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When effectively integrated with transit services, considerable room exists for bicycling to realize various environmental, health, and congestion-mitigation benefits to communities. A core problem, however, exists in that the predominant approach for integrating bicycles and transit—bicycles aboard transit vehicles—frequently runs up against capacity restraints. Given a variety of urban form contexts, what are the most cost effective strategies likely to generate the largest number of cyclists accessing transit?

Study Method
This study developed a framework to evaluate the cost effectiveness of different strategies used to integrate bicycling and transit. The authors: (1) reviewed the state of the knowledge, giving special attention to identifying transit types and locations that have the highest potential to generate cycle–transit users (CTUs), (2) conducted focus groups with cyclists from five case study communities to gauge preferences for bicycle and transit integration strategies, (3) evaluated bicycle and transit integration strategies based on focus group responses using Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), and (4) employed analysis framework for to arrive at cost-effective solutions for integrating bicycling and transit.

Findings
This project provides a baseline understanding of the effectiveness of different bicycle and transit integration strategies and a preliminary approach to identify transit stops on specific routes more likely to generate CTUs. The AHP, a multicriteria, decision-making tool ranked cyclists’ preferences for the four bicycle and transit integration strategies in order of preference: (1) “Bike ON transit”, (2) “Bike TO transit”, (3) “Shared bike”, and (4) “Two bike”. Results of the cost effectiveness assessment suggests that “Bike TO transit” ranked most cost effective overall, followed by “Bike ON transit,” “Two bike,” and “Shared bike” strategies.

Policy Recommendations
The cost effectiveness measure provides enhanced understanding on how to increase understanding for the three strategies. Much of the concern about the lesser preferred options:
(1) “Bike TO transit,” (2) “Shared bike,” and (3) “Two bike” strategies center on security issues. Security ranked highest of the four factors (cost to user, flexibility, guarantee, and security) comprising cyclists' preferences for each integration strategy. Minor adjustments in terms of security could address the current challenge of “Bike ON transit” capacity limitations and make the less cost effective strategies comparable to “Bike ON transit.”

This research revealed several examples of secure bicycle parking efforts near transit services. Chicago has built bicycle parking inside transit stations and several communities have integrated bicycle lockers as part of their bicycle parking. Boulder County is developing bicycle corrals at transit access and egress points in an attempt to increase transit ridership and reduce congestion on a state highway. New approaches such as these may help to overcome the apparent challenges of security that plague the three less preferred strategies and help to increase bicycle and transit integration.
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