Ozarks Transportation Organization

September 20, 2006
Technical Committee Meeting

Plaster Student Union, Room 317

Missouri State University

1:30-3:30 PM

Technical Committee Meeting Agenda, September 20, 2006
Missouri State University Plaster Student Union Room 317 (Third Floor)

Call to Order .... **1:30 PM**

I.   **Administration**

    A. Approval of Technical Committee Meeting Agenda
       (2 minutes/Bingle)
       TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED

    B. Approval of July 20, 2006 Meeting Minutes .... **Tab 1**
       (2 minutes/Bingle)
       TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED

    C. Public Comment Period
       (3 minutes/Bingle)
       Individuals requesting to speak are requested to state their name and organization (if any) that they represent before making comments. Individuals and organizations have up to three minutes to address the Technical Committee.

    D. Executive Director's Report
       (3 minutes/Rudge)
       Dan Rudge will provide a review of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) staff activities since the July Technical Committee meeting.

II.   **New Business**

    A. Functional Classification Map
       (15 minutes/Rudge, Edwards and Miller)
       The region's Functional Classification map has not been updated since 2000. As part of the MPO's Triennial Review, it was recommended that the functional classification map be updated to reflect changes to roadway classifications throughout the region. The Functional Classification map differs from the Major Thoroughfare Plan in that the Functional Classification Map represents how the roadway functions today. The Major Thoroughfare Plan map represents how the roadway is anticipated to function at the end of the Long-Range Transportation Plan cycle. MPO staff, in association with local jurisdictions, met on several occasions to prepare a revised map that accurately portrays the existing functional classification for each roadway in the OTO service area. As a result of this update, several roads will become eligible for STP-Urban and other federal and state funding categories. (Due to database merging problems, the revised Functional Classification Map will not be available for review until the Technical Committee

meeting. At the meeting, some decisions may be necessary to ensure that FHWA guidelines for functional class designations are met.)

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED TO RECOMMEND THE OZARKS TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATION'S FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MAP TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR ADOPTION OR TO RETURN THE MAP TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE FOR FURTHER FINE TUNING.

B. **Establishment of MPO Priority Roadways**... Tab 2
(10 minutes/Rudge)
While the MPO Board has established a list of five priority projects, it is typical for MPOs to designate priority roadways for both long-range planning corridor studies and for potential spot improvements in the MoDOT scoping and preliminary design process. By adopting a series of priority corridors, the MPO can also better direct where regional funds can be focused when the Board is not the lead in establishing funding priorities. (Materials Attached.)

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED TO RECOMMEND THE PRIORITY ROADWAYS TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR ADOPTION.

C. **US 60/65 Interchange TIP Amendment Request** .... Tab 3
(10 minutes/Edwards)
Each year, the MPO receives an apportionment for bridge repair projects for bridges located on the MoDOT roadway system. The FY04-FY06 on-system bridge funds have yet to be programmed for projects and the unencumbered balance exceeds $650,000. Because of MPO priorities, staff is recommending that the unspent FY04-FY06 On-System Bridge funds be designated for use on the US60/US65 Interchange project where two Condition Three bridges need replacement. (Materials Attached.)

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS ON AMENDING THE TIP TO PROGRAM FY04-FY06 ON-SYSTEM BRIDGE FUNDS FOR USE ON THE US60/US65 INTERCHANGE PROJECT. IF RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING; THAT STAFF PREPARE A PRESS RELEASE PURSUANT TO THE MPO'S PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS SO THAT A 15 DAY PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD FOR THE TIP AMENDMENT CAN BE CONDUCTED AND COMMENTS RECEIVED PRIOR TO THE OCTOBER BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING.

D. **Unspent Urban STP Balances** .... Tab 4
(10 minutes/Rudge and Miller)
Recently, MPO staff received e-mail communication from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) regarding the need to program unused Urban STP funds or risk having those funds be redistributed to other metropolitan areas. However, MoDOT has informed MPO staff that there is not a threat to our region's Urban STP funds. MPO staff will discuss each eligible jurisdictions unspent Urban STP balances and MoDOT

staff will recap their discussions with FHWA regarding the status of unprogrammed Urban STP funds. (Materials Attached.)

NO ACTION APPEARS TO BE REQUIRED. THIS AGENDA ITEM IS FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

    F. Update on the North-South Corridor Study
       (10 minutes/Edwards)
       MPO staff member Sara Edwards will provide an overview on the status of the North-South Corridor Study.

III. Other Business

    A. Technical Committee Member Announcements
       (5 minutes/Technical Committee Members)
       Members are encouraged to announce transportation events being scheduled that may be of interest to MPO Technical Committee members.

    B. Transportation Issues For Technical Committee Member Review
       (5 minutes/Technical Committee Members)
       Members are encouraged to raise transportation issues or concerns that they have for future agenda items or later in-depth discussion by the MPO Technical Committee.

    C. Information Items .... **Tab 5**
       (Articles attached.)

IV. Adjournment
    Targeted for 3:00 P.M. Next Technical Committee meeting scheduled for Wednesday, November 15, 2006 at 1:30 PM at the Missouri State University Plaster Student Union.

DR/dr
Attachments and Enclosure

Pc: Tom Carlson, MPO Chair Designee, Mayor, City of Springfield
       David Coonrod, MPO Vice-Chair, Greene County Presiding Commissioner
       Ms. Donna McQuay, Immediate Past-Chair of MPO, Mayor, City of Nixa
       Stacy Burks, Senator Bond's Office
       Terry Campbell, Senator Talent's Office
       Steve McIntosh, Congressmen Blunt's Office
       Area News Media

MEETING MINUTES

Attached for Technical Committee member review are the minutes from the last Technical Committee meeting. Please review these minutes prior to our meeting and note any corrections that need to be made. The Chair will ask during the meeting if any Technical Committee member has any amendments to the attached minutes.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED: To make any necessary corrections to the minutes and then approve the minutes for public review.

The Technical Planning Committee of the Ozarks Transportation Organization met at its scheduled time of 1:30-3:30 p.m., at the Missouri State University Plaster Student Union (East Ballroom, 3rd Floor).

The following members were present:

Mr. Brian Bingle, City of Nixa (Chair)	Mr. Kevin Lambeth, City of Battlefield
Mr. Earl Newman, City of Springfield	Mr. Frank Miller, MoDOT
Mr. Gary Snavely, Missouri State University	Mr. Duffy Mooney, Greene Co. Highway Department
Mr. Fred Gress, City of Willard	Mr. Wally Schrock, City of Republic
Mr. Andy Furedy, City of Springfield	Ms. Natasha Longpine, SMCOG
Ms. Carol Cruise, City Utilities	Mr. Bill Robinett, MoDOT
Mr. David Hutchison, City of Springfield	Mr. Roger Howard, Burlington Northern Railroad
Mr. Steve Childers, City of Ozark	Mr. Marc Thornsberry, City of Springfield
Mr. Ryan Mooney, Chamber of Commerce	Mr. Andy Mueller, MoDOT
Mr. Terry Whaley, Ozark Greenways	Mr. Harry Price, City of Springfield (a)
Mr. Bob Atchley, Christian Co. Planning & Zoning	
Mr. Joel Keller, Greene Co. Planning Department	

The following members were not present:

Mr. John Vicat, City of Strafford	Mr. Gary Cyr, Airport
Mr. Kent Morris, Greene County	Mr. Jim Dow, Springfield R-12 Schools
Mr. Brad McMahon, FHWA	Mr. Mike Tettamble, Jr., Trucking Representative
Mr. Mokhtee Ahmad, FTA	Mr. Dan Smith, Greene Co. Highway Dept. (Chair Elect)
Mr. Thomas Coates, FAA	

Others present were: Carl Carlson, Scott Consulting Engineers; Kyle Kittrell, TranSystems; Mike McKenna, Olsson Associates; Dan Watts, SMCOG; Steve McIntosh, Congressman Roy Blunt's office; Dan Rudge, Sara Edwards and Kim Cook, Ozarks Transportation Organization.

Mr. Bingle called the July 19, 2006 Technical Planning Committee Meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

I. Administration

A. Approval of Technical Committee Meeting Agenda
Mr. Robinett motioned to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Gress seconded, and the motion was carried unanimously.

B. Approval of March 15, 2006 Meeting Minutes
Mr. Robinett noted that the minutes inaccurately listed Steve McIntosh as working for Senator Blunt instead of Congressman Blunt's office.
Mr. Miller asked that the minutes reflect his change voiced at the last meeting, which was to reword 60 West Bypass to US 60 West relocation.
Mr. Thornsberry motioned to approve the March meeting minutes as amended. Mr. Price seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

C. Public Comment Period
No one from the public spoke.

D. Executive Director's Report
Mr. Rudge reported that MPO staff conducted an all day bus survey for the transit development plan. Despite high temperatures and a 5:00 a.m.– midnight schedule, overall everything went smoothly.

