

Multi-Disciplinary Team

Question 1. Was the multi-sector coalition of community stakeholders established for the project useful for completion of the assessment and/or following up on recommendations from the assessment?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Question 1a. What is the primary reason for your answer to the previous question?

Question 1b. What expertise did your team lack (for example: engineering, planning, elected official, etc.)?

Question 2. Do you feel that the team's knowledge, attitudes, and abilities with respect to active transportation have improved as a result of this assessment?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Question 2a. If yes to the previous question, in what ways?

Question 3. Will the team remain in place in the future?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Question 3a. If yes to the previous question, do you believe it will continue to be useful and how? If not, why not?

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

Funding

Question 1. Has the active transportation assessment helped (or do you believe it will help) your community to obtain dedicated city funding to address concerns and recommendations made in that assessment?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Question 1a. If yes to the previous question, what is the funding meant to address, and is the amount adequate?

Question 2. Has the active transportation assessment helped (or do you believe it will help) your community to obtain funding from a source **other** than the city?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Question 2a. If yes to the previous question, what is the funding meant to address, and is the amount adequate?

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

Other Support

Question 1. Aside from funding, what kind of support has been given (or promised) to the active transportation assessment and follow-up by elected officials and others who can help to make an impact on the community?

Question 2. Who do you believe are the primary supporters necessary to implement any recommended changes (completed, in progress, or planned)?

Question 3. Was the technical assistance, support, oversight, and follow-up provided by SDSU Professor Donald Burger useful and adequate for the collaboration?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Question 4. Relative to your needs, how useful have communication, new resources, and support from Beth Davis and the South Dakota Department of Health (SDDOH) been for completing and following up on the active transportation assessment?

- ☐ Too little assistance
- ☐ The right amount of assistance
- ☐ Too much assistance

Question 4a. Specifically, what aspects of this support have been helpful? What aspects have not been helpful?

Question 4b. Has this assessment collaboration provided other learning opportunities for you around healthy community design principles that you would not have had?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

Communication with the Community

Question 1. Has your stakeholder team conducted an active transportation educational event for the community?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 1a. If yes to the previous question, briefly describe the event, and if it has already taken place, whether you feel it was successful or not (and why)?

Question 2. Have the findings of the active transportation assessment been communicated to the community?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 3. What methods were used/will be used to communicate information to the community?

- ☐ Press releases
- ☐ Newsletter articles
- ☐ Social media
- ☐ Official community websites
- ☐ Other

Question 4. Has a community survey been conducted?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No but we plan to

Question 5. In what other ways, if any, has the community been encouraged (or will they be encouraged) to contribute their voices?

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

Ultimate Impact on Active Transportation

To determine what changes have been made in your community based on your active transportation assessment findings and recommendations, please indicate whether or not you have made changes by selecting "Yes," "No," or "Not yet but we plan to" in response to each of the categories below. You do not need to indicate specific changes within each category.

Question 1. **Pedestrian Safety:** safer crosswalks and intersections, sidewalks, curb enhancements, reduced speed zones, pedestrian signals, Safe Routes to School strategies, school siting discussions that encourage active transportation

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 2. **Policy/City Ordinances:** sidewalk and landscaping, mixed-use zoning, complete streets

policy discussion, street design policy

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 3. **Collaboration on Planning:** incorporation of assessment/audits into city master plan, collaboration with Public Works & Department of Transportation, land-use planning, collaboration with land developers

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 6. **Bike Facilities:** bike racks, dedicated bike lanes, bike boulevards, education for drivers and cyclists, bike rodeos for youth

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 8. **Public Transit:** safe access to public transit by foot or bike

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 10. **Other Changes**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

If yes, please specify:

Most cities have a "city wide master plan" that supports active transportation principles. This plan may have different names in different communities, including "pedestrian plan", "master plan", "walkability plan", "bike safety plan", etc.

Question 11. Have changes been made to this plan in your community, as a result of this collaboration?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet
- ☐ I am not aware of this plan

A "Complete Streets" policy formalizes a community's intent to plan, design, and maintain streets so they are safe for users of all ages and abilities. This policy directs transportation designers and engineers to consistently design and construct the right-of-way to accommodate all anticipated users including pedestrians, bicyclists, public transportation users, motorists, and freight vehicles.

Question 12. Does your community currently have a "Complete Streets" or similar policy?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I am not sure

Question 12a. If yes to the previous question, were changes made to this policy based on the results of the active transportation assessment?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not yet

Question 12b. If no to Question 12, would you be interested in learning more and possibly creating a Complete Streets policy for your community based on the results of your current work?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Question 13. Have you utilized any form of traffic counting tools to measure pedestrian activity?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

Question 13a. If yes to the previous question, please describe what type and how you have used these tools?

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

Continuing Support

Question 1. What follow-up would you like to have in order to continue to improve active transportation in your community?

Question 2. Would a future plan of action characterizing short, mid, and long-term goals have been helpful as you completed your active transportation assessment?

