

Washington University in St. Louis  
**Washington University Open Scholarship**

---

Brown School Faculty Publications

Brown School

---

8-2013

# Open streets initiatives in the U.S. : Closed to traffic, open to physical activity

Jill A. Kuhlberg

*Washington University in St. Louis, Brown School, JKuhlberg@WUSTL.EDU*

J. Aaron Hipp

*Washington University in St. Louis, Brown School, ahipp@wustl.edu*

Amy A. Eyler

*Washington University in St. Louis, Brown School, aeyley@wustl.edu*

Genevieve Cheng

*Washington University in St. Louis, Brown School*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/brown\\_facpubs](https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/brown_facpubs)



Part of the [Community Health Commons](#), [Community Health and Preventive Medicine Commons](#), and the [Public Health Education and Promotion Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Kuhlberg, Jill A.; Hipp, J. Aaron; Eyler, Amy A.; and Cheng, Genevieve, "Open streets initiatives in the U.S. : Closed to traffic, open to physical activity" (2013). *Brown School Faculty Publications*. 14.

[https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/brown\\_facpubs/14](https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/brown_facpubs/14)

This Journal Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Brown School at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Brown School Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact [digital@wumail.wustl.edu](mailto:digital@wumail.wustl.edu).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

Open Streets Initiatives in the U.S.: Closed to Traffic, Open to Physical Activity

Kuhlberg, J.A., Hipp, J.A., Eyler, A.E., and Cheng, G.

Corresponding Author Copy:  
Kuhlberg, J.A., Hipp, J.A., Eyler, A.E., and Cheng, G. Open Streets initiatives in the US:  
Closed to traffic, open to physical activity. Journal of Physical Activity and Health

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** The *ciclovía*, or open streets concept, is a community level physical activity promotion strategy where streets are closed to motorized traffic and open for individuals to engage in PA. This paper presents an overview of such initiatives in the U.S. to understand their potential in PA promotion, comparing event and city characteristics.

**Methods:** We searched *ciclovía* and open streets initiatives held in 2011 in the U.S. using internet searches, publication databases, social media, and personal contacts. We extracted data on the each initiative's frequency, route length, attendance, evaluation procedures, and sociodemographic characteristics of host cities.

**Results:** Our search yielded 47 U.S. cities with open streets in 2011. Cities were diverse in sociodemographic characteristics. Route lengths ranged from a few blocks to 51 miles and event frequency ranged from annual to monthly. Reporting number of participants for events was sporadic. Few events conducted formal evaluations.

**Conclusion:** The number of U.S. cities hosting open streets is increasing. The sociodemographics of the host cities suggest a potential to increase physical activity in populations at risk for developing chronic diseases through these initiatives. However, further evaluation is required. Identifying successful promotion and evaluation tactics would boost the health promotion potential of these initiatives.

Word count: 200

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

## **Open Streets Initiatives in the U.S.: Closed to Traffic, Open to Physical Activity**

### **Background**

Nearly 75% of residents in the U.S. do not engage in the recommended thirty minutes of physical activity, five days a week, and over 25% report they have not engaged in any form of physical activity within the past month<sup>1</sup>. These striking statistics place a majority of U.S. adults at risk for developing chronic diseases, such as diabetes, cardiovascular disease, osteoporosis, and some forms of cancer<sup>2,3</sup>. With such a large proportion of the U.S. population at risk for developing chronic diseases due to physical inactivity, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) advocates for community wide initiatives to promote physical activity<sup>4</sup>. *Ciclovías* or open streets events, are one such initiative, where city streets are opened for residents to use for physical activity and closed to motorized traffic<sup>5</sup>.