Mr. Rudge reported that the Safe Route to Schools Advisory Committee had asked him to write a letter to the Safe Route to Schools State Coordinator expressing Advisory Committee concerns with how the program was moving forward. A conference call had been scheduled for Thursday. Mr. Thornsberry questioned what concerns the Safe Route to Schools Advisory Committee had. Mr. Rudge stated that there currently was not any objective criteria to determine what projects would be funded and which would not be funded. Also the Committee wanted to require people that apply for the funds to develop a Safe Route to Schools plan and the Coordinator wanted to be able to just give out the funds.

Mr. Rudge reported that the Board approved all Technical Committee recommendations at its April meeting and that no Board meeting was conducted in June.

Mr. Rudge announced that the replacement of planner Davonna Morgan would be Technical Committee Member, Natasha Longpine from SMCOG. She will begin on July 24, 2006 and the MPO is happy to have her join our team. Mr. Rudge also announced the addition of Kim Cook as administrative assistant, who replaced Danee Avery.

II. New Business

A. Consideration of the FY 2007-2010 Transportation Improvement Program
Ms. Edwards reported that in the past the TIP has had a three year horizon to remain in conformance with federal law. With the passage of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), the TIP must now be based on a four year cycle.

Ms. Edwards reported that a few minor changes have been made to TIP and are as follows:
• Enhancements (Page C6) adding College Station Phase III moving it out of 06 and into 07. The funding changed, using CDBG money. Overall change to dollar amount is within $2,000.00.
• Transit Program (Page E6) Some #'s have changed with the Bus Transfer Facility.
• Transit Program (Page E19) Intermodal Transfer-Facility Parking-Deck. This is a new page. City Utilities and the Intermodal Transfer Facility were listed as one project but now they are separate.

Ms. Edwards presented reviews from FHWA & MoDOT. Minor modifications were made to clarify financial reports, review language and projections.

Ms. Edwards presented a summary of total funding in the TIP broken down by categories. There is approximately $341 million total in the FY 2007-2010 TIP. Also, on the enhancements projects, the OTO received 13 applicants and 11 of the 13 were able to be funded. The total amount available for enhancements was about $1.7 million. All but $8,000 was able to be programmed.

Mr. Thornsberry questioned as to why (D9) showed St. Louis incomplete.

Ms. Edwards stated that the item should be corrected to show the project complete.

Mr. Miller requested that the TIP reflect MoDOT changes for ITS project job numbers to begin with AQ instead of AP.

Mr. Rudge commended the work of Senator's Bond and Talent, and Congressman Blunt for providing federal funding for key regional projects. Mr. Rudge asked the representatives present to please pass on the OTO's gratitude.

Ms. Edwards requested that the FY 2007-2010 TIP be recommended to the Board of Directors for adoption. If recommended for approval to include the following; staff prepare a press release pursuant to the MPO's public involvement process so that a 15 day public review period for the TIP can be conducted and comments received prior to the August Board of Directors meeting.

Ms. Cruise made a motion to recommend the FY 2007-2010 TIP to the Board of Directors for approval. Mr. Miller seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

B. **Missouri Department of Transportation STIP Adoption Request**

Mr. Rudge stated that every year, MoDOT adopts a Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). As part of its efforts to continue to work closely with its planning partners, MoDOT has requested a portion of the STIP covering the OTO service area be adopted by the MPO.

Mr. Miller reported the STIP is mostly an update from last year's program. A few scoping projects were added as the first phase of bringing a project forward.

Mr. Childers made a motion to recommend the STIP to the Board of Directors for adoption. Mr. Gress seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

C. **Designated Recipient for FTA Section 5307, 5316, 5317 Funds**

As part of Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), two new funding categories were revised from discretionary to formula funding as it relates to FTA programs. Under federal requirements, all FTA formula funds must have one designated recipient to receive and administer these funds. In the past, Section 5307 funds were the only formula funds received in the OTO service area and the designated recipient was City Utilities Transit. The FTA has requested that the MPO revise their designated recipient resolution to include the new Section 5316 (Job Access Reverse Commute or JARC) and Section 5317 (New Freedoms Initiative). As before, the MPO would develop selection criteria and rate and rank the funding request submissions. Mr. Rudge added that the OTO would form a special subcommittee should any disputes arise between City Utilities Transit and the applicant or recipients.

Mr. Snavely made a motion to recommend the revised Designated Recipient resolution to the Board of Directors for adoption. Mr. Thornsberry seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

D. **Long-Range Transportation Plan Citizen Comment Review**
    Mr. Rudge reported that as part of the Long-Range Transportation Process, federal regulations require that significant public comments must be reviewed and considered by the Board of Directors before adoption of the plan. At the April Board meeting, staff shared six significant public comments with the Board. The Board determined that five comments were adequately addressed by staff and the Long-Range Plan Subcommittee and no additional action was required on those comments. The sixth comment involves extensive revisions to the Major Thoroughfare Plan in and around Republic. Since the last Board meeting, the City of Republic has decided to table consideration of these revisions until a later date. However, because the comment involves the Major Thoroughfare Plan the Technical Committee needs to decide if it would like to review the suggested revisions or table them until the City of Republic decides to re-consider the recommendations.

    Mr. Rudge requested to either form a subcommittee to review the Major Thoroughfare Plan revisions or to table the review until the City of Republic decides to revisit the recommendations.

    Mr. Schrock made a motion to table the review until the City of Republic decides to revisit the recommendations. Mr. Childers seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

E. **Selection of Additional Priority Subcommittee**
    Mr. Rudge stated that as of June this year all five of our regional priority projects are either in scoping, design, or construction. As a result, MoDOT has requested that the MPO consider developing a short list of other priority projects so that MoDOT can use this list to determine which projects should begin the scoping process. Our original priority projects would remain as our top five priorities until such time as construction on them is complete.

    Mr. Rudge suggested we develop an Additional Priority Subcommittee to create the requested list of possible priority projects.

    Mr. Bingle questioned as to what the difference is between scoping and preliminary design. Mr. Mueller stated that scoping is what comes first. We are determining what the need is so we can decide what the project will be. Preliminary design is where we already have an idea that the need is there and we can get somebody on board to handle environmental clearances, etc.

    Mr. Bingle asked for volunteers for the subcommittee and those members that volunteered were: Mr. Steve Childers, Mr. Wally Schrock, Mr. Fred Gress, Mr. Marc Thornsberry, Mr. Duffy Mooney, Mr. Ryan Mooney, Mr. Brian Bingle, Mr. Earl Newman and Mr. Bob Atchley.

F. **Functional Classification Map Subcommittee**
    As part of the MPO's Triennial Review Process, it was recommended that MoDOT, in consultation with the OTO, update its Functional Classification Map. The roadway Functional Classification Map differs from the Major Thoroughfare Plan Map in that the adopted Major Thoroughfare Plan Map represents what functional classification each roadway will be in 2030. The Functional Classification Map represents what type of roadway currently exists as built.

    Mr. Miller reported that originally the intent was to update the Functional Classification Map every three years. However, it has now been six years since the last update.

    Mr. Rudge requested that a subcommittee be formed to update the Functional Classification Map.

Mr. Bingle asked for volunteers and those members that volunteered were: Mr. Steve Childers, Mr. Brian Bingle, Mr. Bob Atchley, Mr. Frank Miller, Mr. Joel Keller, Mr. Wally Schrock, Mr. Earl Newman and Mr. David Hutchison.

G. Update on the North-South Corridor Study

Mr. Mike McKenna with Olsson Associates reported that they have completed collecting data, conducting agency meetings and public meetings for the North-South Corridor Study. They will begin processing all the data and review information from meetings, etc.

Mr. McKenna asked what time frame/process of review for the preliminary study would need to take place. Mr. Rudge stated that Olsson Associates would need to submit the preliminary study a minimum of one week prior to the next Committee meeting to allow time to review the study before the meeting.

Mr. McKenna stated that the study will be submitted for review one week or more before the September 20, 2006 Technical Committee meeting.

III.   Other Business

A. Technical Committee Member Announcements

Mr. Thornsberry wanted to compliment MoDOT for their acceleration of the Smooth Roads program and the fact that they really have saved the taxpayers money.

Mr. Miller wanted to welcome Mr. Atchley to the Committee.