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

Barriers and Challenges Experienced

Question 1: Did the COVID-19 pandemic pose any challenges to making changes based on the active transportation assessment, and if so, in what way or how? Were there any ways in which the pandemic sparked new opportunities to promote walking outdoors and overall health?

Question 2: Other than the COVID-19 pandemic, what were (or do you anticipate will be) the biggest challenges experienced with respect to making changes based on the active transportation assessment? Examples might include getting appropriate people and departments on board, the length of time to implement policy changes, lack of funding to implement changes, keeping the team motivated, etc.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

Improvements

Question 1. How could the assistance offered by the Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration (SDDOH, SDSU Student Team, SDSU Professor) be improved? Consider the entire process of the active transportation assessment.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey

End of Survey

Please click DONE! You have completed this survey! Thank you for your participation. Your responses are greatly appreciated and will help to improve the quality and delivery of our programs to improve the health of South Dakotans.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey – Pre-2017 Communities (Long-Term Survey)

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey 2

Please respond to all items in this survey with regard to the time period *since 2017*.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey 2

Your Contact Information

What is your first and last name?

What community are you representing?

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey 2

Funding

Question 1. Did the active transportation assessment help your community to obtain dedicated city funding to address concerns and recommendations made in that assessment?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Question 1a. If yes to the previous question, what was the funding meant to address, and was the amount adequate?

Question 2. Did the active transportation assessment help your community to obtain funding from a source **other** than the city? (yes/no)

☐ Yes

☐ No

Question 2a. If yes to the previous question, what was the funding meant to address, and was the amount adequate?

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey 2

Other Support

Question 1. Aside from funding, what kind of long-term support has been given to the active transportation assessment and follow-up by elected officials and others who can help to make an impact on the community?

Question 4. Relative to your needs, how useful have communication, new resources, and support from Beth Davis and the South Dakota Department of Health (SDDOH) been to the long-term outcomes of the active transportation assessment?

- ☐ Too little assistance
- ☐ The right amount of assistance
- ☐ Too much assistance

Question 4a. Specifically, what aspects of this support have been helpful for long-term success? What aspects have not been helpful?

Question 4b. Have you pursued any additional efforts toward health community design principles that you would not have, if you had not participated in the Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Question 4c. If you answered yes to the previous question, please describe these efforts.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey 2

Ultimate Impact on Active Transportation

To determine what changes have been made in your community based on your active transportation assessment findings and recommendations, please indicate whether or not you have made changes by selecting "Yes," "No," or "Not yet but we plan to" in response to each of the categories below. You do not need to indicate specific changes within each category.

Question 1. **Pedestrian Safety:** safer crosswalks and intersections, sidewalks, curb enhancements, reduced speed zones, pedestrian signals, Safe Routes to School strategies, school siting discussions that encourage active transportation

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 3. **Collaboration on Planning:** incorporation of assessment/audits into city master plan, collaboration with Public Works & Department of Transportation, land-use planning, collaboration with land developers

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 6. **Bike Facilities:** bike racks, dedicated bike lanes, bike boulevards, education for drivers and cyclists, bike rodeos for youth

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 8. **Public Transit:** safe access to public transit by foot or bike

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

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

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

Question 10. **Other Changes**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not yet but we plan to

If yes, please specify:

Question 11. As a result of the active transportation assessment collaboration, has your community formalized a 'walkability plan' or something similar to address ongoing work and improvements in this area?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ It is still in progress

Barriers and Challenges Experienced

Question 1: Did the COVID-19 pandemic pose any challenges to making changes based on the active transportation assessment, and if so, in what way or how? Were there any ways in which the pandemic sparked new opportunities to promote walking outdoors and overall health?

Question 2: Other than the COVID-19 pandemic, what were the biggest long-term challenges experienced with respect to making changes based on the active transportation assessment? Examples might include getting appropriate people and departments on board, the length of time to implement policy changes, lack of funding to implement changes, keeping the team motivated, etc.

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey 2

Improvements

Question 1. How could the long-term assistance offered by the Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration (SDDOH, SDSU Student Team, SDSU Professor) be improved?

SDSU Active Transportation Assessment Collaboration Survey 2

End of Survey

Please click DONE! You have completed this survey! Thank you for your participation. Your responses are greatly appreciated and will help to improve the quality and delivery of our programs to improve the health of South Dakotans.

Community Walk Audit Grant Program South Dakota Department of Health

From 2014-2019, the South Dakota Department of Health (SDDOH) provided funding and technical assistance to SD communities interested in healthy community design policy, systems and environmental strategies that improve walkability for all residents. The primary community expectations of this one-year grant cycle program were to convene a multi-disciplinary team of community leaders, conduct a local walkability/walk audit training event, and complete a walk audit. Following the walk audit, leaders were encouraged to develop actionable strategies.

