



# Cobb County Complete Streets Implementation Plan

September 2009  
DRAFT ONE



## Table of Contents

Complete Streets Overview	1
Project Objective and Process	2
Components of Effective Implementation	3
Best Practices of Complete Streets Implementation	8
Costs of Effective Implementation	12
<b>APPENDIX A: Cobb County Complete Streets Policy</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: Peer Local Government Review</b>	
Massachusetts Complete Streets Implementation Strategy	17
Seattle Complete Streets Implementation Strategy	20
Roanoke, VA Complete Streets Implementation Strategy	25
Louisville, KY Complete Streets Implementation Strategy	28
Decatur, GA Complete Streets Implementation Strategy	29
Roswell, GA Complete Streets Implementation Strategy	31
Charlotte, NC Complete Streets Implementation Strategy	33
<b>APPENDIX C: Funding Sources</b>	<b>35</b>
Catalog of State Financial Assistance Programs	
Funding Sources for Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects	
Federal/State Matching Requirements	
<b>APPENDIX D: Training Opportunities</b>	<b>40</b>



## ***Complete Streets Overview***

Traditionally streets in the United States have been designed solely for the automobile, based on level of service, speed, and road category specifications. If other modes of transportation are included in the road design, accessibility and mobility concerns are generally secondary to the automobile.

Complete Streets are defined by the National Complete Streets Coalition as streets that are “Designed and operated to enable safe access for all users”. Pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and transit riders of all ages and abilities must be able to safely move along and across a complete street”.

There is no one size fits all prescription to achieving Complete Streets as a Complete Street can function and look differently from city to county and from rural area to urban area. Complete Streets are context sensitive in form and function, and characterized by the surrounding land uses, mode choices, community input, in addition to speed and level of service concerns.

*Some benefits of Complete Streets are:*

- Improved Safety
- Connectivity Enhancement
- Promotion of Healthy Lifestyles
- Congestion Mitigation
- Reduction in Carbon Emissions
- Reduction in costs due to retrofitting streets
- Increase in Property Values
- Flexible Road Design
- Consideration for all Users
- Transparent and Iterative Public Planning Process

*Elements in a Complete Street include, but are not limited to:*

- Sidewalks
- Bike lanes (or wide paved shoulders)
- Special bus lanes
- Comfortable and accessible transit stops
- Frequent crossing opportunities
- Median islands
- Accessible pedestrian signals
- Curb extensions



## ***Project Objective and Process***

### **Objective**

The objective of the Atlanta Regional Commission Community Choices project is to provide Cobb County with a menu of options for effectively implementing its adopted Complete Streets Policy (***Appendix A***). The project consisted of a comprehensive review of documents related to Complete Streets, an analysis of how the documents might facilitate or hinder program implementation, and implementation options for a successful program based on Complete Streets programs in other local governments across the country.

### **Process**

Community Choices commenced this project by receiving input in the form of a survey from peer local and state governments from across the country that have implemented a Complete Streets policy of their own. The surveys were then analyzed for reoccurring core elements and became the basis of Best Practices presented in the Components of Complete Street Implementation section. The complete surveys are included in ***Appendix B*** of this document. Surveyed local and state governments include:

- Decatur, GA
- Roswell, GA
- Roanoke, VA
- Charlotte, NC
- Louisville, KY
- Seattle, WA
- State of Massachusetts

Cobb County Planning documents related to the Complete Streets policy were collected. An in-depth review was then performed to determine areas of potential conflict and opportunities for better coordination between existing plans and the Complete Streets Policy. A list of the documents reviewed is below. Our review concluded that Cobb County is off to a great start in terms of implementing the Complete Streets policy. Detailed results of the review are provided in the Components of Effective Implementation Section.

#### *Documents reviewed:*

- Cobb County Complete Streets Policy (Adopted 2009)
- Community Development Standards (Adopted 2008)
- Cobb County 2030 Comprehensive Transportation Plan (Adopted 2008)
- Cobb County Senior Adult Transportation Plan
- Cobb County 1993 Bike & Pedestrian Plan

- Cobb County Draft 2009 Bike & Pedestrian Plan
- Cobb County Zoning Ordinance
- Cobb County Sign Ordinance
- Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) Studies
  - Austell Road
  - Cumberland
  - Town Center SuPurb
  - Delk Road
- Cobb Dept. of Transportation Engineering Procedural Manual (Updated 2008)
- Cobb Community Improvement Projects (2005)

The Federal Highway Administration and Smart Growth America provided assistance with determining costs for elements included in Complete Streets Implementation. These findings are presented in the Costs of Effective Implementation Section.

Guidance for this project was also provided by Cobb County Commissioners and the Cobb County Complete Streets Stakeholder Committee. Their input represents valuable community participation that has informed the observations here.

### ***Components of Effective Implementation***

The following are examples that have been identified as elements of effective Complete Streets Programs based on surveys of peer local governments and consultation provided by the National Complete Streets Coalition. These examples function as Best Practices but are broader in scope than those identified in the next section.

### ***An Effective Policy***

The National Complete Streets Coalition advises that successful implementation of Complete Streets is highly contingent on a comprehensive policy that ensures transportation planners and engineers will consistently design roads for all users. The Cobb County Complete Streets Policy is a great start on which to build a program. However, opportunities exist to enhance the policy.

According to the National Complete Streets Coalition, the policy adopted by Seattle, Washington is a good model for local governments to follow. The policy makes any exemption specific and sets a clear procedure that requires high level approval of exceptions. The policy also encourages a comprehensive and connected street network, and applies to both new and retrofit projects. Community Choices has provided a sample of amended language to the Cobb County policy on the following page by incorporating elements of the Seattle policy. The Seattle policy may be found in its entirety in ***Appendix B***.

**Current Cobb County Policy:**

“Cobb County will implement the Complete Streets concept by considering safe access for all users, to include motorists, bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users, including individuals with physical disabilities and senior citizens, in the planning, design, construction and operation of streets within its jurisdiction.”

**Example of Amended Cobb County Policy:**

“Cobb County will implement Complete Streets solutions that fit within the context of the community, by providing appropriate accommodations and safe access for all users, to include motorists, bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit users, including individuals with physical disabilities and senior citizens, in the planning, design, construction and operation of streets within its jurisdiction.

Cobb County will incorporate Complete Streets principles into the Department’s Transportation Plan, Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan, and other Cobb DOT plans, manuals, rules, regulations and programs as appropriate, and will establish performance standards with measurable outcomes.

Cobb County will encourage street connectivity and create a comprehensive, integrated, connected network for all modes.

Except in unusual or extraordinary circumstances Complete Streets principles will not apply:

- To ordinary maintenance activities designed to keep assets in serviceable condition (e.g., mowing, cleaning, sweeping, spot repair, and surface treatments such as chip seal, or interim measures on detour or haul routes)
- Where the Director of Transportation issues a documented exception concluding that application of Complete Street principles is unnecessary or inappropriate because it would be contrary to public safety, or
- Where other available means or factors indicate absence of need, including future need.

Complete Streets may be achieved through single projects or incrementally through a series of smaller improvements or maintenance activities over time. It is the Chairman’s and Commissioners’ intent that all sources of transportation funding be drawn upon to implement Complete Streets. The County believes that maximum financial flexibility is important to implement Complete Streets principles.”