B. Transportation Issues for Technical Committee Member Review
None.

C. Information Items
None.

IV. Adjournment

Mr. Robnett made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Schrock seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

The next scheduled meeting of the Technical Committee has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 20, 2006, 1:30 – 3:30 p.m., Plaster Student Union, Missouri State University.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE AGENDA 09/06; ITEM II.B

Establishment of MPO Priority Roadways

Ozarks Transportation Organization
(Springfield, MO Area MPO)

AGENDA DESCRIPTION: At the last Technical Committee meeting, a subcommittee was formed to recommend an additional set of priority projects to provide direction for the Board of Directors and MoDOT in determining what projects should be next in line for scoping and preliminary design. This would allow the MPO to select projects based on regional priorities rather than having the Board react to individual requests from citizen-based or business groups.

After some debate, the subcommittee agreed that instead of establishing a list of priority projects, the MPO should establish a list of priority corridors. These corridors would be selected based on what corridors where most important in facilitating regional movement and connecting the region to other parts of the state and nation. Because the corridors are set as priorities, long-range planning studies could also be targeted at improving the movement of people and goods over the long-range plan horizon. The list identifies five existing priority corridors including known locations where spot improvements could improve regional traffic flow. In addition, the route for the new North-South corridor is included on the list. By adopting a series of priority corridors, the MPO can better direct where regional funds should be directed when the Board of Directors is not the lead in establishing funding priorities.

SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The subcommittee carefully considered multiple travel corridors and selected these five priorities based on their importance for regional travel and for connectivity to other parts of the state and nation. The subcommittee unanimously recommends these corridors to the full technical committee.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED: To either recommend the list of MPO Priority Roadways for Scoping and Preliminary Design to the Board of Directors for adoption or to return the list to the subcommittee for further consideration.

OTO Scoping and Preliminary Design High Priority Corridors

US 65 – Capacity Improvements to Include Six Lanes from I-44 to Route 14
> Interchange improvements at Chestnut and US 65 including RR grade separation
> Interchange improvements at Battlefield and US 65
> Interchange improvements at Route 14 and US 65

US 60 – Capacity Improvements
> Interchange improvements at National Avenue and James River Freeway
> Interchange improvements at James River Freeway and Campbell Avenue
> Upgrade to Freeway from US 65 through Rogersville
> US 60 West Relocation Study (MPO portion of US 60/SR37 from AR to JRF)

I-44 – Capacity Improvements
> Interchange improvements at Route 13 and I-44
> Interchange Improvements at Route 266 and I-44

US 160 – Capacity Improvements
> Capacity improvements from Springfield to Willard
> Capacity improvements from James River Freeway south through Nixa.

Route 14 – Capacity Improvements
> Capacity improvements from Business 65 in Ozark to US 160 in Nixa
> Bridge Widening over 65

Selected North South Corridor resulting from Study

The above list was not developed in order to preempt the scoping or development of existing projects. The existing scoping projects, which are listed below, appear in the 2007-2010 Transportation Improvement Program. These projects listed below remain a priority. The list above was developed to direct future scoping decisions, when additional resources become available.

Existing Scoping Projects

MoDOT Job #	Route	Project Description
8S0736	RT CC	Grading, widening, resurfacing and minor realignment from Route 160 to Route 65.
8P0588	MO 14	Grading, widening, resurfacing and minor realignment from west of Main Street in Nixa to west of Route 65.
8P0786	MO 14	Scoping for roadway safety improvements at Tiffany/Majestic Oak Drive in Nixa.
8P0605	US 65	Improve system efficiency and capacity from Valley Water Mill in Springfield to Route F in Ozark
8S0724	RT H	Scoping to determine needs at interchange and intersections on Rte. H from north of

		FR102 (Valley Water Mill) to south of I-44
8S0835	RT M	Add turn lanes, signal at Republic High School
8S0795	New	Scoping for needs of new access road to serve new Midfield terminal at Springfield/Branson National Airport
8P0760	Var	Scoping for Advanced Transportation Management System at MoDOT's at various routes in Springfield area
8P0858	Var	Repair guardrail in the Ozarks Transportation Boundary
8P0683D	US 60	Scoping for corridor preservation for US 60/J/NN interchange with corresponding outer roads from w/o Highland Springs Rd. to e/o Farm Road 213
8P0683E	US 60	Scoping for corridor preservation for interchange and outer roads from west of FR213 to FR247
8P0683B	US 60	Rebuild interchange and replace cloverleaf with directional ramps at Route 60/65 interchange in southeast Springfield
8P0791	US 60	PE to determine intersection needs at James River Freeway and National in Springfield
8P0792	US 60	PE to determine intersection needs at James River Freeway and Route 160/13 (Campbell) in Springfield
8PO789	BU 65	PE to determine intersection needs at Glenstone and Primrose in Springfield
8P0850	US 65	Scoping to improve interchange capacity at Rte. Business 65 (Chestnut Expressway)
8P0841	MO 13	Scoping to improve interchange capacity at I-44
8S0851	MO 266	Scoping to improve capacity on Chestnut Expressway at I-44 interchange and between I-44 and Route AB
8S0790	MO 744	PE to determine intersection needs at Kearney and National in Springfield
8S0852	MO 744	Scoping to determine pavement rehabilitation needs from Route 65 to Route OO
8I0860	I-44	Repair guard cable in the Ozarks Transportation Organization boundary
8I0862	I-44	Repair guard cable in the Ozarks Transportation Organization boundary
8P0896	US 160	Scoping to improve intersection capacity at Hughes Road in Willard

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE AGENDA 09/06; ITEM II.C

US 60/US65 On-System Bridge TIP Amendment Request

Ozarks Transportation Organization
(Springfield, MO Area MPO)

AGENDA DESCRIPTION: Each year, the MPO receives an apportionment for repair projects for bridges on the MoDOT roadway system. The FY04-FY06 on-system bridge funds have yet to be programmed for projects and the unencumbered balance exceeds $650,000. While there are a number of bridges that qualify for these funds, staff believes that on-system bridge funds should be used on MPO priority projects that have a Condition Three bridge included in the project area.

The US60/US65 Interchange Project contains two Condition Three bridges. In order to complete the project, MoDOT has phased the project and is exploring funding options for future phases. Currently, renovation for one of the Condition Three bridges is in a later phase of the project and funding is contingent on how low the construction bids are for earlier phases.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Since the request is using unencumbered funds and would be used on a top five MPO priority project, staff recommends approval of the TIP amendment request.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED: To either recommend the US 60/US65 TIP amendment to the Board of Directors for approval or to form a special subcommittee to further study the issue. If recommended for approval include the following; that staff prepare a press release pursuant to the MPO's Public Involvement Process so that a 15 day public review period for TIP amendments can be conducted and comments received prior to the February Board of Directors meeting.

CITY OF SPRINGFIELD (Incorporated City Limits)

FY2008

Traffic Signal/Traffic Calming Annual Program 2007-2010 ....TIP #SP0801
Install one new signal annually or replace and maintain signal system.

Work or Fund Category: Design/ROW/Construction

Local (City of Springfield ¼ cent sales tax): $400,000
TOTAL FY2008: $400,000

* *This project is subject to voter approval*

FY2009

US 60/65 (MoDOT Project #8P0683C) ....TIP # SP0626
Interchange and Ramp Improvements at Route 60/65. Amendment 3 Major Project

MoDOT Funding Category: Major Projects
Work or Fund Category: Construction

Previous Funding: $3,721,000
MoDOT: $44,694,000
TOTAL FY2009: 44,694,000
Total Project: $48,415,000

This project is subject to the State Legislature approval for bonding.

Traffic Signal/Traffic Calming Annual Program 2007-2010 ....TIP #SP0801
Install one new signal annually or replace and maintain signal system.

Work or Fund Category: Design/ROW/Construction

Local (City of Springfield ¼ cent sales tax): $400,000
TOTAL FY2009: $400,000

* *This project is subject to voter approval*

Route 65 (MoDOT #8P0897) .... TIP #SP0901
Rebuild northbound bridge A0647 over Route 60 in southeast Springfield. To be let in combination with 8P0683C and 8P0898.

Federal Source Agency: FHWA
Federal Funding Category: Bridge
MoDOT Funding Category: Taking Care of System
Work or Fund Category: Construction

FHWA: $3,304,800
MoDOT: $826,200
Total FY2009: 4,131,000

Route 60 (MoDOT #8P0898) .... TIP #SP0902
Redeck and widen westbound bridge L-5142 over James River/Lake Springfield in southeast Springfield. To be let in combination with 8P0683C and 8P0897.