These initiatives originated in Bogotá, Colombia, and have recently become popular in the U.S. Descriptions of widely attended and regularly offered open streets initiatives in Colombia and other cities in Latin America make a case for evaluating their potential social, environmental, and health benefits at the community level<sup>5</sup>. However, little is known about the growing number of open street initiatives in the U.S. Information about host cities, who and how many people are participating, what types of activities are organized for the initiatives, route distance, and frequency of events is necessary information for determining the potential of open streets to improve community health and increase physical activity. The purpose of the present study is to describe open streets initiatives in the U.S. and make comparisons across sites based on both the characteristics of the events (e.g., length of routes, frequency, number of participants) and the host city (e.g., demographics of residents, population).

## 1 **Access to Public Spaces for Physical Activity**

2 Scientific evidence from the Guide to Community Preventive Services (2009) shows that  
3 providing access to outdoor sites for physical activity, such as trails, influences the level of  
4 physical activity in a community. Studies have concluded that when trails are introduced in a  
5 neighborhood, people who were not regularly physically active begin to use the trail and increase  
6 their physical activity<sup>4</sup>. However, access to open spaces varies greatly. There is considerably  
7 less access to safe public spaces for physical activity in lower income neighborhoods, than in  
8 higher income neighborhoods<sup>6</sup>. Open streets initiatives democratizes the commons by creating  
9 safe, public spaces for community residents to engage in physical activity that can be accessible  
10 to all city residents regardless of disparity<sup>7,8</sup>.

## 11 ***Ciclovías* in Latin America: The first open streets initiatives**

12 The regular closure of streets to cars and other motorized vehicles to give residents an  
13 opportunity for physical activity began in Bogota, Colombia, in the early 1980s. Residents could  
14 bike, walk, run, or participate in a number of free physical activity stations, including aerobics  
15 and dance classes on the streets. Starting with just a few block closures one Sunday per month,  
16 the event and others like it spread across Colombia and grew into weekly events. Currently, in  
17 Bogotá, more than 100 km of streets are closed each Sunday and more the one million residents  
18 participate each week. Sarmiento and colleagues (2009) found that 35 cities across nine  
19 countries in Latin America hosted *ciclovías* through 2008. The majority of the cities hosting  
20 events in Latin America report thousands of participants. Considering the regularity and high  
21 attendance at the *ciclovías* in several cities in Latin America, researchers have suggested the  
22 potential for *ciclovía* initiatives to increase physical activity levels in residents, and in turn,  
23 reduce residents' risk for developing chronic diseases<sup>2,3,5</sup>.

## 1 ***Ciclovía* Initiatives in the U.S.**

2 Sarmiento et al.'s (2009) review of *ciclovías* found that by 2009 just three sites in the  
3 U.S. had hosted *ciclovías*. Although many U.S. cities hosted similar events, frequently referred  
4 to as 'open streets' initiatives, they did not meet the definitive criteria set forth for concept, event  
5 frequency (at least twice a month), and/or route length (more than one km of public streets  
6 closed) <sup>5</sup>.

7 Little is known about the origins of the open street movement in the U.S. Wayne County,  
8 Michigan is considered the first site of a *ciclovía* initiatives in the U.S., with its *Saturdays in the*  
9 *Park* events that since 1983 closes 6 miles of road every week from 9:00AM to 3:30PM in the  
10 warmer months (May-September; Wayne County Parks Department, 2012). However, the next  
11 documented US *ciclovía* initiative did not occur until decades later. Even today, few cities such  
12 as Atlanta, GA, Portland, OR, and St. Louis, MO, have publicized data on participation and  
13 attendance. The present study fills a knowledge gap about the nature and extent of these  
14 initiatives not previously reported. Although the number of initiatives appears to be growing, to  
15 date there has been a lack of empirical data that describes the initiatives. A detailed description  
16 of initiatives and the cities that host them can provide information for improving implementation.  
17 Additionally, demographic characteristics from the host cities can be used for comparison and  
18 diffusion of these initiatives.