Walk audits are an easy, doable assessment that communities can utilize as an education and advocacy tool to spark both short and long term policy planning efforts. Walk audit assessment data can position communities for larger grant opportunities, launching complete street policy efforts that enhance the built environment and improve walkability. Enhancing walkability increases the number of individuals walking for recreation, exercise, and/or transportation leading to the reduction of chronic disease risk and burden.

Communities selected convened a multi-sector coalition of stakeholders. Representation included Elected Officials, Community/Civic Leaders, Tribal Entities, Wellness, Public Works, Zoning, Planning, Transportation, Engineering, Parks and Recreation, Transit Authority, Walking/Bicycling Advocacy, Schools, Historical Preservation, Local Business, Economic Development, Social Services, Tourism, Older Adults, Youth, Childcare, Healthcare, People Differently Abled, Law Enforcement, Main Street/Downtown Associations, and other residents.

Potential action items resulting from community walk audits included, but were not limited to:

Short Term – Small Street-Scale Built Environment Enhancements, Expanded Assessments, Mayoral Directives to Improve Walkability, Healthy Community Design Resolution, Planning for Model Ordinances that support walkability, Positioning for Larger Funding Opportunities, Safe Routes to Schools, Pop-Up Projects, Bike Events

Long Term – Integration into City Master Planning, Development of City-Wide Walkability Plan, Adoption of Model Ordinances that support walkability, Complete Streets Policy Development and Adoption, Built Environment Infrastructure Investments

Hermosa, Viborg, Lake Andes, Keystone, Mobridge, Burke, Pierre, Rapid City, and Sioux Falls received funds for walk audits in their communities and are at varying stages of implementation of the goals set forth through their walk audit process. Communities were selected through a competitive application process, with an average grant award of \$5000.00. The SDDOH now partners with [Healthy Hometown Powered by Wellmark™](#) for walk audit community technical assistance as part of Wellmark's Eat Well, Move More, Feel Better Initiative.

For more information, contact:

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



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

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

Active transportation is the integration of physical activity into daily routines such as walking or biking to destinations like work, school, grocery stores, or parks. Creating activity-friendly routes to everyday destinations is an evidence-based strategy to increase physical activity, as are active transportation policies and practices in community design, land use, and facility access. Improving the built environment conducive to active transportation also improves community aesthetics, enhances the economy of a community, and improves overall community connectedness and quality of life.

Communities are selected through a competitive application process, available each January at www.healthysd.gov. No funds are awarded to communities, however, the end deliverable to each community is a comprehensive final report with designs, sketches, maps and recommendations. By engaging in the assessment process, communities can position themselves for larger funding opportunities to support short-term healthy community design enhancements, or long-term complete streets policy implementation and infrastructure investments.

Communities selected convene a multi-sector coalition of community stakeholders. Representation includes Elected Officials, Community/Civic Leaders, Tribal Entities, Wellness, Public Works, Zoning, Planning, Transportation, Engineering, Parks and Recreation, Transit Authority, Walking/Bicycling Advocacy, Schools, Historical Preservation, Local Business, Economic Development, Social Services, Tourism, Older Adults, Youth, Childcare, Healthcare, People Differently Abled, Law Enforcement, Main Street/Downtown Associations, and other residents.

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

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



Links to SDSU Community Reports

Huron	https://www.dropbox.com/s/8kyvbk6pxa28elf/HURON%20EXECUTIVE%20DOCUMENT.pdf?dl=0
Mitchell	https://www.dropbox.com/s/odwkvacw4iamryc/Final%20DocMitchell.pdf?dl=0
Salem	https://www.dropbox.com/s/082fol96fbmqtf/Salem%20Recommendations%20work%20logo.pdf?dl=0
Volga	https://www.dropbox.com/s/3gbvozrf4j2zmi0/Volga%20Executive%20Document.pdf?dl=0
Ft. Pierre	https://www.dropbox.com/s/ej6muz379qd7tls/Fort%20Pierre%20Executive%20Document.pdf?dl=0
Crooks	https://www.dropbox.com/s/94ndbh8bpht3wxj/Crooks%202017%20Executive%20Document.pdf?dl=0
Burke	https://www.dropbox.com/s/rq447wp2y5mybkw/Burke%20Executive%20Document%20Final.pdf?dl=0
Tripp	https://www.dropbox.com/s/im7hk4208kub44g/Tripp%20Executive%20Document%20Final.pdf?dl=0
Sioux Falls and Harrisburg	https://www.dropbox.com/s/cixadrt9653litm/Sioux%20Falls%20and%20Harrisburg%20Active%20Transportation%20Recommendations.pdf?dl=0
Sturgis	https://www.dropbox.com/s/p3k3an81u513b3v/Sturgis%20Active%20Transportation%20Recommendations.pdf?dl=0
Mission	https://www.dropbox.com/s/161mnzk95jbxko6/Mission%20Active%20Transportation%20Recommendations.pdf?dl=0
Wanblee	https://www.dropbox.com/s/w1st7rfssmyk2qz/Wanblee%20Active%20Transportation%20Recommendations%20%281%29.pdf?dl=0