## ***Adoption of a Design Manual***

### **Context Sensitive Design**

Complete Streets function by coordinating street design with land uses. This coordination allows the street to be context sensitive. Context sensitivity is important because a rural road has many different characteristics than an urban road. A critical tool for ensuring that street design is a Street Design Manual.

The city of Charlotte, NC and State of Massachusetts Design Guideline Manuals have been provided in **Appendix E** (*will be included in a later draft*). These manuals have been identified as among the most comprehensive documents by the National Complete Streets Coalition. Both manuals provide flexibility that exceeds the guidelines of the AASHTO Green Book. Also, since both manuals are public documents, elements may be borrowed and incorporated into the Cobb County Design Manual without cost.

Basic facets defined in both Design Manuals are:

- Community Participation Process
- Character Area Districts
- Character Area Design Elements
- Streetscape Element Guidelines
- Traffic Calming Alternatives

As an example, Charlotte, NC determines a project's context sensitivity through the following process outlined in their Design Manual:

- Identify the street type according to Charlotte's street hierarchy (outlined in Street Design Guideline)
- Identify the current and future character district(s) that pertain to the project
- Identify the most appropriate street typical section according to the street type and character district
- Identify any general elements that may apply to the work

Once a Design Manual has been formally adopted by Cobb County all appropriate codes, ordinances and standards would need to be updated to ensure that design components for all new or modified streets follow the intent of the Design Manual.

### **Public Process**

A Design Manual will not only provide transportation engineers and planners with a tool that ensures consistent and context sensitive design, but it also defines a public process.

The City of Charlotte, NC, has incorporated a six step iterative planning process to guide public participation on all publicly Funded Projects. It is Charlotte's intention to incorporate this process on private "by right" development as well once their zoning and development codes have been updated.

### ***Training of Transportation Engineers, Staff and Planners***

Another critical component of effective implementation of Complete Streets is insufficient training of transportation engineers, staff, and planners. Training helps ensure continuity to the planning and road design process, because many engineers and planners are not familiar with Complete Streets ideology. As an example, Louisville, KY experienced difficulty with implementation by not providing training before their Complete Streets Policy was implemented. The National Complete Streets Coalition recommends that the transportation department attend seminars, workshops and webinars before, during and after program implementation. Seminars may be arranged with the National Complete Streets Coalition, and other opportunities are listed in **Appendix D**. In addition, the American Planning Association's *Best Practices Manual for Complete Streets*, which is scheduled to be published early 2010, promises to be a valuable resource for training and education regarding Complete Streets implementation.

### ***Coordination***

In order to minimize expenditures, coordination of projects is an essential component of successful implementation. Fiscal responsibility may be achieved through inter-departmental coordination and by identifying potential funding sources before projects are initiated. Following are several examples of how local governments have achieved such coordination.

### ***Funding Sources***

The Cobb County Capital Improvement Program is very comprehensive in identifying all current and potential future sources of funding for street improvements. There exists the opportunity to implement a Safe Routes to School Program that is eligible for funding through Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT). This program encourages sidewalk construction and enhancement in proximity to county schools. Cobb County has initiated a pilot Safe Routes to School Program in conjunction with the 2009 Cobb County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Completion of the Safe Routes to School Program will greatly enhance Complete Streets Implementation. **Appendix C** includes other opportunities for funding sources, as well as Transportation Enhancement Grants which Cobb County already pursues aggressively.

## **Inter-Departmental Coordination**

Inter-departmental project coordination is equally important to funding

Examples of such coordination would be:

- Using repaving, restriping, and major road projects as a trigger to implement road diets, bike lanes, sidewalks, and/or median installations.
- Coordinating sewer and storm water drainage repairs with sidewalk installation or widening projects.
- Updating the process of evaluating requests for new curb and/or pedestrian accommodations.
- Working with public and private utilities, where possible, that work in public rights-of-way to secure their five-year project plans and long range plans so that improvement projects can be coordinated and also to ensure that repairs are performed consistently with the County vision.

*For projects that incorporate improvements or modifications to Georgia Department of Transportation rights-of-way in part or in whole, consult with the GDOT District Office early and often to avoid project delays.*

## **Measuring Success**

Measuring the success of a Complete Streets program is necessary because from place to place a program will operate differently. Performance evaluation provides the opportunity for the local government to calibrate the program so that its performance may be enhanced within the context it is implemented.

Several performance measures are available to monitor the effectiveness of a Complete Streets program. Roanoke, VA uses the following strategy that includes analyzing:

- Total miles of on-street bicycle routes defined by streets with clearly marked or signed bicycle accommodation
- Linear feet of new pedestrian accommodation
- Number of new curb ramps installed along city streets
- Number of new street trees planted along city streets
- Pedestrian and bicycle counts before and after program implementation
- Pedestrian and bicycle crash data before and after program implementation

## ***Best Practices of Complete Streets Implementation***

Although Complete Streets look and function differently from local government to local government and urban area to rural area, there are certain core components that are intrinsic to Complete Streets Implementation Programs.

In the following section, the core components are laid out as Best Practices that may serve as a menu of options for implementing near, mid-term, and long-term Complete Streets Goals. The Best Practices section includes an analysis of Cobb County documents to determine areas of potential conflict and opportunities for better coordination with regard to Complete Streets Best Practices.

Although immediate and mid-term goals have been presented, a successful Complete Streets Program requires many years of commitment by the County and the Community.

Best Practices	Related Documents	Coordination Status	Implementation Goals
<b>Create a Unified Street Design Manual</b>	Development Regulations, Engineering Procedures Manual, Comprehensive Transportation Plan, Zoning Codes, Bike & Pedestrian Plan	Currently no unified design manual exists. Greater flexibility in design is needed. Design should be context sensitive and surrounding coordinated with land uses (See Appendix E for Examples)	<b>Immediate</b> Use ITE CSS to supplement AASHTO guidelines and allow greater design flexibility and begin process for creating Cobb Street Design Manual
			<b>Mid-Term</b> Adopt Design Manual and apply to all County funded projects
			<b>Long-Term</b> Amend Development Regulations and Zoning Code to enforce Design Manual on “by right” development
<b>Clearly Define Street Planning Process</b>	Development Regulations, Engineering Procedures Manual, Zoning Code	Process is not codified in a single document. Process should include all users (Aging, Disabled, Transit, Advocate for Children)	<b>Immediate</b> Create a document that outlines the current street planning process
			<b>Mid-Term</b> Create and adopt a transparent planning process on all County funded projects (e.g. Charlotte, NC 6 step process)
			<b>Long-Term</b> Include adopted process in Design Manual for use in public and private funded projects
<b>Project Prioritization</b>	Comprehensive Transportation Plan, Bike & Pedestrian Plan, SPLOST Program	Projects are appropriately linked to Comprehensive Transportation Plan and the Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan	<b>Immediate</b> Focus prioritization of improvements on access to schools, major activity centers, ADA accessibility in conjunction with safety and congestion
			<b>Mid-Term</b> Link 5 year CIP to implementation strategies from CTP and Bike & Pedestrian Plan
			<b>Long-Term</b> Continue to update CIP based on updates of Transportation Plans