Federal Source Agency: FHWA
Federal Funding Category: STP/BRM
MoDOT Funding Category: Taking Care of System
Work or Fund Category: Construction

FHWA (STP): $4,189,949
FHWA (BRM): $654,051
MoDOT: $1,211,000
Total FY2009: $6,055,000

FINANCIAL SUMMARY
--Highways/ Roads--
2009

PROJECT	FEDERAL						MoDOT	Local	Total
	STP Urban	STP	NHS	BRIDGE	ITS	TOTAL			
GR0901						$0	$180,000		$180,000
NX0901						$0		$3,297,050	$3,297,050
NX0902						$0		$1,296,750	$1,296,750
SP0626						$0	$44,694,000		$44,694,000
SP0801						$0		$400,000	$400,000
SP0901		$3,304,800				$3,304,800	$826,000		$4,131,000
SP0902		$4,189,949		$654,051		$4,844,000	$1,211,000		$6,055,000
MO0901						$0	$173,000		$173,000
MO0902		$444,000				$444,000	$111,000		$555,000
MO0903		$548,800				$548,800	$137,200	$454,873	$1,140,873
TOTAL	$0	$8,487,549	$0	$654,051	$0	$9,141,600	$47,332,200	$5,448,673	$61,922,473

FINANCIAL SUMMARY
--Highways/ Roads--
FINANCIAL CONSTRAINTS

	FEDERAL						MoDOT	Local	Total
	STP Urban	STP	NHS	BRIDGE	ITS	TOTAL			
2007 Anticipated	$14,893,603	$9,266,894	$12,183,200	$1,613,600	$596,862	$38,554,159	$32,066,890	$20,323,485	$90,944,534
2007 Programmed	$4,050,400	$9,266,894	$12,183,200	$1,613,600	$596,862	$27,710,956	$32,066,890	$20,323,485	$80,101,331
Balance	$10,843,203	$0	$0	$0	$0	$10,843,203	$0	$0	$10,843,203
2008 Anticipated*	$2,853,954	$4,095,886	$4,750,000	$2,151,200	$739,656	$14,590,696	$7,439,685	$13,588,597	$35,618,978
2008 Programmed	$6,661,284	$4,095,886	$4,750,000	$2,151,200	$739,656	$18,398,026	$7,439,685	$13,588,597	$39,426,308
Balance	-$3,807,330	$0	$0	$0	$0	-$3,807,330	$0	$0	-$3,807,330
2009 Anticipated*	$2,853,954	$8,487,549	$0	$654,051	$0	$11,995,554	$47,332,200	$5,448,673	$64,776,427
2009 Programmed	$0	$8,487,549	$0	$654,051	$0	$9,141,600	$47,332,200	$5,448,673	$61,922,473
Balance	$2,853,954	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,853,954	$0	$0	$2,853,954
2010 Anticipated*	$2,853,954	$2,199,200	$0	$0	$0	$5,053,154	$549,800	$9,439,769	$15,042,723
2010 Programmed	$0	$2,199,200	$0	$0	$0	$2,199,200	$549,800	$9,439,769	$12,188,769
Balance	$2,853,954	$0	$0	$0	$0	$2,853,954	$0	$0	$2,853,954

TOTAL BALANCE REMAINING 2007-2010   **$12,743,780**

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE AGENDA 09/06; ITEM II.D

Unspent Urban STP Balances

Ozarks Transportation Organization
(Springfield, MO Area MPO)

AGENDA DESCRIPTION: Recently, MPO staff received e-mail communication from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) regarding the need to program unused Urban STP funds or risk having those funds be redistributed to other metropolitan areas. However, MoDOT has informed MPO staff that there is not a threat to our region's Urban STP funds. MPO staff will discuss each eligible jurisdictions unspent Urban STP balances and MoDOT staff will recap their discussions with FHWA regarding the status of unprogrammed Urban STP funds.

The correspondence suggests that unobligated Urban STP balances must be explained so that FHWA can complete its due diligence regarding STP balances as required under SAFETEA-LU. Also according to the correspondence, Missouri is not one of the states considered to be in non-compliance with the requirement. Staff has therefore placed this item on the agenda so that each of the MPO jurisdictions is aware of the requirements, what corrective actions are necessary, if any, and what consequences there may be if Urban STP funds are not obligated.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ACTION REQUESTED: None. This agenda item is for informational purposes only.

Memorandum

U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Highway
Administration**

Subject:	**ACTION**: Funds Suballocated to Urbanized Areas Over 200,000 Population
	Date: August 7, 2006

	/Original signed by C. J. Burbank (for)/	Reply to	
From:	Frederick G. Wright, Jr.	Attn. of:	HEP-2
	Executive Director		

To: Division Administrators

The purpose of this memorandum is to direct your attention to 23 U.S.C. 133(f), as amended by SAFETEA-LU. This provision requires States to make obligation authority (OA) available for funds suballocated to urbanized areas over 200,000 population over two 3-year periods - FYs 2004-2006 and 2007-2009. Section 133(f)(2) specifies that it is the joint responsibility of each State, each affected MPO and the Secretary of Transportation to ensure compliance with this provision. Attachment 1 includes notes on this provision that may be helpful to you.

Section 133(f) applies to all States except Alaska and Hawaii (which have a legislative exemption) and those States that do not have any urbanized areas with a population over 200,000 (Maine, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming). Puerto Rico is also excepted from 133(f). Since enactment of ISTEA, the 41 affected States have been required to make OA available to these urbanized areas at the same rate that the States receive OA. (Idaho was not covered by this requirement until FY 2003.)

Attachments 2 and 3 are FMIS reports M89A and M83A that show the status of obligations of suballocated funds as of June 30, 2006. The data in these reports are cumulative beginning with FY 1992, except for Idaho which only has had suballocated STP funds beginning with FY 2003. More current data can be obtained by running these reports in FMIS.

The M89A report shows the "target" amount of OA that each State must "make available" to urbanized areas with population over 200,000 and the amount of suballocated funds actually obligated. They do not show the OA a State may have made available that an urbanized area did not use. For example, an area may choose to accumulate annual apportionments for a large project to be developed in a later year or may have a project going through the environmental process for which funds and OA will not be needed until some future year. Thus, the tables should be used as only one indication of whether the States have made the obligation authority available.

The M89A shows that as of June 30, nine States (Alabama, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Virginia) have obligated less than 85 percent and 16 States (Arkansas, California, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, and Washington) have obligated between 85 to 95 percent of their target amounts.

FHWA oversight of the provisions of 23 USC 133(f) is important. To fulfill our oversight responsibilities, Divisions in these 25 States should discuss this matter with the State and MPOs and facilitate an agreement as to how and when the remaining suballocated funds will eventually be obligated or an agreement among the affected organizations that the OA was "made available," but not used by the MPO(s). Please advise Tony Solury in HEP by August 25 as to whether such an agreement has been reached and what the agreement indicates so that FHWA can be responsive if this question arises in the coming months. Attachment 4 is a form that may facilitate your response.

If you have any questions about Section 133(f), please feel free to contact Tony at 202-366-5003.

Attachments (4)

cc: Directors of Field Services

FHWA:HEP-2:TSolury:65003:8/2/2006
bcc: HEP-1, HEPP-1, HCF-1, HCF-1, HCF-30, HIF-1, HAD-1, HCC-30, TPL-1

NOTES FOR DIVISIONS ON 23 USC 133(f)

1. Section 133(f) of title 23, U.S.C. applies to suballocated STP funds and any additions to the STP or apportionment adjustments (Hold Harmless, 90 percent of Payment Adjustments, Interstate Reimbursement, Donor State Bonus, Minimum Guarantee, and Equity Bonus) that are subject to the suballocation provisions of Section 133(d). It does not apply to pre-TEA-21 Minimum Allocation funds that were not subject to the obligation limitation.

2. This requirement can not be met by counting the obligation of other categories of Federal-aid funds (e.g., CMAQ, NHS, HBRRP, etc) obligated within these urbanized areas.

3. It is recognized that a variety of factors affect the information over time and can result in an appearance of a problem in complying with Section 133(f) when no problem may exist. For example, because of the way projects are advanced, the amount obligated changes daily. Further, with the additional apportionments and obligation authority made available each FY, obligation percentages are naturally lower at the beginning of a FY than at the end. Other reasons for low obligation rates of suballocated funds need to be considered on a State-by-State and individual urbanized area basis.

4. If the "Percent of Target Obligated" in the M89A for a State is close to or above 100 percent, it would imply that the State is complying with this provision. However, since the provision needs to be complied with for each separate urbanized area, the data in the M83A report should be reviewed for each urbanized area to determine if corrective action may be needed in a specific area.

5. The M83A does not include the percent OA received or the obligation target for each urbanized area. To calculate the percent of the obligation target that has been obligated for an area, it will be necessary to multiply the total obligations for the area in the M83A by the percent OA that the State has received from the second column of the M89A and then divide the total obligations for the area to date by this target amount.