## 19 **Methods**

20 For the purpose of this overview, U.S. open streets are defined as any free, public  
21 initiative held in a city where streets are closed to motorized traffic for a period of time and  
22 opened to residents with the primary purpose of encouraging physical activity. We used more  
23 general criteria than Sarmiento and colleagues (2009) for this overview of open streets initiatives

1 and no event was excluded based on the absence or limits of these event attributes. However,  
2 routes where streets are closed entirely inside the boundaries of parks were not included in the  
3 search.

#### 4 **Literature Review**

5 To locate articles about open streets initiatives in the U.S., a review of the literature was  
6 first conducted in databases of peer-reviewed journal articles including MEDLINE and Google  
7 Scholar, following search terms suggested in a previous review <sup>5</sup>. Additional search terms were  
8 added to reflect common names of open streets initiatives in the U.S. including, “*ciclovía*”,  
9 “open streets”, “Sunday streets”, “Sunday parkways”, and “streets alive”. A search of grey  
10 literature, including agency, alliance, foundation reports, or national cycling and active living  
11 websites was then employed, using the internet to locate additional resources that described open  
12 streets being held across the U.S., and any results or studies from them. This effort included  
13 collaboration with the Open Streets Project and the Alliance for Biking and Walking  
14 (OpenStreetsProject.org). Finally, we used Google searches, and Google Alerts to search for any  
15 websites that indicated an open streets was being held in a city, and searched for Facebook  
16 groups and Twitter <sup>9</sup>. Although Google Alert notifications helped us to triangulate information  
17 on events we already had collected from Facebook, Twitter, and other websites hosted by  
18 organizations or city governments, they did not produce any knowledge of new events that had  
19 not been found in previous search strategies. All searching was conducted between May 2011  
20 and January of 2012.

#### 21 **Data Extraction and Evaluation**

22 Cities hosting open streets initiatives were included in the final overview if they hosted at  
23 least one event in 2011. Data about the initiatives were extracted from the journal articles,

1 internet sources, and open street organizers and entered into a spreadsheet. A description of each  
2 *ciclovía* included the following characteristics: 1) frequency (i.e., times per year), 2) year of  
3 inception, 3) length of the route, 4) estimated number of participants per event, 5) hours of the  
4 initiatives, 6) incorporation of other physical activity activities along the route, 7) sponsors and  
5 organizers of the initiatives (e.g., public, private or both), 8) use of social media (i.e., Facebook,  
6 Twitter, YouTube, etc.) in any way to promote the initiatives, and 9) any evidence of formal  
7 evaluation. In addition to initiative characteristics, demographic characteristics of each host city:  
8 city population, percent of residents living under the federal poverty line, percent of minority  
9 residents, percent of Hispanic residents, and percent of the population under eighteen years of  
10 age and minority<sup>10</sup>. These characteristics were obtained to gain an understanding of the  
11 potential for these open streets to involve large populations, especially low-income communities  
12 of color at-risk for developing chronic diseases related to lack of physical activity.

### 13 **Analysis**

14 Data was gathered and imported into an Excel spreadsheet. After all information was  
15 collected, descriptive analysis was used to capture frequencies, means, and ranges.

### 16 **Results**

17 The search yielded 48 open street initiatives across 47 cities (Seattle hosts two separately  
18 organized open street initiatives, *Bicycle Sunday* and *Summer Streets*), in 26 states and  
19 Washington, DC, in 2011. Five host cities were found via peer-reviewed journal articles<sup>5</sup>, and  
20 the remaining were found through web searches and Google Alerts which included mention of  
21 open streets or similar terms on websites of the city and county, local news sources, non-profit  
22 organizations sponsoring open streets initiatives, and social media sites.