<b>Train Engineers, Planners and Staff on CS</b> <b>Train Engineers, Planners and Staff on CS principles (cont.)</b>	Institute of Transportation Engineers Context Sensitive Solutions, American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials Bicycle & Pedestrian Design Guidance, (Cobb Street Design Manual)	Currently there is not a Complete Streets training program developed for the County	<b>Immediate</b> Provide training through Local and National Complete Streets and CSS Seminars before a formal manual is written
			<b>Mid-Term</b> Continue to provide on going training. When the Design Manual is complete, conduct an orientation session with all personnel
			<b>Long-Term</b> Have new hires attend Complete Streets seminars and training, and Cobb Street Design Manual orientation
<b>Research and Secure Appropriate Funding</b>	Zoning Codes, Design Manual, Capital Improvement Plan, Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax Program	Funding sources are clearly organized in Capital Improvement Plan and Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax program	<b>Immediate</b> Apply for Transportation Enhancement and Safe Routes to School funding
			<b>Mid-Term</b> Amend zoning codes to provide incentives to developers that included bike lanes and public sidewalks in new projects. Monitor GDOT, ARC and FHWA for new funding opportunities
			<b>Long-Term</b> Determine what funding will be available after new federal transportation bill has been adopted. Create a funding appendix in Street Design Manual and update regularly
<b>Inter-Departmental Coordination</b>	Capital Improvement Plan, Comprehensive Transportation Plan, Bike and Pedestrian Plan	Coordination exists in County funded projects in initial planning. Additional coordination in the prioritization phase by coordinating plans with other departments and utility companies	<b>Immediate</b> Evaluate what current projects can be consolidated. Determine where road diets can be made on any current repaving projects
			<b>Mid-Term</b> Determine where sidewalk and bike lanes can be installed in conjunction with storm water, sewer, or utility projects

			<p><b>Long-Term</b> Continue dept. coordination and outreach to GDOT and utility companies so that projects may be combined</p>
<b>Performance Evaluation</b>	Design Manual, Comprehensive Transportation Plan, Bike & Pedestrian Plan, Engineering Procedures Manual	The Engineering Procedures Manual does not require bike or pedestrian counts before or after infrastructure improvements	<p><b>Immediate</b> Amend the Engineering Procedures Manual to require pedestrian and bicycle counts before sidewalk and bike lane additions/improvements and/or road diets</p>
			<p><b>Mid-Term</b> Conduct bike and pedestrian counts after major maintenance, construction, or road diets. Measure miles of sidewalk and bike lanes to track progress of expanding bike and pedestrian network. Measure transit ridership and land use changes along streets where improvements are made</p>
			<p><b>Long-Term</b> Analyze data from bike and pedestrian counts and crash data to determine the effectiveness of improvements and make adjustments where necessary</p>



## ***Costs of Effective Implementation***

Infrastructure improvements and retrofits have costs associated with construction. The following table outlines costs provided by the Federal Highway Administration. As stated in previous sections, effective inter-departmental coordination and project prioritization can greatly reduce project costs.

<b>Development of a Road Design Guideline Manual</b>	According to the State of Massachusetts’s Engineering Department, the Development of a manual will take from 5 to 7 years and can cost up to \$950,000. Staff engineers may be used where possible to reduce cost and ensure inter departmental support. Also, most manuals produced by State and Local Governments are public documents. These manuals can be adopted in part, or as a whole, by Cobb County as a means to reduce financial expenditures.
<b>Lower automobile speeds - 25 to 35 mph</b>	Signs range in costs from \$50 to \$150
<b>Narrow lanes to 10 or 11'</b>	No cost or reduces cost due to less asphalt needed
<b>Road Diet - Convert 4 lanes to 3 lanes with center turn lane</b>	The cost for restriping a mile of four-lane street to one lane in each direction plus a two-way, left-turn lane and bike lanes is about \$ \$5,000 to \$20,000 per mile, depending on the amount of lane lines that need to be repainted.
<b>Tighten Curb Radii</b>	\$2,000 to \$20,000 per corner, depending on site conditions (e.g., drainage and utilities may need to be relocated).
<b>Accessible Pedestrian Signals</b>	\$20,000 to \$140,000
<b>Raised Medians</b>	The cost for adding a raised median is approximately \$15,000 to \$30,000 per 100 ft, depending on the design, site conditions, and whether the median can be added as part of a utility improvement or other street construction project.
<b>Addition of Bike Lanes</b>	The cost of installing a bike lane is approximately \$5,000 to \$50,000 per mile. It is most cost efficient to create bicycle lanes during street reconstruction, street resurfacing, or at the time of original construction.
<b>Right Turn on Red Restrictions</b>	\$30 to \$150 per ‘NO TURN ON RED’ sign plus installation at \$200 per sign. Electronic signs have higher costs.
<b>Sidewalks and Walkways Installation</b>	The cost for concrete curbs and sidewalks is approximately \$15/linear foot for curbing and \$11/square foot for walkways.

<b>Marked Crosswalks and Enhancements</b>	Approximate installation costs are \$100 for a regular striped crosswalk, \$300 for a ladder crosswalk, and \$3,000 for a patterned concrete crosswalk.
<b>Curb Ramps</b>	The cost is approximately \$800 to \$1,500 per curb ramp (new or retrofitted).
<b>Landscaping</b>	A variety of funding options are available to jurisdiction - Can be funded by HOA, CID or commercial entity.
<b>Curb Extensions</b>	Curb extensions cost from \$2,000 to \$20,000 per corner, depending on design and site conditions.
<b>Crossing Island</b>	Costs range from \$4,000 to \$30,000. The cost for an asphalt island or one without landscaping is less than the cost of installing a raised concrete pedestrian island with landscaping.
<b>Sidewalk widening or Sidewalk retrofits</b>	Widening a sidewalk can cost \$62,000 to \$100,000 or more per mile.



## ***Summary***

An analysis of Cobb County existing policies compared to the implementation strategies recommended by the National Complete Streets Coalition and peer communities indicates that the County is actually in very good shape to successfully implement a comprehensive Complete Streets program.

However, this report documents some areas in which the County can achieve enhanced coordination and more specific design and construction standards.

Cobb County has set a regional example through formal adoption of the Complete Streets Policy. The information and strategies included in this report and the accompanying appendix materials are intended to facilitate effective and successful implementation of a Complete Streets program in Cobb County.

## APPENDIX A

### COBB COUNTY COMPLETE STREETS POLICY

(Adopted January 2009)



*Cobb County...Expect the Best!*

**Purpose:** To assure that new roadway construction and existing roadway improvement projects on County roadways include consideration for adequate infrastructure, where appropriate and feasible, for bicyclists, pedestrians, users of public transit of all ages and abilities, and the physically disabled.

**Applicability:** Applies to all roadways within the County.

**Rationale:** Some of Cobb County's existing roadways where bicycling and walking are prevalent lack the infrastructure needed to make these means of travel safe. These roadways may lack sidewalks and/or crosswalks, have lanes that are too narrow to share with bicyclists, and make insufficient accommodation for transit users or the physically disabled. There is a need to improve accommodations for a growing segment of the County's population that travels by means other than the automobile.

**Background:** This policy supports the Department's Mission Statement, which is to *plan, design, construct, operate and maintain a multi-modal transportation network in a fiscally responsible manner to promote safe and efficient travel throughout Cobb County.*

The County's Comprehensive Transportation Plan calls for the incorporation of Complete Streets into the planning, design and construction of all future roadways when adequate right-of-way is available.