Report on Status of Suballocated Funds
[23 U.S.C. 133(f)]

State:

Report Prepared by:

Date of Report:

Urbanized Area	% of Target Obligated	Obligation Shortfall	Comments/Findings*

* Please indicate if the State and MPO agree that the OA was made available to the urbanized area, why the funds have not been obligated, and add any other explanatory material that would be helpful.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

STATUS OF FUNDS FOR STP, HH, 90% PAYMENT, I-REIMBURSEMENT, FUNDING RESTORATION, FAUS,
MINIMUM ALLOCATION, AND DONOR STATE BONUS
URBANIZED AREAS OF 200,000 OR MORE POPULATION
FY 1992 - 2006

AS OF JUNE 30, 2006

Attachment 2

STATE	TOTAL URBANIZED AREA SUBALLOCATIONS	PERCENT OBLIGATION AUTHORITY	OBLIGATION TARGET	OBLIGATIONS TO DATE	PERCENT OF TARGET OBLIGATED	OBLIGATION SHORT FALL	FY 2006 OBLIGATION AUTHORITY
ALABAMA	266,429,689.00	94.07	250,630,408.44	185,740,353.64	74.11	64,890,054.80	487,674,721.10
ARIZONA	576,023,188.00	93.83	540,482,557.30	519,115,164.49	96.05	21,367,392.81	429,947,875.47
ARKANSAS	85,873,986.00	93.80	80,549,798.87	69,981,172.00	86.88	10,568,626.87	303,732,302.00
CALIFORNIA	2,743,310,051.91	92.97	2,550,455,355.26	2,250,156,428.88	88.23	300,298,926.38	2,182,979,178.11
COLORADO	373,804,573.00	93.96	351,226,776.79	288,587,231.34	82.17	62,639,545.45	310,455,856.00
CONNECTICUT	326,649,466.00	95.27	311,198,946.26	321,069,324.30	103.17	-9,870,378.04	335,875,201.98
DELAWARE	151,930,949.00	93.71	142,374,492.31	142,930,149.99	100.39	-555,657.68	101,981,029.33
DIST. OF COL.	196,073,863.83	93.88	184,074,143.36	195,200,206.50	106.04	-11,126,063.14	113,565,135.24
FLORIDA	1,647,987,179.00	93.68	1,543,834,389.29	1,341,452,957.00	86.89	202,381,432.29	1,117,223,522.00
GEORGIA	633,458,108.00	93.37	591,459,835.44	563,217,705.35	95.23	28,242,130.09	758,673,728.09
IDAHO	21,652,005.00	93.50	20,244,624.68	16,249,571.00	80.27	3,995,053.68	178,081,202.00
ILLINOIS	1,114,718,755.00	93.69	1,044,380,001.56	1,013,267,581.70	97.02	31,112,419.86	843,794,540.09
INDIANA	458,848,008.61	93.46	428,839,348.85	396,763,893.43	92.52	32,075,455.42	583,749,358.00
IOWA	106,563,472.00	94.12	100,297,539.85	81,225,720.73	80.98	19,071,819.12	286,477,812.67
KANSAS	206,830,433.00	94.51	195,475,442.23	182,157,102.11	93.19	13,318,340.12	289,668,067.67
KENTUCKY	243,521,299.00	93.88	228,617,795.50	220,867,703.03	96.61	7,750,092.47	379,333,688.00
LOUISIANA	267,770,960.99	95.17	254,837,623.57	272,745,205.40	107.03	-17,907,581.83	403,662,778.79
MARYLAND	481,031,765.00	94.34	453,805,367.10	474,044,553.38	104.46	-20,239,186.28	373,505,729.88
MASSACHUSETTS	557,913,772.00	96.90	540,618,445.07	519,417,047.08	96.08	21,201,397.99	447,571,325.33
MICHIGAN	824,829,406.00	93.59	771,957,841.08	746,381,143.23	96.69	25,576,697.85	769,664,480.80
MINNESOTA	348,046,320.00	94.00	327,163,540.80	287,775,766.29	87.96	39,387,774.51	375,705,904.27
MISSISSIPPI	89,054,752.00	94.55	84,201,268.02	67,094,853.00	79.68	17,106,415.02	291,388,884.33
MISSOURI	479,672,614.00	93.71	449,501,206.58	442,461,694.68	98.43	7,039,511.90	571,303,830.67
NEBRASKA	150,672,747.00	94.13	141,828,256.75	132,536,700.62	93.45	9,291,556.13	198,808,607.99
NEVADA	157,226,291.76	95.43	150,041,050.23	141,748,642.99	94.47	8,292,407.24	176,530,586.64
NEW HAMPSHIRE	9,734,933.00	94.60	9,209,246.62	9,414,946.27	102.23	-205,699.65	118,873,105.01
NEW JERSEY	821,421,014.00	93.73	769,917,916.42	730,901,720.34	94.93	39,016,196.08	572,974,989.33
NEW MEXICO	157,248,492.00	93.68	147,310,387.31	139,400,831.64	94.63	7,909,555.67	240,283,897.17
NEW YORK	1,324,415,854.00	93.95	1,244,288,694.83	1,118,908,255.59	89.92	125,380,439.24	1,192,954,446.00
NORTH CAROLINA	300,613,141.00	93.45	280,922,980.26	214,789,062.00	76.46	66,133,918.26	647,313,882.00
OHIO	910,548,549.00	93.75	853,639,264.69	817,814,351.33	95.80	35,824,913.36	802,975,663.83
OKLAHOMA	321,043,120.00	94.69	303,995,730.33	243,348,581.65	80.05	60,647,148.68	399,739,589.87
OREGON	163,482,790.00	93.26	152,464,049.95	134,151,413.79	87.99	18,312,636.16	267,887,747.55
PENNSYLVANIA	721,429,387.76	93.53	674,752,906.37	644,788,791.56	95.56	29,964,114.81	893,713,942.29
RHODE ISLAND	176,032,117.00	94.67	166,649,605.16	176,653,656.76	106.00	-10,004,051.60	135,011,499.00
SOUTH CAROLINA	247,161,643.43	94.12	232,628,538.80	219,202,320.07	94.23	13,426,218.73	386,999,120.33
TENNESSEE	389,277,039.00	93.54	364,129,742.28	274,024,593.18	75.25	90,105,149.10	496,638,800.00
TEXAS	2,114,782,915.86	93.60	1,979,436,809.24	1,855,441,393.36	93.74	123,995,415.88	1,926,911,892.00
UTAH	248,349,535.00	94.36	234,342,621.23	211,495,880.95	90.25	22,846,740.28	178,936,684.71
VIRGINIA	576,233,086.00	93.13	536,645,872.99	394,839,876.80	73.58	141,805,996.19	588,341,004.29
WASHINGTON	346,877,695.98	95.57	331,511,014.05	306,522,209.75	92.46	24,988,804.30	451,911,623.97
WISCONSIN	333,482,538.00	93.75	312,639,879.38	319,343,455.91	102.14	-6,703,576.54	466,147,505.51
GRAND TOTAL	21,672,027,506.13		20,332,581,315.08	18,683,229,213.11	91.89	1,649,352,101.97	22,078,970,739.31

NOTE 1: MINIMUM ALLOCATION FUNDS NOT SUBJECT TO LIMITATION ARE EXCLUDED.
NOTE 2: ALASKA, HAWAII AND PUERTO RICO ARE EXEMPT FROM THE SUBALLOCATION PROVISIONS OF 23 U.S.C. 133(D)(3)(A)
NOTE 3: TOTAL SUBALLOCATIONS DO NOT INCLUDE PRE-ISTEA URBANIZED FUNDS (FAUS).
NOTE 4: OBLIGATIONS TO DATE INCLUDE OBLIGATIONS(LESS ANY TRANSFERS) OF FAUS ATTRIBUTABLE FUNDS SINCE 9/30/91.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

STATUS OF FUNDS FOR STP, HH, 90% PAYMENT, I-REIMBURSEMENT, FUNDING RESTORATION, FAUS, MINIMUM ALLOCATION, AND DONOR STATE BONUS URBANIZED AREAS OF 200,000 OR MORE POPULATION