### 23 **General description of host cities**



1           Five (10%) of the cities that hosted open streets in 2011 were large metropolitan areas  
2 with populations over one million residents (Chicago, Los Angeles, New York City, Phoenix,  
3 and San Antonio). Over half the cities in the analysis (n=27, 56%) have populations between  
4 100,000 and less than one million, and one-third have populations less than 100,000, with the  
5 smallest being Cornwall Town, New York (pop. 12,646). The sociodemographic characteristics  
6 of the host cities' residents varied. However most of the cities hosting open streets in 2011 had a  
7 high percentage of residents that are considered at high risk for developing chronic diseases (i.e.,  
8 low income minority adults and children). The average percent of the population living below  
9 the poverty line in the host cities was 16% (national average 15%), ranging from 3% in Albany,  
10 CA, to 31% in Cleveland, OH. Thirty-eight (81%) cities had minority populations greater than  
11 the 2010 national proportion <sup>10</sup>. The average percentage of minority children living in host cities  
12 was 45%, with a range from 7% (Greenbrier, WV) to 85% (Ferguson, MO). Just over one-third  
13 (n=18, 36%) of the cities had a higher percentage of Hispanic residents than the national average  
14 of 16% <sup>10</sup>.

### 15 **Open street event characteristics**

16           Although Wayne County Michigan is credited with the first open street event in the U.S.,  
17 Seattle, WA (*Bicycle Sunday*), and Westchester County, NY (*Bicycle Sundays*), list the inception  
18 dates for their open street-type events in 1965 and 1974, respectively. Between 1983 and 2000,  
19 only one city (Phoenix, AZ: *Silent Sundays*) began new open streets initiatives, however, from  
20 2000 through 2009, 15 other cities began hosting their initiatives. In 2010, 16 cities hosted their  
21 first open streets, and in 2011 13 cities hosted inaugural events. Most events hosted in 2011 were  
22 held on Sundays (n=39, 81%), fewer on Saturdays (n=8, 17%), and *Somerstreets* in Somerville,  
23 MA had events on both Saturday and Sunday. The average length of the events held in 2011 was

1 4.7 hours (SD=1.9). Most open streets spanned from morning through the afternoon (n=29,  
2 60%), some *ciclovías* were afternoon-only events (n=14, 29%), with fewer morning events only  
3 (n=4, 8%). Route length data was available for 27 of the events, with lengths from 0.14 miles in  
4 Greenbrier County, WV (*Parkersburg Park Day*), to 51 miles in Phoenix, AZ (*Silent Sundays*).  
5 The average length was 4.7 miles, the median 2 miles.

6 Over half of the open streets initiatives were considered annual events in 2011 (n=26,  
7 51%) Ten (21%) were held less than quarterly, three (6%) more than quarterly, but less than  
8 monthly, ten (21%) were held monthly. Estimates for attendance were found for just over one-  
9 third of the events (n=17, 36%), and attendance estimates varied greatly. The smallest  
10 attendance was for *Cycling Sunday* in Winston-Salem, NC (250 estimated participants) and both  
11 New York City's *Summer Streets* and Los Angeles' *CicLAvia* reported over 100,000 participants  
12 at each of their open streets initiatives. Across all initiatives, the mean was 24,100 participants  
13 (SD=33,600) per event day, and the median 10,000 participants.

#### 14 **Partnerships and Evaluation**

15 The partnerships and collaborations that cities form to host the events vary across open  
16 streets sites. The majority of the events were organized with funds from both the private and the  
17 public sector (n=24, 51%), other open streets were organized with only public sector funds  
18 (n=11, 23%), and some were organized with only private funding (e.g., NGOs and/or private  
19 businesses; n=12, 26%). Lastly, of the 48 initiatives in the search, only 7 (15%) had some type  
20 of formal evaluation of their event.

#### 21 **Discussion**

22 This paper provided an overview of the 48 open street initiatives hosted in cities across  
23 the U.S in 2011. While the number of open streets has doubled since 2009, most of the events

1 are held infrequently (less than 6 times total per year). The cities hosting these events range in  
2 size from small suburban towns to large metropolitan areas, and also range in socioeconomic  
3 demographics. The events themselves are as varied as the cities that host them; the event time of  
4 day, duration of the event, length of the route, types of sponsors, activities offered, and number  
5 of participants all range broadly.