The Cobb County Senior Adult Transportation Study (SATS) recommends the use of Complete Streets principles in the planning and design of transportation infrastructure. Complete Streets principles also play a large role in Tier 2 of the 3-step implementation program for the SATS.

The Atlanta Regional Commission's Atlanta Region Bicycle Transportation and Pedestrian Walkways Plan was developed to address the infrastructure and policy needs for the 13-county ARC planning area, which includes Cobb County. Amongst the plan's policy recommendations is the following: *Incorporate the concepts of routine accommodation and Complete Streets into planning, design, and construction of all future roadways and adopt development review regulations requiring developers to build bicycle and pedestrian facilities as integral components of their transportation infrastructure.*

Complete Streets policies and design practices played a large role in the revision of the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials' (AASHTO) Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities. In keeping with the long-standing practice of adhering to AASHTO standards and guidelines, the Department sees fit for it to establish this policy formally.

**Policy :**Cobb County will implement the Complete Streets concept by considering safe access for all users, to include motorists, bicyclists, pedestrians and transit users, including individuals with physical disabilities and senior citizens, in the planning, design, construction and operation of streets within its jurisdiction.

## MASSACHUSETTS COMPLETE STREETS IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

### **What is the implementation strategy for your Complete Streets policy?**

Our Complete Streets policy was formally implemented through the issuance of our *2006 Project Development and Design Guide*. The Guide was developed over the course of many years by working with constituency groups that have an interest in road and bridge projects. The task force that developed the Guide included representatives from municipalities, regional planning agencies, Walk Boston (pedestrian advocacy group), MassBike (bicycling advocacy group), conservation commissions, the Massachusetts Historical Commission, the Massachusetts Office on Disability, ACEC, FHWA and others. Although all of the goals of the task force did not relate directly to implementing a Complete Streets policy, many of the primary ones did. Two of the guiding principles for development of the Guide were Multimodal Consideration and Context Sensitive Design. Both of these principles support a Complete Streets policy, especially the principle of equal consideration for the safety and mobility of pedestrians, bicyclists and drivers in all phases of project development.

### **What changes were made to your design manual in order to implement your Complete Streets policy?**

The previous (1997) *Design Manual* was replaced entirely with the *2006 Project Development and Design Guide*. Changes were numerous. Those that were notable with regard to Complete Streets were a new project screening and initiation process, new design controls and increased flexibility for designers to allow them to choose appropriate design criteria for each project. The project development process emphasizes early outreach and involvement of all interested parties, identifying all project needs before defining solutions, and considering all modes of transportation. The new basic design controls highlight a shift away from some traditional AASHTO design controls which focus on the functional classification of the roadway, design speed of motor vehicles and level of service of motor vehicles. One new design control is for Roadway Context, which replaces the traditional functional classification. Roadway Context includes flexible categories for roadway type and area type to allow a designer to more appropriately choose the context of the facility instead of relying on a classification that is largely intended for federal funding eligibility. Designers choose between 6 roadway types and 9 area types, and these choices affect the acceptable ranges of design values available for elements like design speed, lane width and shoulder width. The ranges of acceptable values for these elements are generally broader than the ranges contained in the previous design manual, and they allow for lower values to be selected without the need for a design exception. There is also a substantial discussion about the roadway users, beginning with the most vulnerable (the pedestrian) and ending with the least vulnerable (the driver). Space requirements for

each user are clearly defined. There was a conscious effort to frame the designer's thinking about the roadway cross section space from the outside in. This could allow for more consideration of users on the outside of the layout (pedestrians and bicyclists) than through previous design procedures where designers typically began their thought process from the centerline of the roadway and worked their way out to the layout line. Often through this type of process, pedestrians and bicyclists were treated as "secondary" users of the facility and did not receive equal consideration throughout the development process.

**Is your Complete Streets policy applied only to new roads? If not, to what extent is it applied to existing roads (retrofits) and how is this determined?**

The Design Guide is applied to all projects on all roadways. It is actually written to apply more towards retrofits of existing roads than to new roads because retrofits of existing roads currently comprise the large majority of our capital program.

**Was your plan development process manual updated in order to implement Complete Streets? If so, how was this accomplished?**

Yes, see previous answers.

**What do you consider the primary barriers to implementation of your Complete Streets policy?**

Potential changes in organizational priorities could someday place a larger emphasis on other contradictory initiatives, such as system expansion or maintenance of existing facilities (with no enhancements).

**Have you collected any pedestrian or bicycle data (bike counts, etc.) after implementing Complete Streets? How was this done?**

No. We may have data for some projects in urban areas, but generally we do not have this type of data for the "before" or "after" conditions. Also, since the policy was only adopted 3 years ago, it is difficult to assess real benefits based on such data.

**Did implementation of your Complete Streets policy include training engineers and planners? How was this done and what format did it take?**

A one-day orientation session was conducted for hundreds of agency employees, design consultants, planners and municipal officials within the first few months after the Guide was implemented on January 30, 2006. Sessions were held throughout the state at various locations, with between 30 and 50 people at each. The Guide was authored by a consultant firm under contract with MassHighway and that firm (Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, VHB) also led the orientation sessions.

MassHighway also recently completed formal CSS training workshops for about 80 agency employees.

**What are some takeaway lessons you would offer to another local government seeking to implement its Complete Streets policy?**

Partner with identified constituent groups to ensure wide support for any new initiatives. Let others have a voice in agency policies. This can be difficult to implement, but the results can be great. Public employees need to embrace the “what can we do for you?” attitude as opposed to the “we know what is best for you” attitude.

Borrow materials from others. The MassHighway guidebook has no copyright and is available for anyone to use. Much of the material in our book was taken from other sources as well. We didn’t necessarily invent anything new, we just compiled lots of good ideas into a single document.

Secure high-level agency support. It can be difficult to change from within. In the beginning, our process was driven largely by external pressure, ultimately from our Governor. This gave great incentive to complete our work. We were also somewhat lucky to retain upper management continuity throughout our development process, which really began about 7 years prior to issuance of the Guidebook. It began as a series of group discussions with constituent groups about different design elements. The decision to write a new Guidebook didn’t occur until about the 4<sup>th</sup> year, and the actual document production didn’t occur until the final 18 months. Our Commissioner, Luisa Paiewonsky, was involved in the process throughout the 7 years, beginning when she was Director of Planning, continuing when she was Deputy Commissioner, and ending when she was Commissioner. She is still Commissioner in 2009. Luisa was at the table with the other group members for 7 years and fully participated in all discussions. This ultimately helped immensely by keeping the project as an agency priority.

Hire an outside consultant to assist in any way. Agency employees have other responsibilities and can not devote adequate time to large efforts like this. Our task force consisted of over 30 people, all with different opinions and different writing styles. It would have been impossible for us to write the guidance as a group. VHB came in and worked with us for 6 months before they even began to write. It worked out well for us because we chose the right company to help.

**SEATTLE COMPLETE STREETS IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

**What is the text of your Complete Streets Policy?**

AN ORDINANCE relating to Seattle's Complete Streets policy, stating guiding principles and practices so that transportation improvements are planned, designed and constructed to encourage walking, bicycling and transit use while promoting safe operations for all users.