AS OF JUNE 30, 2006

STATE AND AREA	TOTAL APPORTIONMENT	OBLIGATIONS THRU 09/30/2005	OBLIGATIONS F.Y. 2006 TO DATE	TOTAL	UNOBLIGATED BALANCE
DETROIT,MI	604,663,216.00	531,951,598.80	20,306,341.88	552,257,940.68	61,537,126.34
FLINT	53,439,156.00	46,342,944.65	2,547,003.71	48,889,948.36	4,650,718.90
GRAND RAPIDS	75,563,727.00	57,957,303.91	6,630,190.76	64,587,494.67	11,038,827.48
LANSING	44,449,730.00	36,995,911.43	3,812,014.59	40,807,926.02	3,645,523.89
SOUTH BEND-MISHAWAKA, IN-MI	4,263,258.00	3,372,433.46	389,560.32	3,761,993.78	521,603.30
TOLEDO (OH)	3,487,146.00	1,842,153.54	77,969.14	1,920,122.68	1,744,344.87
MICHIGAN					
TOT URBAN	824,829,406.00	709,343,069.91	37,038,073.32	746,381,143.23	88,283,182.48
MINNESOTA					
MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAU, MN	348,046,320.00	264,784,739.85	22,991,026.44	287,775,766.29	60,184,166.45
MINNESOTA					
TOT URBAN	348,046,320.00	264,784,739.85	22,991,026.44	287,775,766.29	60,184,166.45
MISSISSIPPI					
BILOXI-GULFPORT	14,832,747.00	5,949,440.00	-525,000.00	5,424,440.00	9,408,307.00
JACKSON	65,017,793.00	58,515,254.00	-650,381.00	57,864,873.00	8,059,812.00
MEMPHIS (TN-AR)	9,204,212.00	5,355,987.00	-1,550,447.00	3,805,540.00	5,367,353.00
MISSISSIPPI					
TOT URBAN	89,054,752.00	69,820,681.00	-2,725,828.00	67,094,853.00	22,835,472.00
MISSOURI					
KANSAS CITY (KS)-MO	151,830,802.00	138,135,225.23	9,043,345.83	147,178,571.06	6,047,055.18
SPRINGFIELD	13,945,650.00				13,945,650.00
ST. LOUIS (IL)	313,896,162.00	279,913,183.30	15,369,940.32	295,283,123.62	23,698,674.19

NOTE 1: MINIMUM ALLOCATION FUNDS NOT SUBJECT TO LIMITATION ARE EXCLUDED.
NOTE 2: ALASKA, HAWAII AND PUERTO RICO ARE EXEMPT FROM THE SUBALLOCATION PROVISIONS OF 23 U.S.C. 133 (D) (3) (A).
NOTE 3: TOTAL SUBALLOCATIONS DO NOT INCLUDE PRE-ISTEA URBANIZED FUNDS (FAUS).
NOTE 4: OBLIGATIONS TO DATE INCLUDE OBLIGATIONS (LESS ANY TRANSFERS) OF FAUS ATTRIBUTABLE FUNDS SINCE 9/30/91.

STP Funding Available By Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Population in MPO Area	Population in Urbanized Area	% of MPO Population	% of Urbanized Area Pop.
Christian County	13488	13488	5.24%	5.53%
Greene County	54106	54106	21.01%	22.17%
Battlefield	2452	2452	0.95%	1.00%
Nixa	12192	12192	4.73%	5.00%
Ozark	9975	9975	3.87%	4.09%
Republic	8461	0	3.29%	0.00%
Springfield	151823	151823	58.96%	62.21%
Strafford	1834	0	0.71%	0.00%
Willard	3179	0	1.23%	0.00%
Totals	257510	244036	100.00%	100.00%

Jurisdiction	FY 2003/2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	Projected FY 2007	TOTAL
Christian County	$316,983	$187,185	$158,260	$160,848	$823,276
Greene County	$1,271,553	$750,877	$634,845	$645,228	$3,302,504
Battlefield	$57,625	$34,029	$28,770	$29,241	$149,664
Nixa	$286,526	$169,199	$143,053	$145,393	$744,171
Ozark	$234,424	$138,432	$117,040	$118,955	$608,851
Republic	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Springfield	$3,568,015	$2,106,984	$1,781,394	$1,810,529	$9,266,922
Strafford	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Willard	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Special Earmarks			$200,000		
	$6,310,147	$3,386,706	$3,063,362	$2,910,194	$15,670,409

STP-Urban Balance

Christian County

Appropriation FY03 & 04	316,983
Kansas Extension Study Obligation	(205,342)
Appropriation FY 05	187,185
Projected Appropriation FY 06	158,260
Nicholas at 14	(50,000)
Projected Appropriation FY 07	160,848
Longview Extension	(200,000)
Highway 14 Eastern Bypass	(176,000)
Balance	191,934

STP-Urban Balance

Greene County

Small Urban Remaining Funds	$344,279
Appropriation FY 03 & 04	$1,271,553
Appropriation FY 05	$750,877
Transfer from City of Battlefield	$45,000
Appropriation FY 06	$634,845
Weaver/Campbell	($1,132,142)
JRF/ Glenstone	($500,000)
Glenstone, I-44 to Valley Water Mill	($1,500,000)
Projected Appropriation FY 07	$645,228
TOTAL	$559,641

STP-Urban Balance

City of Battlefield

Appropriation FY 03 & 04	$57,625
Obligation (Transfer to Greene County)	($45,000)
Appropriation FY 05	$34,029
Appropriation FY 06	$28,770
Projected Approriation FY 07	$29,241
Balance	$104,664

STP-Urban Balance

City of Nixa

Appropriation FY 03 & 04	**$286,526**
Appropriation FY 05	**$169,199**
Appropriation FY 06	**$143,053**
Nicolas/14	($50,000)
Tiffany/ Majestic/14	($224,000)
CC Study	($24,000)
Projected Appropriation FY 07	**$145,393**
Balance	**$446,171**

City of Ozark

Appropriation FY03 & 04	$234,424
Appropriation FY 05	$138,432
Appropriation FY 06	$117,040
Projected Appropriation FY 07	$118,955
Balance	$608,851

City of Republic STP-Urban Funds

Date	Amount Available	Amount Obligated	Balance
10/1/2003	$303,436.03		$ 303,436.03
3/19/2004	$303,436.03	$ 303,436.00	$0.03
2005	$33,077.66	0.00	$33,077.66
2006	$33,077.66	0	$33,077.66
2008	$33,077.66	0	$33,077.66
2009	$33,077.66	0	$33,077.66
			$132,310.67

STP-Urban Balance

City of Springfield

Small Urban Balance	**$3,163,402.68**
FY 03/04 Allocation	**$3,568,014.70**
FY 05	**$2,106,983.81**
FY 06	**$1,781,394.05**
Weaver/ Campbell Intersection	($1,553,142.00)
Glenstone/JRF/Republic Interchange	($1,726,400.00)
National/ Chestnut Intersection	($1,400,000.00)
Glenstone/ Primrose	($1,400,000.00)
Glenstone (I-44 to Valley Water Mill)	($1,200,000.00)
Campbell Avenue Traffic Signals	($240,000.00)
44/65 Enhancements	($74,000.00)
Railroad Reconfiguration Study	($800,000.00)
Projected Appropriation FY 07	**$1,810,529.46**
BALANCE	**$4,036,782.70**

Projects are estimated figures. Actual obligations pending program agreements.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Attached for Technical Committee member review are various information items regarding transportation in our region, state, and nation. These information items are typically drawn from newspapers, special reports, and mailings received by MPO staff. They are provided for the sole purpose of keeping MPO Technical Committee members apprised of transportation issues currently under review by MPO staff and/or other transportation organizations. The focus is on information that may have a direct impact on the Ozarks Transportation Organization study area.

City ponders more spaces for bicycles: Existing rule viewed as insufficient.

Matthew Leblanc, Columbia Daily Tribune, Mo.

Sep. 10--Fred Schmidt rides everywhere on his bike.

He rides to the store. He rides to work. He even rides for pleasure in Columbia parks.

Deciding what to do with the bicycle after reaching his destination is sometimes a challenge. Often there aren't any bike racks at businesses he visits, and Schmidt is left searching for somewhere to tether his two-wheeler.

"I'm used to lashing my bike to whatever is convenient," he said.

The city in 2001 put in place regulations that require some businesses to provide parking places for bicycles. The requirements call for new commercial developments with more than 50 vehicle parking spaces to install bicycle racks or lockers where bikes can be secured.

Smaller businesses such as convenience stores and drug stores of less than 10,000 square feet were exempted because those who drafted the law worried the regulations would hurt owners of small businesses.

City leaders now say the parking requirements -- part of Columbia's zoning regulations -- are outdated and should be changed. More residents are traveling by pedal power, they say, and all businesses should tailor their parking lots to accommodate bicyclists.

"We made a progressive start," said Mayor Darwin Hindman, "but I think" the regulations "are actually inadequate. We need to look into reforming it."

The Columbia City Council agreed last week to move forward with a review of the regulations, and the city's Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission will begin discussions on the issue later this month.

Bicycle parking in Columbia is required on a sliding scale, depending on the number of vehicle parking spaces at a business. For example, lots with 100 to 199 vehicle spaces must have at least 12 parking places for bikes. Lots with 300 or more vehicle spaces need to have bicycle parking equal to 5 percent of the number of vehicle spaces.