6 Open streets events have potential to increase physical activity in community residents  
7 and raise awareness about the importance of physical activity, but can also produce additional  
8 social benefits such as enhanced sense of community among residents<sup>5,7,8</sup>. Open streets  
9 initiatives may also promote active transportation and positively contribute to the economy by  
10 creating jobs in event organizing and increasing revenue for vendors of goods and services,  
11 especially if held regularly. However, without adequate evaluation and documentation, the  
12 attainability of this potential remains unclear for open streets in the U.S. More research is needed  
13 on the most effective aspects of these events such as length of the routes and frequency<sup>11,12</sup>.

14 Our results show that open streets initiatives are held in a wide variety of cities across the  
15 U.S. Initiatives take place in large metro areas and smaller suburban areas. Additionally,  
16 sponsorship and partnership varies by host city. Different combinations of private corporations,  
17 non-profit organizations, and city, state, and county governments are collaborating to sponsor  
18 *ciclovía* initiatives in cities across the U.S., indicating the support for community-wide health  
19 promotion initiatives across various sectors. Future studies should include research on the  
20 transdisciplinary nature and collaborative relationships in event planning and implementation.  
21 Although initiatives do not appear to be concentrated in any geographic region(s), further  
22 investigation is needed to understand the diffusion of this kind of event, as some states with high

1 prevalence of obesity and chronic disease like Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Louisiana do  
2 not host initiatives.

3         In addition to community and health benefits, open streets can benefit a city  
4 economically. Past literature on open streets has reported that residents and shopkeepers initially  
5 find public street closures to be a nuisance, but over time become engaged in the benefits of the  
6 events' objectives. For example, shopkeepers may experience increased business from the open  
7 streets participants as a result of the event, or may even find a way to creatively encourage  
8 business during the events. In this way, it could be that initiative organizers might experience a  
9 "worse before better" result, meaning business owners and residents may experience some delay  
10 in the benefits (i.e., increased business) these initiatives can generate. Sponsors and organizers  
11 should be aware of this lag in acceptance and actively work to engage stakeholders, as local  
12 governments have done in Bogota in the early years of their *ciclovía*<sup>13</sup>. Event organizers from  
13 Bogota, as well as the Open Streets Project have created materials to help plan opens streets  
14 initiatives, detailing steps from talking with stakeholders, and route planning to evaluation and  
15 dissemination of event outcomes.

16         Although this overview found that nearly fifty cities currently host open streets  
17 initiatives, few initiatives had formal evaluation components. Evaluation can help organizers  
18 improve their initiatives and can help them report aspects of event success to the community and  
19 sponsors, Evidence of success can further increase support for the local initiatives. Evaluation  
20 results can also assist other communities interested in starting open streets initiatives.

## 21 **Limitations**

22         Although this paper is unique that it describes open streets initiatives in the U.S., there  
23 are several limitations. First, data reported for a one-year period (2011) was extracted from

1 diverse sources, ranging from peer-reviewed journals to local newspapers and event websites,  
2 limiting the conclusions that can be drawn from any comparisons due to differences in what and  
3 how event details are reported. Events for which attendance numbers were available in most  
4 cases did not describe their methods for counting and estimation thus limiting comparability.

5 In addition, data on the characteristics of the events extracted from various Internet  
6 sources were verified with initiatives organizers when possible, but in a few cases no organizer  
7 could be contacted. Only events that have information on the Internet have been included in this  
8 review. While the use of the Internet is growing to be a standard method of reporting and event  
9 promotion, if events were only promoted in methods other than the Internet, these events would  
10 go unmentioned in this paper, introducing bias into the sample we examined. However, despite  
11 these limitations, this paper was the first to describe and compare open streets hosted in the U.S.,

## 12 **Conclusion and Implications**

13 As the number of open street initiatives hosted in the U.S. continues to increase, so does  
14 the potential to use these events for physical activity promotion in communities at most risk for  
15 chronic diseases related to lack of physical activity. However, to increase the effectiveness of  
16 these events, there is a need for standard evaluation methods of the events and mechanisms for  
17 host cities to share best practices.