WHEREAS, the City Council, with the Mayor concurring, adopted Resolution 30915 that defines the Complete Streets policy; and

WHEREAS, City policy as stated in the Transportation Strategic Plan and the Seattle Comprehensive Plan is to encourage walking, bicycling and transit use as safe, convenient and widely available modes of transportation for all people; and

WHEREAS, Seattle's Complete Streets guiding principle is to design, operate and maintain Seattle's streets to promote safe and convenient access and travel for all users --- pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and people of all abilities, as well as freight and motor vehicle drivers; and

WHEREAS, other jurisdictions and agencies nationwide have adopted Complete Streets legislation including the U.S. Department of Transportation, numerous state transportation agencies, San Francisco, Sacramento, San Diego, Boulder, Chicago and Portland; and

WHEREAS, the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) will implement Complete Streets policy by designing, operating and maintaining the transportation network to improve travel conditions for bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and freight in a manner consistent with, and supportive of, the surrounding community; and

WHEREAS, transportation improvements will include an array of facilities and amenities that are recognized as contributing to Complete Streets, including: street and sidewalk lighting; pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements; access improvements for freight; access improvements, including compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act; public transit facilities accommodation including, but not limited, to pedestrian access improvement to transit stops and stations; street trees and landscaping; drainage; and street amenities; and

WHEREAS, SDOT will implement policies and procedures with the construction, reconstruction or other changes of transportation facilities on arterial streets to support the creation of Complete Streets including capital improvements, re-channelization projects and major maintenance, recognizing that all streets are different and in each case user needs must be balanced;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. SDOT will plan for, design and construct all new City transportation improvement projects to provide appropriate accommodation for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and persons of all abilities, while promoting safe operation for all users, as provided for below.

Section 2. SDOT will incorporate Complete Streets principles into: the Department's Transportation Strategic Plan; Seattle Transit Plan; Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans; Intelligent Transportation System Strategic Plan; and other SDOT plans, manuals, rules, regulations and programs as appropriate.

Section 3. Because freight is important to the basic economy of the City and has unique right-of-way needs to support that role, freight will be the major priority on streets classified as Major Truck Streets. Complete Street improvements that are consistent with freight mobility but also support other modes may be considered on these streets.

Section 4. Except in unusual or extraordinary circumstances, Complete Streets principles will not apply:

- to repairs made pursuant to the Pavement Opening and Restoration Rule (SDOT Director's Rule 2004-02);
- to ordinary maintenance activities designed to keep assets in serviceable condition (e.g., mowing, cleaning, sweeping, spot repair and surface treatments such as chip seal, or interim measures on detour or haul routes);
- where the Director of Transportation issues a documented exception concluding that application of Complete Street principles is unnecessary or inappropriate because it would be contrary to public safety; and
- where other available means or factors indicate an absence of need, including future need.

Section 5. Complete Streets may be achieved through single projects or incrementally through a series of smaller improvements or maintenance activities over time. It is the

Mayor's and Council's intent that all sources of transportation funding be drawn upon to implement Complete Streets. The City believes that maximum financial flexibility is important to implement Complete Streets principles.

Section 6. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force thirty (30) days from and after its approval by the Mayor, but if not approved and returned by the Mayor within ten (10) days after presentation, it shall take effect as provided by Municipal Code Section 1.04.020.

**What is the implementation strategy for your Complete Streets policy?**

Our department is directly by City Council Ordinance to apply complete streets principles to all of our projects, save where exceptions apply. You can view our ordinance on line at:

<http://clerk.ci.seattle.wa.us/~scripts/nphbrs.exe?s1=complete+streets&s2=&s3=&s4=&s5=&Sect4=and&l=20&Sect2=THESON&Sect3=PLURON&Sect5=CBOR1&Sect6=HITOFF&d=CBOR&p=1&u=%2F%7Epublic%2Fcbor1.htm&r=1&f=G>

Our implementation strategy is multipronged. We have a Complete Streets checklist which we use internally to review all large capital projects (also attached), we have a management level steering committee to review project designs and approve policy changes, our Capital projects team has a monthly meeting with our Director to review any exceptions (the final decision is made by our Director as to whether a Complete Streets element is to be exempted from a project or not), and we are starting to develop conceptual design plans for streets that incorporate Complete Streets. These plans get amended to our design manual (the link is: [http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/rowmanual/manual/6\\_1.asp](http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/rowmanual/manual/6_1.asp)) and are available to both public agency staff and private developers.

**What changes were made to your design manual in order to implement your Complete Streets policy?**

We updated our design manual prior to adopting Complete Sts. policy direction. there are some changes we are considering in the next update, but our design manual already addressed walking, bicycling and transit design elements, so a major overhaul was not required. Check out New York City's new street design manual. That is a good model.

**Is your Complete Streets policy applied only to new roads? If not, to what extent is it applied to existing roads (retrofits) and how is this determined?**

We, by and large, do not build any new roads in Seattle. It is a built city. We apply Complete Streets to all large projects, but those that are the best fit are our repaving

projects. They allow us to add rechannelization (road diets), stop bars, crosswalks, bicycle loop detectors, and other elements that support Complete Streets. The costs are much less than if we were not repaving the roadway at the same time.

**Was your plan development process manual updated in order to implement Complete Streets? If so, how was this accomplished?**

Not sure what you mean by this. I don't think we have a "plan development process manual."

**What do you consider the primary barriers to implementation of your Complete Streets policy?**

In some cases, political will. In others funding, but funding is not the key issue. We also have a section in our Complete Streets ordinance that addresses freight corridors and that we will only add Complete Street improvements in these corridors if they do not adversely impact freight. We often get into lively debates with our constituents over the specific roadway section (bike lane or sharrow? curb bulbs or not). The public debate can stretch on for a while, but our staff is motivated to make the improvements and the elected officials expect it of us--getting those ducks in a row is the bigger win for our jurisdiction. One of the other barriers remains coordination among programs within our department. It is important to identify design elements well in advance of projects getting to 30% design. Our program managers need to plan for funding to support complete streets when they put their annual budgets together, not as part of a budget fire drill. Getting these pieces in place is making implementation much smoother.

**Have you collected any pedestrian or bicycle data (bike counts, etc.) after implementing Complete Streets? How was this done?**

We do before and after counts on any streets where we do road diets. We count vehicle, bicycle and truck volumes before and after.

**Did implementation of your Complete Streets policy include training engineers and planners? How was this done and what format did it take?**

Again, the direction came from the top (the Mayor, City Council and our Director). Many of our long time staffers who, in the past, would be adverse to Complete Streets either retired or moved to other jobs. Our new hires understand, up front, that Complete Streets implementation is part of their job. They need to be looking for ways to make the program work. We have recently hired an urban design to coordinate our Complete Streets program. Her design ability and collaboration skills are more important, in my mind, than training every engineer. You need a few champions at all levels of the organization to make implementation of Complete Streets simply the way

your organization does business. However, if your engineers don't have appropriate training re: designing streets for bicycle and pedestrian travel, I'd certainly invest in some training. The American Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals (APBP) is a good resource for training opportunities. Plenty exist. Also, [www.walkinginfo.org](http://www.walkinginfo.org) is a great resource for this work.