Tim Teddy, the city's director of planning, said comments from developers about the regulations have largely been positive since they were introduced. He acknowledged, however, that across-the-board requirements sometimes don't fit well with certain types of developments.

Large stores such as Sam's Club on Conley Road have dozens of bicycle spaces because of the size of their parking lots, even though it's unlikely shoppers would frequent those stores on two wheels.

"That's what the variance process is for," Teddy said, "to adjust" the regulations "to reality. If an owner feels this is excessive, they could go to the Board of Adjustment."

A report to the city council says the method of calculating the required bicycle parking spaces will also be reviewed.

Other cities, including Springfield, calculate the number of bike spaces needed based on the size of buildings.

Marya Morris, a senior research associate with the **American Planning Association**, said bicycle parking has become a popular topic among the nation's city planners. An increasing number of trails in U.S. cities appears to be driving the discussion, she said.

In Columbia, the discussion likely will center on the cost of installing bike racks -- planners estimate one rack costs $2,000 -- and whether a formula can be found to tailor regulations to meet the needs of local cyclists and businesses.

Businessman Jeff Viles said it's important that changes to regulations apply specifically to the needs of prospective customers at small businesses.

"The city paints with too wide a brush," Viles said.

Don Stamper, of the Central Missouri Development Council, said city officials should focus first on problems such as road infrastructure and affordable housing.

"We've got a lot of priorities and needs in the community," he said.

Schmidt said he would rather see business owners install bicycle parking on their own, without city regulations.

"These are hard types of things to write," he said.

EDITORIAL: Step Toward **Smart Growth**

The Hartford Courant, Conn.

Sep. 10--Connecticut has lagged behind most Northeastern states in fighting sprawl, resulting in poorly planned, low-density development in many of our suburban and rural towns. Sprawl has meant more traffic congestion and pollution, loss of farms and forests, higher costs for infrastructure and services and a loss of housing variety.

Let's hope that will change.

In an unusually passionate announcement last weekend, Gov. M. Jodi Rell said she's begun a national search for a deputy commissioner of the state Department of Transportation who will focus on mass transit and anti-sprawl measures.

"We need to combat sprawl," Mrs. Rell said. "Our goal is to create more attractive, livable, economically strong communities while protecting natural resources, and our battle to attain those goals must include mass transit." She spoke of bringing affordable housing and business to the areas around transit stops, to create "walkable, bikable neighborhoods."

The governor correctly observes that transit and transit-related planning "have been on the back burner for decades." To turn things around, the "state's economic development, environment, public health, energy and transportation policies need to be coordinated and balanced every step of the way."

Mrs. Rell framed the issue properly. But to succeed, she -- or her successor -- must oversee and support the effort. This editorial page argued that the DOT commissioner, not a deputy commissioner, should be the expert in transit and transit-oriented development. Nonetheless, the deputy commissioner can be a leader in fighting sprawl, with the strong support of the commissioner and the governor.

In addition, the governor needs to champion a legislative package that will create incentives to build in town centers and transit corridors, provide more help for regional planners and local land-use officials, and make a stronger commitment to farmland preservation.

The governor should initiate a statewide review of zoning legislation, because current zoning laws in many towns are outdated and work against **smart growth**.

Mrs. Rell has supported $3.5 billion in transportation improvements in the past two years. Her national search for a transit leader is another step toward reversing the helter-skelter development that is threatening the state's vaunted quality of life. With perseverance, these initiatives will **grow** into a solid **smart-growth** policy in Connecticut.

The Charlotte Observer (North Carolina)

Distributed by McClatchy-Tribune Business News

September 7, 2006 Thursday

STATE AND REGIONAL NEWS

20060907-CH-0907-City-to-file-for-light-rail-damages

877 words

City to file for light-rail damages: Several flaws found, and more are expected

Richard Rubin, The Charlotte Observer, N.C.

Sep. 7--City officials cited a litany of errors Wednesday in the design of Charlotte's light-rail line, blaming a contractor for problems that will push the project beyond its $427 million budget.

Alleged mistakes by Parsons Transportation Group include:

--Designing an 11-foot ceiling in a maintenance building's boiler room that was supposed to hold an 11-foot, 7-inch boiler.

--Failing to coordinate schedules between different contractors. In one case, a contractor was supposed to install ticket machines on the platforms -- before the platforms were built.

--Planning a parking deck near Interstate 485 with incorrectly estimated soil conditions and handicapped parking spaces that would not meet building codes.

Most of the problems were discovered during construction of the 9.6-mile line along South Boulevard, which is still scheduled to open in late November 2007. The project is only 56 percent complete, and the city expects to discover more problems.

The Charlotte Area Transit System has not created a new budget or totaled the cost of Parsons' errors.

"We just can't speculate on a number today," said city attorney Mac McCarley. The city plans to file a claim for damages against Parsons at the end of the project, and a lawsuit is possible, he said.

A spokeswoman for California-based Parsons declined to answer questions Wednesday, saying the company was still trying to get its facts straight before commenting publicly.

City Council members learned of the problems from the city staff during a two-hour closed meeting Tuesday, and several expressed disappointment that they were not told sooner.

"What's clear to me is that somebody was asleep at the switch," said Democrat Anthony Foxx. "And I think that taxpayers hold us accountable for making sure that their resources are being expended wisely, and we have a responsibility to hold staff accountable for that as well."

Parsons has been involved in the South Corridor project even longer than CATS CEO Ron Tober, who was hired in summer 1999. By that time, Parsons' consultants were holding meetings with citizens along the corridor.

The rail line is CATS' first big project, and as it moved from concept to completion, the agency tried to avoid expanding its staff too quickly, Tober said. Parsons was hired to design the line and oversee construction.

Although some CATS officials worked in the same building as Parsons, the public employees were outmanned as they tried to supervise the designers. CATS had two engineers on the project. At times, Tober said, Parsons had 100 people working on the line.

"We won't make that mistake again," he said, adding that CATS put too much trust in Parsons.

In 2004 and 2005, CATS started running into problems with the consultants, including high construction bids.

"The relationship between client and consultant deteriorated," according to a 2005 report from an oversight firm hired by the federal government.

In early 2005, CATS decided not to let Parsons oversee construction, hiring another company instead. This year, CATS ended Parsons' preliminary work on the light-rail line to University City. Another contractor will be chosen for that project.

City auditors found problems with about $83,000 worth of Parsons' bills, much of it on travel and hotel expenses. A forthcoming audit will question another $109,000, but those are relatively small amounts, given Parsons' total bills, said city auditor Greg McDowell. The company has been paid about $38 million.

Parsons provided a good, basic design for the rail line and the project will be safe, Tober said. But many problems surfaced when multiple construction companies tried to use Parsons' plans, requiring redesign.

The designs haven't been the only issue that increased the price of the rail line. Problems with Norfolk Southern and rising costs of construction materials also were factors.

CATS is working with the Federal Transit Administration on a revised estimate, which will not be ready for several weeks, Tober said. Additional costs will come from CATS' reserves, funded by a half-cent sales tax. City officials don't expect to go more than 5 percent over the $427 million price, putting the potential gap somewhere below $22 million.

Republican City Council member Don Lochman wants more analysis.

"The public needs to be reminded of just how drastically this has changed from the initial forecast to where we are now, and they have a right to expect better performance and better accountability," he said. "I would hope that would be pretty obvious at this point."

Corridor History

1998: Rough estimates say the line could cost $227 million.

May 2000: Inflation and new costs push the price to $331 million.

July 2002: The cost rises to $371 million.

March 2004: A new bridge and higher land costs bring the project to $398.7 million.

January 2005: High construction bids prompt CATS to raise the target to $427 million.

September 2006: The city announces that the cost will exceed $427 million.

St. Petersburg Times (Florida)

September 8, 2006 Friday

A; Pg. 1A

920 words

Regional light rail idea is revived

By JANET ZINK

Times Staff Writer

TAMPA — Mayor Pam Iorio is pushing to resurrect old plans for light and commuter rail lines connecting Pinellas, Hillsborough, Polk, Pasco and Manatee counties.

"I'm asking that these studies be taken off the shelf," Iorio said Thursday, referring to plans from 1993 and 2002 mothballed due to lack of support.

Road construction has become practically cost-prohibitive, she said, pointing out that price estimates to expand Interstate 275 in Tampa came in $100-million over budget.

And building new highways and toll roads leads to suburban sprawl and longer commutes, she said. A beltway proposed by the TampaHillsborough Expressway Authority through largely undeveloped land around Tampa Bay "ignores smart growth principles" because it doesn't move people between major population and employment centers.

"Our future is in mass transit," she said.

Having a rail plan and local financial commitment would open the door to state and federal money, which is how Orlando is funding a commuter rail system, she said.