18

19

1 **References**

- 2 1. Barnes PM, Schoenborn C a. Trends in adults receiving a recommendation for exercise or  
3 other physical activity from a physician or other health professional. *NCHS data brief*.  
4 2012;(86):1–8.
- 5 2. Fogelholm M. Physical activity, fitness and fatness: relations to mortality, morbidity and  
6 disease risk factors. A systematic review. *Obesity reviews* □: *an official journal of the*  
7 *International Association for the Study of Obesity*. 2010;11(3):202–21.
- 8 3. Friedenreich CM, Orenstein MR. Physical Activity and Cancer Prevention: Etiologic Evidence  
9 and Biological Mechanisms. *J. Nutr.* 2002;132(11):3456S–3464.
- 10 4. Control C for D. The Community Guide - Promoting Physical Activity: Environmental and  
11 Policy Approaches.
- 12 5. Sarmiento O, Torres A, Jacoby E, Pratt M, Schmid TL, Stierling G. The Ciclovía-Recreativa:  
13 A mass-recreational program with public health potential. *Journal of physical activity & health*.  
14 2010;7 Suppl 2:S163–80.
- 15 6. Leslie E, Cerin E, Kremer P. Perceived neighborhood environment and park use as mediators  
16 of the effect of area socio-economic status on walking behaviors. *Journal of physical activity &*  
17 *health*. 2010;7(6):802–10.
- 18 7. Hipp JA, Eyler AA, Kuhlberg JA. Target Population Involvement in Urban Ciclovias: A  
19 Preliminary Evaluation of St. Louis Open Streets. *Journal of urban health* □: *bulletin of the New*  
20 *York Academy of Medicine*. 2012.
- 21 8. Torres A, Sarmiento OL, Stauber C, Zarama R. The Ciclovía and Cicloruta programs:  
22 promising interventions to promote physical activity and social capital in Bogotá, Colombia.  
23 *American journal of public health*. 2013;103(2):e23–30.
- 24 9. Finney, A., Eyler, AA, Hipp J. The use of online news alerts in the digital world of research.  
25 *Submitted*. 2012.
- 26 10. Bureau USC. American FactFinder - Search.
- 27 11. Montes F, Sarmiento OL, Zarama R, et al. Do health benefits outweigh the costs of mass  
28 recreational programs? An economic analysis of four Ciclovía programs. *Journal of urban*  
29 *health* □: *bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*. 2012;89(1):153–70.
- 30 12. Zieff, S, Kim, M-S, Wilson, J, Tierney P. A “ciclovía” in San Francisco: characteristics and  
31 physical activity behavior of Sunday Streets participants. *Journal of Physical Activity and*  
32 *Health*.
- 33 13. Díaz del Castillo A, Sarmiento OL, Reis RS, Brownson RC. Translating evidence to policy:  
34 urban interventions and physical activity promotion in Bogotá, Colombia and Curitiba, Brazil.  
35 *Translational Behavioral Medicine*. 2011;1(2):350–360.

36

37

**Table 1. Characteristics of open streets initiatives held in 2012 and their host cities.**

City, State	Year of Inception	Pop.,	% minority		Route		Durat. (Hrs.)	Freq.	Est. attend.	Org.	Funded	Eval.
		% Below Poverty	% minority, % Hispanic	under 18 yrs.	Day	Length (miles)						
Albany/El Cerrito, CA												
Alberrito Streets	2010	42088, 8.1	46.1, 10.7	53.6	Sun.	0.2	3	1	--	Pub	Both	No
Atlanta, GA												
Streets Alive	2010	420003, 22.6	61.6, 5.2	73.1	Sat.	2.7	4	2	6000	NP	Both	Yes
Boulder, CO												
Green Streets	2010	97385, 21.1	12, 8.7	19.7	Sun.	0.7	6	1	15000	Pub	Both	No
Cambridge, MA												
Memorial Dr. Closed Sundays	2004	105162, 15.0	33.4, 7.6	50.1	Sun.	1	8	7	--	Pub	Pub	No
Charlestown, SC												
2 <sup>nd</sup> Sunday on King St.	2010	120083, 17.9	29.8, 2.9	43.1	Sun.	1.25	4	12	--	Both	Both	No
Chicago, IL	2008	2695598, 55, 28.9	55, 28.9	65.4	Sun.	0.7	5	1	--	NP	Priv	No