**What are some takeaway lessons you would offer to another local government seeking to implement its Complete Streets policy?**

Do what it takes to make Complete Streets implementation part of the way your organization does business. Look for the easy opportunities to implement changes to the roadway (e.g. as part of an already funded project or an annual program). Get design elements well in hand in advance of the project design so that the funding of Complete Streets elements is not a surprise to those who control the resources. Tie Complete Streets policy to the broader goals of Climate Health, personal health and efficient use of resources. Part of making the systemic change for Seattle is developing project prioritization criteria for all of our program areas. The projects that used to be funded out of these programs were largely determined by individual managers--the prioritization criteria was not clear or coordinated among programs. We are working hard to get these priorities in line. Also, check out our Bicycle Master Plan <http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/bikemaster.htm> and our Draft Pedestrian Master Plan [http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/pedestrian\\_masterplan/](http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/pedestrian_masterplan/) These plans are very helpful with complete streets implementation.

## ROANOKE, VA COMPLETE STREETS IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

### **What is the implementation strategy for your Complete Streets policy?**

Implementation is recognized as a long-term process through a combination of:

Larger street improvement projects (reconstruction or expansion of existing streets for increases in traffic) through the state transportation improvement process.

Street improvements through the City's capital improvement program (CIP).  
Constructing sidewalks through the City's curb gutter and sidewalk programs.  
Using the City's regular street repaving/maintenance program (opportunities to restripe street to create wide outside lanes for bicycles or separate bike lanes) Private sector development through subdivisions, rezonings and/or planned unit developments

### **What changes were made to your design manual in order to implement your Complete Streets policy?**

The City developed a set of "Street Design Guidelines" that were adopted by the City Planning Commission and then recognized in our Council adopted Complete Streets Policy. These guidelines identify Character Districts (traditional neighborhood, downtown, suburban neighborhood, industrial, etc.) and street types (arterial, collector, local) in the City. Based on the character district, street type and available/desired right-of-way the appropriate street cross-section can be determined. The guidelines and complete street policy can be found at: <http://www.roanokeva.gov/WebMgmt/ywbase61b.nsf/vwContentByKey/N27ANQJY490FGUREN>

### **Is your Complete Streets policy applied only to new roads? If not, to what extent is it applied to existing roads (retrofits) and how is this determined?**

We apply the guidelines to both new construction and existing roads. As Roanoke is largely developed/built-out we need to address existing streets if we want to have a comprehensive program. Existing streets will be addressed over time through the items identified in questions

We have also developed an internal street design team that rates potential street improvement/complete streets projects to provide a prioritization for the CIP.

### **Was your plan development process manual updated in order to implement Complete Streets? If so, how was this accomplished?**

Basically, yes - our manual was developed as part of our comprehensive plan which states that by 2020 the City will have attractively designed streets for multimodal use. A specific action called for the development of a street design manual. Once the Street Design Guidelines were adopted by our Planning Commission in 2007 we then moved to a Council adopted Complete Streets Policy to implement the guidelines (2008).

**What grants have you applied for to pursue additional funding?**

To date the only grants that we've used for Complete Streets related projects has been for Safe Routes to School projects for new sidewalks, crossings and shared use paths. The City has also used enhancement grants for greenway construction which compliments complete streets but is a separate (yet complimentary) item...

**What do you consider the primary barriers to implementation of your Complete Streets policy?**

Our two biggest challenges are 1) funding and 2) the need to work within existing rights-of-way since most of the City is built out.

**Have you collected any pedestrian or bicycle data (bike counts, etc.) after implementing Complete Streets? How was this done?**

No, although Parks & Recreation is doing this for our greenways.

**Did implementation of your Complete Streets policy include training engineers and planners? How was this done and what format did it take?**

The Planner that developed the guidelines put on internal training sessions for Public Works, transportation and Engineering. She reviewed the guidelines and looked at specific case studies on City streets. This seemed to work well.

The committee that developed the guidelines was made up of planning staff as well as the Director of Public Works, the City Engineer and our Transportation Manager, so we had pretty good buy in to the plan to start with. I believe this was critical to our success as our guidelines balance planning "ideals" with physical constraints of available right-of-way and funding constraints to come up with something that is realistic to implement.

Our street design committee also pulls in staff from Engineering, Planning, transportation, Parks & Recreation and Neighborhood Services so we have good representation/balanced perspectives.

**What are some takeaway lessons you would offer to another local government seeking to implement its Complete Streets policy?**

I think the three things to take away are:

- 1) Have guidelines that are easy to follow/use. I think our planner did a good job with the Character District/Street Hierarchy approach. You can basically look at a map and move quickly to the most appropriate cross section.
- 2) Involve all the internal stakeholders in the process of developing the design manual.
- 3) Recognize that implementation is going to be a long-term process and set up mechanisms to make sure that complete streets area reflected in development ordinances, street maintenance programs, etc.

**LOUISVILLE, KY COMPLETE STREETS IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

**What is the implementation strategy for your Complete Streets policy?**

Not answered

**What changes were made to your design manual in order to implement your Complete Streets policy?**

A document was prepared indicating various treatments based upon roadway classification. This was not incorporated into a design manual. We are looking at modifying MnDOT's Bikeway Facility Design Manual and have gained their approval to do so. Go to <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/bike/bikewaysdesignmanual.html>.

**Is your Complete Streets policy applied only to new roads? If not, to what extent is it applied to existing roads (retrofits) and how is this determined?**

It applies to all new developments and re-developments. We are requesting that the outside through lane be 14 ft in width. Once we have a contiguous section of wide lanes, we will mark with bike lanes. We are presently developing a Bicycle System Network, that once adopted will guide the installation of facilities through retrofits, development and re-development.

**Was your plan development process manual updated in order to implement Complete Streets? If so, how was this accomplished?**

No.

**What do you consider the primary barriers to implementation of your Complete Streets policy?**

Lack of training by the plan review staff.

**Have you collected any pedestrian or bicycle data (bike counts, etc.) after implementing Complete Streets? How was this done?**

We collected some counts manually prior to implementation. We are looking at automated counters, but this is still in its infancy.

**Did implementation of your Complete Streets policy include training engineers and planners? How was this done and what format did it take?**

See 5 above. We are developing training courses, but they have not been implemented and we adopted our policy February 2008.

**What are some takeaway lessons you would offer to another local government seeking to implement its Complete Streets policy?**

Training to "hit the ground running."

**DECATUR, GA COMPLETE STREETS IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

**What is the implementation strategy for your Complete Streets policy?**

Public Works staff education through training sessions on complete streets and creation of a design manual

We apply for grant funding to rebuild our streets and intersections and all plans submitted are complete streets

**What changes were made to your design manual in order to implement your Complete Streets policy?**

We don't currently have a design manual.

**Is your Complete Streets policy applied only to new roads? If not, to what extent is it applied to existing roads (retrofits) and how is this determined?**

It applies to every street

**Was your plan development process manual updated in order to implement Complete Streets? If so, how was this accomplished?**

We don't have this, but are in the process of creating one.

**What do you consider the primary barriers to implementation of your Complete Streets policy?**

Most of our major streets are controlled by GDOT. This agency does not support complete streets.

**Have you collected any pedestrian or bicycle data (bike counts, etc.) after implementing Complete Streets? How was this done?**

No. We did develop bike/ped level of service measures as part of our transportation planning process.

**Did implementation of your Complete Streets policy include training engineers and planners? How was this done and what format did it take?**

Yes, we brought in the National Complete Streets coalition to provide a training session.

