



## FACT SHEET T-03 – OPTIONS FOR FINANCING MEASURES FOR CYCLING

### Introduction

Research has shown that investments in bicycle transport are promising in terms of cost-ratio aspects: “Paths and parking facilities for bicycles are far less expensive than for cars. Furthermore, increased cycle use helps minimise the consequential costs of traffic in areas such as environment, health, and land use” (Thiemann-Linden et al (2012)). A study from Austria compared infrastructure that can be implemented with a budget of 50.000€. The results are indicated in figure 1.

However, cycling promotion still needs a solid and sustainable financial background to improve local conditions. A cycling master plan as an important

part of the SUMP is recommended to define measures of high priority (more impact with less financial effort). This ensures efficient use of a city’s cycling budget and/or funds. Additionally, compliance with technical regulations and inclusion in a bicycle master plan increasingly is a requirement when demanding funding.

When deciding on measures to improve the cycling infrastructure, consideration of low-cost measures as a serious alternative to cost-intensive reconstruction measures is recommended. This could include, for example, turning a parking lane into a cycle lane and painting pictograms or cycle lanes.

This fact sheet includes information about different options for financing cy-

cling measures. All options should be seen as complementary tools.

### Dedicated cycling budget and general budget for transport

Promotion of cycling is mainly a task for municipalities. This includes the need to provide a budget at the local level to improve conditions for cycling. In German cities a budget often only exists for investments in infrastructure. This enables the cycling officer or cycling unit to realize small measures without much administrative effort. On the other hand it neglects that implementation of facilities independent of major roads and of soft measures can be much more cost-effective (e.g. reconstruction of one accident hot spot vs. campaign for more consideration and respect in traffic). Therefore it is recommended to open dedicated cycling budgets for the implementation of bicycle facilities independent of main streets and for soft measures.

Bigger infrastructure projects should generally be funded by the overall budget for investments in infrastructure, where cycling needs should be considered automatically in every infrastructure planning process.

It is recommended that the local cycling strategy determines a coherent target network and main cycling routes. Measures of the cycling strategy should be prioritized in implementation to ensure efficient use of available budget.

According to German experiences it

building 300 m of a cycle path	marking 6,5 km of a bike lane
signing 35 km of a cycle route network	establishing and designing 6-7 residential streets
purchasing 600 cycle stands	providing 50 covered cycle-parking spaces including lighting
establishing a pool of 50-100 rental bikes	offering 100 bicycle training sessions
organising 50 bicycle check days	hiring a cycling coordinator for 1,5 years

Figure 1: What can you do with 50.000€? - study results from Austria (source: Thiemann-Linden et al (2012))

More sustainable transport in Central European cities through improved integrated bicycle promotion and international networking

can be assumed that expenditure of cities for cycling issues range from 0,8€ to 8€ per inhabitant and year. This merely includes money for construction, maintenance and operation of cycling infrastructure. Only very few cities now also have a continuous budget for public relations for bicycle transport.

### External funding opportunities

Communities have the possibility to systematically apply for European and national funding. The opportunities for funding bicycle promotion are not limited to transport-related programmes. Since cycling is beneficial for the environment and for health, it can also be included in projects that consider sustainable development, climate change, energy or health issues.

In the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Poland there are possibilities for acquiring funds from the state, which can be (e.g. in Poland) connected with the requirement to develop a SUMP (Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan). Therefore, it is up to the communities, whether they can fit their measures into national or European requirements.

Alternative possibilities for acquiring funds are different approaches to internalise some external costs of car traffic. There are many examples how fees for car use and parking are used for cycling investments, as well as for public transportation.

Another source of financial resources is the engagement of private investors. This is especially useful for providing bicycle parking facilities near newly constructed public buildings such as a

shopping centre. Investors have to provide a certain amount of car parking facilities. Similar regulations should apply for bicycle parking, too.

### Low-cost measures

Integrating cycling infrastructure into existing road networks must not be expensive. Some measures with low costs in relation to their benefits can improve conditions for cycling and at the same time improve safety for all road users:

**Speed 30 zones:** Secondary roads often provide very good pre-conditions for cycling as there is little traffic. To improve road safety and the attractiveness of the environment the implementation of speed 30 zones is very valuable. In Dresden - and in most German cities - most streets of the secondary network have a speed limit of 30km/h. The network of main roads (intersection density approx. 500m) has a regular speed limit of 50km/h. More details on Speed 30 zones can be found in CMB fact sheet H-07 Traffic calming measures.



Figure 2: Speed 30 zone in Graz (Jan Schubert)

**Markings:** Advisory cycle lanes on single lane roads with limited lorry traffic and a sufficiently wide carriageway can be implemented without a lot of financial resources. Advisory cycle lanes

increase the visibility of cyclists. At the same time they help reduce vehicular speeds since the advisory cycle lanes leaves a smaller core lane for cars without a centre marking. Many cities in the Czech Republic started implementation of so-called pictogram corridors, which are similar to advisory lanes.



Figure 3: Pictogram corridor Pardubice (J. Schubert)

**Provide shortcuts for cyclists:** Opening pedestrian zones is controversially discussed in Germany. However, it easily provides good access to city centres for cyclists. The opening of one-way streets and dead-end streets enables cyclists to reach destinations without detours.

**Bicycle street:** On bicycle streets, bicycles have priority to cars, which are only allowed, when a special sign is installed. The initial implementation of bicycle streets requires little financial resources. Costs only arise through the installation of traffic signs.



Figure 4: Bicycle street in Leipzig (Tomas Cach)

**Lessons learned:** Money for transport has to be used as efficiently as possible. Cycling infrastructure usually is cheaper than infrastructure for car traffic. However, cycling infrastructure also needs continuous financial resources either from municipal budget or external funding. Cycling infrastructure can easily be developed by using low-cost measures such as markings or opening shortcuts for cyclists. Also secondary network can be converted into good cycling infrastructure without much money with traffic calming measures.

For further resources, links and best practice examples visit the Sustainable Urban Transport Project website: <http://www.sutp.org/>

Central MeetBike is implemented through the CENTRAL EUROPE Programme co-financed by the ERDF.

Contact: Jan Schubert / Dr. Frank Ließke (after September 2014)

Tel.: +49 351 463-390 44 / +49 351 465-366 68

Email: [jan.schubert1@tu-dresden.de](mailto:jan.schubert1@tu-dresden.de) /

[frank.liesske@tu-dresden.de](mailto:frank.liesske@tu-dresden.de)

Contributing authors: Prof. Dr.-Ing. Gerd-Axel Ahrens, Jan Schubert, Kevin Vincent

Photo: Jan Schubert

#### Sources / Further literature:

Bushwell, Max; Poole, Bryan; Zegeer, Charles; Rodriguez, Daniel: Costs for Pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure improvements - a resource for researchers, engineers, planners and the general public. UNC Highway Safety Research Center. Chapel Hill. 2013.

Deffner, Jutta; Ziel, Torben; Hefter, Thomas; Rudolph, Christian (eds.): "Handbook on Cycling Inclusive Planning and Promotion". Capacity development material for the multiplier training within the Mobil2020 project. Frankfurt/Hamburg. 2012.

Thiemann-Linden, Jörg; Mettenberger, Tobias, Wiechmann, Susanne (ed.): "Benefits and costs of cycling infrastructure". Cycling Expertise A-07. Berlin. German Institute of Urban Affairs (DIfU) GmbH. 2012.