OPEN STREETS IN THE U.S.

Open Streets		20.9										
Cleveland, OH		396815,										
Walk + Roll	2006	31.2	62.7, 10	74.3	Sat.	3	5	1	--	NP	Priv	No
Coral Gables, FL		787033,										
Gables Bike Day	2011	21.4	38.5, 5.6	52.9	Sun.	0.8	5	1	--	NP	Priv	No
Cornwall (Town), NY		46780,										
Storm King Hike & Bike	2011	9.0	9, 53.6	7	Sat.	3.5	4	8	--	Pub	Pub	No
Denver, CO		12646,										
Viva Streets	2011	5.0	8, 8.3	11.9	Sun.	2	4	1	75000	BP	Both	Yes
Durham, NC		600158,										
Bull City Summer Streets	2010	19.2	31.1, 31.8	44.5	Sun.	0.9	3	1	--	NP	Priv	No
El Paso, TX		228330,										
Scenic Sundays	2007	17.9	57.5, 14.2	68.5	Sun.	8	6	12	--	Pub	Pub	No
Eugene, OR		649121,										
Summer Streets	2011	24.1	19.2, 80.7	21.2	Sun.	3	4	1	--	Pub	Both	No



OPEN STREETS IN THE U.S.

Evanston, IL		156185,											
Bike the Ridge	2009	20.7	14.2, 7.8	22	Sun.	2	4	1	--	--	--	No	
Fargo/Moorhead, ND		74486,											
Streets Alive	2010	11.4	34.4, 9	42.2	Sun.	3	5	2	6000	Priv	Both	Yes	
Ferguson, MO		21203,											
Sunday Parkways	2010	17.6	70.7, 1.2	85	Sun.	1	3	3	--	NP	Both	No	
Fort Worth, TX		741206,											
Open Streets	2011	17.0	38.9, 34.1	44.5	Sun.	0.85	4	2	--	Pub	Both	No	
Greenbrier County, WV		35480,											
Parkersburg Park Day	2011	19.4	5.4, 1.2	7.4	Sun.	0.14	5	1	--	NP	Both	No	
Las Cruces, NM		97618,											
<i>Ciclovía</i>	2003	20.4	24.7, 56.8	31	Sun.	7	4	12	--	Pub	Both	No	
Lexington, KY		295803,											
2 <sup>nd</sup> Sunday	2008	17.5	24.3, 6.9	35	Sun.	1	6	12	15000	Pub	Pub	No	
Lincoln, NE	2011	258379,	14, 6.3	22.3	Sun.	3.3	4.5	1	3000	Both	Both	No	

OPEN STREETS IN THE U.S.

Streets Alive!		14.9										
Long Beach, CA		462257,										
LB Bike Festival	2008	19.1	53.9, 40.8	63.7	Sat.	3	7	1	5000	NP	Priv	No
Los Angeles, CA		3792621,										
CicLAvia	2010	19.5	50.2, 48.5	55.9	Sun.	10	5	2	100000	NP	Priv	No
Madison, WI		233209,										
Ride the Drive	2011	17.9	21.1, 6.8	38.5	Sun.	6	5	1	15000	NP	Priv	No
Miami, FL		399457,										
Bike Miami Days	2008	27.3	27.4, 70	34.1	Sun.	0.4	4	1	--	Pub	Pub	No
Minneapolis, MN		382578,										
Open Streets	2011	22.7	36.2, 10.5	59.6	Sun.	2.6	4	1	--	BP	Both	No
Missoula, MT		66788,										
Sunday Streets	2010	22.1	7.9, 2.9	13.3	Sun.	0.8	6	2	3500	NP	Priv	Yes
New York, NY		8175133,										
Summer Streets	2008	19.1	56, 28.6	63.3	Sat.	7	5	3	100000	Pub	Pub	No

OPEN STREETS IN THE U.S.