**What are some takeaway lessons you would offer to another local government seeking to implement its Complete Streets policy?**

- a. Build Community support through workshops and surveys
- b. Provide training for public works staff and elected leaders
- c. Measure the current LOS for bikes/peds to give the same consideration as vehicles
- d. Utilize a health impact assessment on all road construction projects

We do not have a design manual, just conceptual plans for all our major streets and intersections. That is something we will try to develop over the upcoming year. In 90%

of the cases, city staff is not building a street or reconstructing an intersection beyond adding an ADA ramp. It is either GDOT or private contractors.

**ROSWELL, GA COMPLETE STREETS IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

**What is the implementation strategy for your Complete Streets policy?**

As the City updates its Master Plan over the next six months, we plan to address implementation of our Complete Streets policy. At this time, we simply state that when work is performed on a road, we will investigate ways to add Complete Street treatments.

**What changes were made to your design manual in order to implement your Complete Streets policy?**

None to date, except by reference to the actual policy.

**Is your Complete Streets policy applied only to new roads? If not, to what extent is it applied to existing roads (retrofits) and how is this determined?**

No. The policy states that when we do more than simple maintenance (such as pothole repair) we are to investigate the possibility of adding Complete Streets treatments. This includes striping plans or paved shoulders as appropriate.

**Was your plan development process manual updated in order to implement Complete Streets? If so, how was this accomplished?**

Not to date.

**What do you consider the primary barriers to implementation of your Complete Streets policy?**

To date, the City has not determined what facilities would be most appropriate for a bike lane vs a paved shoulder, for example, so as we go into certain corridors, it is uncertain what (if any) treatments would be appropriate for the corridor. The master Plan update should correct this.

**Have you collected any pedestrian or bicycle data (bike counts, etc.) after implementing Complete Streets? How was this done?**

Not to date.

**Did implementation of your Complete Streets policy include training engineers and planners? How was this done and what format did it take?**

No training has taken place to date.

**What are some takeaway lessons you would offer to another local government seeking to implement its Complete Streets policy?**

Make sure the policy you chose to adopt is not so vague that it looks like “political fluff” while at the same time not making the policy so specific that it forces you into a certain

direction without the support of the jurisdiction's Master Plan, CTP, or Comprehensive Plan.

## CHARLOTTE, NC COMPLETE STREETS IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

### **What is the implementation strategy for your Complete Streets policy?**

The City of Charlotte is taking a two phase approach to implementing Complete Streets. Over five years Charlotte has put together their *Urban Street Design Guidelines* which is a context sensitive design manual that provides flexibility in designing roads. The Guidelines also uses a six step planning process and applies to all city funded projects. Charlotte is currently updating its zoning code, development regulations, and subdivision regulations so that all “by right” development will be mandated to use the *Urban Street Design Guidelines* instead of encouraged.

### **What changes were made to your design manual in order to implement your Complete Streets policy?**

The *Urban Street Design Guidelines* manual was written before a formal policy was adopted. Complete Streets is integrated into the *Urban Street Design Guidelines* by providing options in road design and guided by the six step transparent planning process.

### **Is your Complete Streets policy applied only to new roads? If not, to what extent is it applied to existing roads (retrofits) and how is this determined?**

Complete Streets applies to new and modified roads.

### **Was your plan development process manual updated in order to implement Complete Streets? If so, how was this accomplished?**

All city documents that apply to Complete Streets are being updated in order to mandate use of the six step iterative planning process and *Urban Street Design Guidelines* in “by right” development.

### **What do you consider the primary barriers to implementation of your Complete Streets policy?**

It is important to have high level support during the development of policies and guidelines and transition to implementation. Coordination with State DOT can be challenging, however NCDOT has just adopted a Complete Streets Policy.

### **Have you collected any pedestrian or bicycle data (bike counts, etc.) after implementing Complete Streets? How was this done?**

Charlotte tracks how many miles of bike lanes and sidewalks have been added, but does not do bicycle or pedestrian counts.

**Did implementation of your Complete Streets policy include training engineers and planners? How was this done and what format did it take?**

This is an ongoing process. It also is important to have city engineers incorporated into the creation of the *Urban Street Design Guidelines* in order to strengthen support.

**What are some takeaway lessons you would offer to another local government seeking to implement its Complete Streets policy?**

It is important to maintain frequent and on going communication between all departments. Successful Complete Streets implementation depends heavily on public participation and a transparent and iterative planning process. Also, road design must be flexible and context sensitive so that speed, design, and classification is coordinated with surrounding land uses.

## APPENDIX C

### FUNDING SOURCES

#### Catalog of State Financial Assistance Programs

##### [State Financial Assistance Programs](#)

Published by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs  
60 Executive Park South NE  
Atlanta, GA 30329-2231  
(404) 679-4940

##### [Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality \(CMAQ\) Improvement Program](#)

Funding for projects, including certain bicycle and pedestrian projects that will reduce emissions or decrease congestion

Georgia Department of Transportation  
Office of Planning  
600 West Peachtree St NW  
Atlanta, GA 30308  
(404) 631-1783  
[PPeevy@dot.ga.gov](mailto:PPeevy@dot.ga.gov)

##### [Governor's Office of Highway Safety Grant Program](#)

Funding for bicycle and pedestrian safety, awareness and education programs

34 Peachtree St, Suite 800  
One Park Tower  
Atlanta, GA 30303  
(404) 656-6996  
Grants: [www.gohs.state.ga.us/grantapp.html](http://www.gohs.state.ga.us/grantapp.html)

##### [Land & Water Conservation Fund](#)

Includes acquisition of land for recreation, parks, and greenways

Parks, Recreation and Historic Sites Division  
2 Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr SE, Suite 1352  
Atlanta, GA 30334  
(404) 656-3830 (Grants Coordinator)

### Recreational Trails Program

Department of Natural Resources  
Parks, Recreation and Historic Sites Division  
2 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive SE, Suite 1352  
Atlanta, GA 30334  
(404) 656-3830 (Grants Coordinator)

### Safe Routes to School Program

Georgia Department of Transportation  
Office of Planning  
600 West Peachtree St NW  
Atlanta, GA 30308  
(404) 631-1775  
[srts@dot.ga.gov](mailto:srts@dot.ga.gov)

### Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program

Funding for bicycle and pedestrian facilities (e.g., sidewalks, bike lanes & trails) and education programs

Georgia Department of Transportation  
Office of Planning  
600 West Peachtree St NW  
Atlanta, GA 30308  
(404) 631-1982  
[TEAdmin@dot.ga.gov](mailto:TEAdmin@dot.ga.gov)

### **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

The Transportation Improvement Program is administered by MPOs. All federally funded transportation projects, including bicycle and pedestrian projects, must be programmed in the TIP or the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) (for non-MPO areas).

### **Funding Sources for Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects**

Bicycle and pedestrian projects are broadly eligible for funding from almost all the major Federal-aid highway, transit, safety, and other programs. Bicycle projects must be "principally for transportation, rather than recreation, purposes" and must be designed and located pursuant to the transportation plans required of States and Metropolitan Planning Organizations.

