# Workshop – Module 3: Collection of data for active modes

## Breakout group scenarios

### Scenario A – walking

A medium-sized Baltic Sea Region city (approx. 180,000 residents) has a compact city centre and several large housing districts dating back 50 years. Many everyday destinations such as schools, grocery stores, and bus stops are within walking distance, yet walking rates have stagnated. Some of the barriers include wide roads with long pedestrian crossings, uneven or poorly maintained sidewalks (especially in winter), and concerns about safety and lighting in certain areas. The municipality wants to increase everyday walking, especially for short trips (under 1.5 km), but lacks detailed data about pedestrian flows, user experience, and where interventions would have the greatest impact.

### Scenario B – cycling

A medium-sized Baltic Sea Region city (approx. 180,000 residents) has started investing in cycling infrastructure over the past decade, adding several separated cycle lanes and recreational paths. However, cycling remains highly seasonal and commuter cycling rates are still relatively low. Some of the barriers include fragmented cycling networks, unsafe intersections, limited winter maintenance, and a lack of secure bicycle parking near key destinations. The municipality wants to increase everyday cycling for commuting and short urban trips but needs better data to prioritise infrastructure improvements and encourage more residents to cycle year-round.

## Topics

1. **Identify a clear objective**

"What is ONE objective that would improve walking/cycling in this city scenario?" (1 answer)

**Walking scenario**
- Improve pedestrian safety at major road crossings in residential districts
- Reduce barriers for short walking trips by improving sidewalk quality and winter maintenance
- Increase walking trips to schools within 1 km of residential areas
- Improve lighting and perceived safety along key pedestrian routes
- Reduce pedestrian waiting times at major crossings
- Increase walking for short trips (under 1.5 km) between housing districts and local services
- Other: …

**Cycling scenario**
- Improve safety at key cycling intersections along commuter routes
- Increase year-round cycling by improving winter maintenance of main cycle routes

- Close gaps in the cycling network between residential districts and the city centre
- Increase commuter cycling from outer districts to the city centre
- Improve bicycle parking availability at public transport hubs and workplaces
- Increase cycling for short urban trips under 3 km
- Other: …

Feel free to add some objectives, considering your experiences. Let's choose one objective we'll keep working on.

## 2. Choose an activity

"What activity, intervention or pilot could help achieve this objective?"
Propose one concrete activity or pilot to keep working on.

## 3. Identify information needs

"What do you need to know to design or evaluate this activity?"
Think about what information or evidence is missing. Propose some questions that need to be answered. You can also rely on experience from your city.

## 4. Identify types of data

"What types of data would help answer these questions?"
Cities often combine different types of data. Which types would be useful for your activity? Let's choose the most suitable type of data in 3 categories – quantitative data, qualitative data and street environment observations.

**I Quantitative data (measuring volumes or patterns – how many, how often?)**
- Pedestrian or cyclist counts
- Travel behaviour surveys
- GPS / mobile movement data
- Bicycle parking occupancy counts
- Public transport ridership data
- Other: specify

**II Qualitative data (understanding experiences and perceptions – how do people feel, why?)**
- User surveys or questionnaires
- Intercept interviews with pedestrians or cyclists
- Focus groups or workshops

- Participatory mapping of barriers or routes
- Other: specify

**III Street environment observations (assessing infrastructure or behaviour – what's happening on the street?)**
- Street / infrastructure audits (sidewalks, crossings, cycle lanes)
- Lighting or accessibility assessments
- Traffic conflict observations
- Intersection safety observations
- Other: specify

### 5. Build a data collection package

We now have a combination of three data types to support our activity (one quantitative method, one qualitative method, one method observing the street environment).

"Does this combination make sense? What adjustments should be made to serve the purposes of the chosen pilot better? Should we replace or add anything? Have we involved citizens enough in data collection to improve accuracy and foster community engagement? How often data should be collected with each of these methods considering the whole data collection package?"

### 6. Reflection question

"Where and how can this combination of data be used?"
Rank from the highest to the lowest value.
- Infrastructure planning -> priority locations, network gaps, safety improvements
- Pilot evaluation -> expand or modify pilots
- Operations -> winter maintenance, parking provision
- Policy and behaviour -> campaigns, funding justification, SUMP improvement
- Communication -> explaining the need of changes in the current situation
- Other: specify

What data and how should be collected to make other decisions? What may be limitations of collected data to use in these decisions? How to communicate/ present the data to different audiences – decision-makers, stakeholders, and the public—to ensure transparency and impact of decisions?

**Group work template**

| Scenario A/B | A walking/ B cycling (underline correct one) | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Objective:** | | | |
| **Pilot/ activity:** | | | |
| **Questions:** | 1.<br>2.<br>3. | | |
| **Types of data:** | **Quantitative** | **Qualitative** | **Street environment observation** |
| | 1. | 2. | 3. |
| **Decision support:** | 1.<br>2.<br>3.<br><br>Limitations of collected data to use in these decisions:<br><br><br>Communication/presentation of data to support decision making: | | |