Oak Forest, IL		27962,											
Open Streets	2010	8.3	16.6, 13.4	22.1	Sun.	1.6	1.5	1	--	Pub	Both	No	
Phoenix, AZ		1445632,											
Silent Sundays	1999	19.1	34.1, 40.8	43.7	Sun.	51	14	12	--	Pub	Pub	No	
Pinecrest Village, FL		18223,											
Bike Days	2010	4.2	9.9, 41.3	10	Sun.	2	3.5	1	--	Priv	Both	No	
Portland, OR		583776,											
Sunday Streets	2008	16.3	23.9, 9.4	37.6	Sun.	6	5	12	31600	NP	Both	Yes	
Redding, CA		89861,											
Shasta Streets Alive	2011	17.3	14.2, 8.7	22		1.5	5	1	--	Pub	Both	No	
San Antonio, TX		1327407,											
SíClovía	2011	18.9	27.4, 63.2	30.8	Sun.	2.2	4	1	--	NP	Both	No	
San Francisco, CA		805235,											
Sunday Streets	2008	11.9	51.5, 15.1	64.9	Sun.	4.5	4	12	20000	Pub	Both	No	
San Mateo, CA	2010	718451,	46.6, 25.4	52.9	Sun.	--	3	1	--	Pub	Pub	No	

OPEN STREETS IN THE U.S.

Streets Alive		7.0										
Seattle, WA		608660,										
Bicycle Sunday	1965	12.7	30.5, 6.6	42.6	Sun.	3	8	10	3200	Both	Both	No
Seattle, WA		608660,										
Summer Streets	2008	12.7	30.5, 6.6	42.6	Sun.	3	4	4	--	NP	Priv	No
					Sat.							
Somerville, MA		75754,										
SomerStreets	2010	14.7	26.1, 10.6	42	Sun.	2	4	5	--	NP	Priv	No
Spartanburg, SC		37013,										
Sunday Streets	2011	22.8	54.4, 3.4	69.6	Sun.	0.3	4	2	--	NP	Priv	No
Spokane, WA		208916,										
Summer Parkways	2010	18.7	13.3, 5	21.5	Sun.	2	4	3	--	Pub	Pub	No
St. Louis, MO		319294,										
Open Streets	2010	26.0	56.1, 3.5	73.9	Sat.	2	4	2	1200	BP	Both	Yes
Tucson, AZ	2010	520116,	30.3, 41.6	41.5	Sun.	5.5	5	1	10000	NP	Priv	Yes

OPEN STREETS IN THE U.S.

Cyclovia		21.3										
Vineland, NJ		60724,										
Open Streets	2011	12.8	33, 38	42.3	Sun.	1	3	1	--	Pub	Pub	No
Washington, DC												
Feet in the Street/ <i>Ciclovía</i>		601723,										
DC	2009	18.5	61.5, 9.1	79	Sun.	1.6	6	1	--	Pub	Both	No
Wayne County, MI		1820584,										
Saturday in the Park	1983	13.6	47.7, 5.2	54.2	Sat.	6.8	4	12	--	--	--	No
Westchester County, NY		949113,										
Bicycle Sundays	1974	8.2	31.9, 21.8	36.2	Sun.	6.6	4	12	--	Priv	Both	No
Winston-Salem, NC												
Cycling Sunday	2009	--	--	--	Sun.	2	3	1	250	NP	Both	No

---