**National Highway System** funds may be used to construct bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways on land adjacent to any highway on the National Highway System, including Interstate highways. *23 USC Section 217 (b)*

**Surface Transportation Program (STP)** funds may be used for either the construction of bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways, or non-construction projects (such as maps, brochures, and public service announcements) related to safe bicycle use and walking. TEA-21 added "the modification of public sidewalks to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act" as an activity that is specifically eligible for the use of these funds. *23 USC Section 217 (a)*

Ten percent of each State's annual STP funds are set-aside for **Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEAs)**. The law provides a specific list of activities that are eligible TEAs and this includes "provision of facilities for pedestrians and bicycles, provision of safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicyclists," and the "preservation of abandoned railway corridors (including the conversion and use thereof for pedestrian and bicycle trails)." *23 USC Section 109 (a)(35)*

Another 10 percent of each State's STP funds is set-aside for the **Hazard Elimination and Railway-Highway Crossing programs**, which address bicycle and pedestrian safety issues. Each State is required to implement a Hazard Elimination Program to identify and correct locations which may constitute a danger to motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians. Funds may be used for activities including a survey of hazardous locations and for projects on any publicly owned bicycle or pedestrian pathway or trail, or any safety-related traffic calming measure. Improvements to railway-highway crossings "shall take into account bicycle safety." *23 USC Section 152*

**Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program** funds may be used for either the construction of bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways, or non-construction projects (such as maps, brochures, and public service announcements) related to safe bicycle use. *23 USC Section 217 (a)*

**Recreational Trails Program** funds may be used for all kinds of trail projects. Of the funds apportioned to a State, 30 percent must be used for motorized trail uses, 30 percent for non-motorized trail uses, and 40 percent for diverse trail uses (any combination). *23 USC Section 206*

Provisions for pedestrians and bicyclists are eligible under the various categories of the **Federal Lands Highway Program** in conjunction with roads, highways, and parkways. Priority for funding projects is determined by the appropriate Federal Land Agency or Tribal government. *23 USC Section 204*

**National Scenic Byways Program** funds may be used for "construction along a scenic byway of a facility for pedestrians and bicyclists." *23 USC Section 162 (c)(4)*

**Job Access and Reverse Commute Grants** are available to support projects, including bicycle-related services, designed to transport welfare recipients and eligible low-income individuals to and from employment. *TEA-21 Section 3037*

**High Priority Projects and Designated Transportation Enhancement Activities** identified by Section 1602 of TEA-21 include numerous bicycle, pedestrian, trail, and traffic calming projects in communities throughout the country.

#### **Bikes Belong Coalition**

Provides small grants for a variety of bicycle facility projects, education programs & advocacy efforts. Grants are typically under \$10,000 with some applicants receiving over \$25,000.

Contact Information: 1920 13th St, Suite A  
Boulder, CO 80302  
(303) 449-4893  
[www.bikesbelong.org](http://www.bikesbelong.org)

Elizabeth Train, Grants & Research Director  
[elizabeth@bikesbelong.org](mailto:elizabeth@bikesbelong.org)

#### **Federal Transit Program**

Title 49 U.S.C. (as amended by TEA-21) allows the **Urbanized Area Formula Grants, Capital Investment Grants and Loans, and Formula Program for Other than Urbanized Area** transit funds to be used for improving bicycle and pedestrian access to transit facilities and vehicles. Eligible activities include investments in "pedestrian and bicycle access to a mass transportation facility" that establishes or enhances coordination between mass transportation and other transportation. *49 USC Section 5307*

TEA-21 also created a **Transit Enhancement Activity** program with a one percent set-aside of Urbanized Area Formula Grant funds designated for, among other things, pedestrian access and walkways, and "bicycle access, including bicycle storage facilities and installing equipment for transporting bicycles on mass transportation vehicles". *49 USC Section 5307(k)*

#### **Highway Safety Programs**

Pedestrian and bicyclist safety remain priority areas for **State and Community Highway Safety Grants** funded by the Section 402 formula grant program. A State is eligible for these grants by submitting a Performance plan (establishing goals and performance measures for improving highway safety) and a Highway Safety Plan (describing activities to achieve those goals). *23 USC Section 402*

Research, development, demonstrations and training to improve highway safety (including bicycle and pedestrian safety) is carried out under the Highway Safety Research and Development (Section 403) program. **23 USC Section 403**

#### **Federal/State Matching Requirements**

In general, the Federal share of the costs of transportation projects is 80 percent with a 20 percent State or local match. However, there are a number of exceptions to this rule. Federal Lands Highway projects and Section 402 Highway Safety funds are 100 percent Federally funded. Bicycle-related Transit Enhancement Activities are 95 percent Federally funded. Hazard elimination projects are 90 percent Federally funded. Bicycle-related transit projects (other than Transit Enhancement Activities) may be up to 90 percent Federally funded.

Individual Transportation Enhancement Activity projects under the STP can have a match higher or lower than 80 percent. However, the overall Federal share of each State's Transportation Enhancement Program must be 80 percent.

States with higher percentages of Federal Lands have higher Federal shares calculated in proportion to their percentage of Federal lands.

The State and/or local funds used to match Federal-aid highway projects may include in-kind contributions (such as donations). Funds from other Federal programs may also be used to match Transportation Enhancement, Scenic Byways, and Recreational Trails program funds. A Federal agency project sponsor may provide matching funds to Recreational Trails funds provided the Federal share does not exceed 95 percent.

## APPENDIX D

### TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES

#### **PEDS ([www.peds.org](http://www.peds.org))**

PEDS is a results-oriented pedestrian advocacy organization making metro Atlanta pedestrian-friendly. PEDS supports walkable neighborhoods, healthy communities, transportation choices, and safer walking environments.

PEDS recently hosted a workshop on Designing Pedestrian Accessibility, and hosts other workshops periodically.

#### **Georgia Department of Transportation**

##### ***Local Technical Assistance Program***

The LTAP Mission is to foster a safe, efficient, environmentally sound transportation system by improving skills and knowledge of local transportation providers through training, technical assistance, and technology transfer.

The Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP) is operated out of the Technology Transfer Center (T2). Georgia's LTAP stimulates active, progressive and cost-effective transfer of highway technology and technical assistance to rural and local governments through a variety of resources including on-site training, a videotape library, workshops, newsletters and manuals, much of which is made available at no charge to local governments.

##### **National Complete Streets Coalition Workshop**

Effective complete streets policies help communities routinely create safe and inviting road networks for everyone, including bicyclists, drivers, transit operators and users, and pedestrians of all ages and abilities. The National Complete Streets Coalition has created a workshop series to respond to state and local agencies' need to learn how to balance the needs of all users, and develop and implement effective policies.

The full-day, highly interactive workshops are customized to help approximately 30 key decision makers, stakeholders, and agency professionals learn how to more effectively balance the needs of all users and routinely create and maintain complete streets. Two nationally-known complete streets design and policy experts who help participants learn:

- Why complete streets are important, what they are – and are not;
- The many avenues to complete streets;
- How complete streets can help achieve multiple transportation, health, and community goals.

These workshops take participants far beyond the typical session focused on design specifics, to an understanding of how to transform the decision-making process itself. We offer three types of hands-on workshops tailored to each client's jurisdiction or

state. For further information or to schedule a workshop or series of workshops, please contact Linda Tracy at [Linda@apbp.org](mailto:Linda@apbp.org)

**Transportation for America**

Transportation for America has formed a broad coalition of housing, business, environmental, public health, transportation, equitable development, and other organizations. We're all seeking to align our national, state, and local transportation policies with an array of issues like economic opportunity, climate change, energy security, health, housing and community development.

Transportation for American has several webinars available at (<http://t4america.org/webinars/>)