St. Petersburg Mayor Rick Baker applauded Iorio for coming forward with the idea, which proposes a line that extends from downtown Tampa to Tampa International Airport and downtown St. Petersburg.

"Pam and I have had a number of discussions about methods to connect the two downtowns along with connections to the two airports, the St. Pete gateway and Tampa," he said.

Rail is one option for doing that, he said.

But it could be expensive and a long time to complete, he said.

"There are other options to look at as well. One of them would be a similar system that connects via some sort of bus rapid system. We're exploring that on our side," Baker said. "The good news is both sides of the bay are looking at ways to provide connectivity between the communities."

Mass transit plans have come and gone over the years with no progress.

Hillsborough's most recent light rail plan called for a 20-mile line linking downtown Tampa to the University of South Florida and West Shore Business District. That system would have cost $985-million to build over 20 years, with annual operating expenses of $22-million. It was put aside in 2003.

Iorio wants that concept revisited, as well as the idea of expanding along existing CSX rail lines into neighboring counties.

Iorio joins a chorus of high-powered voices from elected officials to business leaders who have been saying it's time to bring better mass transit to the bay area.

Tampa developer Al Austin, who in the past opposed light rail, said that as chair of the Tampa Chamber of Commerce's growth management task force he's come to realize rail is necessary.

"With the growth of this area and the amount of traffic that we're going to incur over the next 10 years, we have to find alternative ways to get people from point A to point B," he said. "Light rail makes sense in certain applications, particularly in getting from the airport to West Shore or downtown Tampa or St. Pete or the area around the University of South Florida."

State Sen. Mike Fasano, who represents suburban areas in Citrus, Hernando, Pasco and Pinellas counties, is part of a group working on legislation to create a regional authority to finance and build multi-county transportation projects.

He said Iorio's proposal would be a "perfect match" for the agency.

"Many of us who live outside of Tampa and Hillsborough County go there a lot. I would very much like to be able to find a great way to head from Pasco County south through Hillsborough County when I go to the Lightning games," he said.

Rep. Bill Galvano of Bradenton, another key player in the move to establish a regional authority, was also enthusiastic, but more cautious.

"The concept of expanding rail fits squarely within the objectives of the regional transportation authority," he said. "We have been pitching it as a multimodal authority from the beginning. The specific plan of where the rail would go will have to be left to the authority."

St. Petersburg City Council member Bill Foster said light rail transportation is "inevitable" for the region.

"I'd like to see it in my lifetime," he said. "I'm glad she's dusting off the plans."

Tampa City Council member Shawn Harrison, who chairs Hillsborough's Metropolitan Planning Organization, said that group in May voted to conduct a complete review of all mass transit options for the county, including rail.

"We're on it," he said.

Harrison said he also recently talked to a representative of CSX about a commuter rail line from the south of Gandy Boulevard area to downtown Tampa.

CSX is already working with local, state and federal officials to plan a commuter rail around Orlando.

"He told me that they were focused on Orlando right now and it would take about six months to pull that off. If they can, they will look at other areas, including Tampa," Harrison said.

But Hillsborough County Commissioner Mark Sharpe urged caution.

Some type of mass transit, possibly rail, is clearly one component of solving the region's transportation woes. But it shouldn't be the top priority.

Sharpe stands by plans to build a beltway around the bay area, saying that limiting exits would keep suburban sprawl in check.

"I've been calling all along for making sure we do our roads first," he said. "The problem with the **transit system** is by itself it will move such a small number of people that you will still have congestion problems. It's got to be done in conjunction with other things."

Los Angeles Times

September 7, 2006 Thursday
Home Edition

CALIFORNIA; Metro; Metro Desk; Part B; Pg. 9

376 words

Officials Stumped by Signs to Trump Course

Bob Pool, Times Staff Writer

The mystery surrounding illegal freeway signs promoting developer Donald Trump's new Rancho Palos Verdes golf course deepened Wednesday as authorities continued searching for new signs -- and for the phantom work crew that has installed them across a 25-mile swath of Los Angeles.

Puzzled motorists first noticed the official-looking but phony signs pointing the way to the Trump National Golf Club a week ago. So far, California Department of Transportation maintenance workers have removed four of them along two freeways.

But others have reportedly popped up near freeway onramps to confound commuters and transportation engineers alike.

Most resemble the standard green freeway directional signs used by Caltrans throughout the state. But at least one mimics the brown directional signs used in public parks.

The source of the signs, meantime, remains unknown.

Some motorists wondered whether the signs might be the handiwork of contestants on Trump's television show, "The Apprentice." But Mike van der Goes, general manager of Trump National's Rancho Palos Verdes club, said Trump has denied any involvement.

"We have no idea who put them up," van der Goes said Wednesday. "I spoke with Mr. Trump and he knows nothing about them."

Leaders of a group of guerrilla artists that some had speculated might have been behind the signs also denied responsibility. That group, which calls itself Heavy Trash, caused a stir six years ago by erecting mock MTA signs on the Westside announcing the future route of a fictitious subway it dubbed "the Aqua Line."

In an unsigned e-mail, the group said it advocates "urban solutions like housing, schools, public transportation, parks and pedestrian-friendly commercial development."

"We would never support something as wasteful as a new golf course within the Los Angeles Basin."

Commuters have seen the rogue signs along the Harbor Freeway -- near Sepulveda Boulevard, at Gaffey Street, and in the vicinity of Pacific Coast Highway -- as well as next to the 405 Freeway's Sunset Boulevard ramps.

Caltrans has removed the two 405 Freeway signs as well as two from the Harbor Freeway, spokeswoman Judy Gish said Wednesday.

"If more signs are brought to our attention we will remove them immediately," she said.

The Seattle Times

September 6, 2006 Wednesday
Fourth Edition

ROP ZONE; Local News; Pg. B4

348 words

Metro bus expansion will be on Nov. 7 ballot;
"Transit Now" - Measure would raise $50M a year if approved

Keith Ervin, Seattle Times staff reporter

King County voters will decide Nov. 7 whether to increase the sales tax to pay for a broad expansion of Metro Transit bus service.

The County Council voted 8-1 Tuesday in favor of a public vote on "Transit Now," a one-tenth-of-a-percentage-point tax increase that advocates said would dramatically improve bus service in the face of higher gas prices and rapid suburban population growth.

"People all over King County are demanding more bus service," said Councilwoman Julia Patterson, D-SeaTac, who teamed with County Executive Ron Sims in support of the proposal.

Council Chairman Larry Phillips, D-Seattle, said the only complaint he hears about Metro bus service is, "It ain't enough."

If approved by voters, the measure would raise $50 million a year for transit and would raise the tax on a $1 purchase from 8.8 cents to 8.9 cents in most parts of King County.

For most households, said Councilman Bob Ferguson, D-Seattle, the tax would cost $25 a year. "That's a bargain," he said. "The services the voters and residents of King Conuty will receive will be worth that investment."

Reagan Dunn, R-Bellevue, cast the only vote against the measure, saying he agrees with its goals but worries it would jeopardize a three-county transit-and-highways package expected to go before voters next year.

Dunn called that proposal being put together by Sound Transit and the Regional Transportation Investment District "the single most important transportation package to face this region in a long time. ... "

"The tolerance of the people is limited. It would be a shame if we got this bus service and next year we didn't get the roads part of this."

Transit Now would bring more frequent service on 35 major routes and add routes or buses to outlying areas, including Redmond Ridge, the Snoqualmie Valley, Maple Valley and Black Diamond.

A new "RapidRide" service would bring buses every 10 to 15 minutes along five heavily used routes connecting Shoreline, Ballard and West Seattle to downtown Seattle, Bellevue to Redmond, and SeaTac to Federal Way.

EXCERPTS FROM:

GUIDE TO
COMPLETE STREETS CAMPAIGNS

**For Thunderhead Alliance
Member Organizations
March 2006**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere thanks go out to the executive directors and staff at those organizations that we singled out for campaign examples. They patiently took our questions and phone calls and even proofed to make sure that we got it right. These are:

- Ed Barsotti, League of Illinois Bicyclists
- John Gideon, Central Ohio Bicycle Advocacy Coalition
- Deb Hubsmith, Marin County Bicycle Coalition
- Robin Stallings, Texas Bicycle Coalition

Essential guidance and input came from the Thunderhead Complete Streets Committee comprised of Randy Neufeld, Barb Culp, Dan Grunig, Noah Budnick, Eric Gilliland and Sue Knaup.

Thanks also go out to Nancy Weaver, who assisted with some of the campaign research, writing, and documentation, and the Sierra Club, who have wonderful publications related to environmental issues and grassroots campaigns that were an inspiration to us. One such publication, How to Guide: Grassroots Organizing on Texas Water Issues, produced by the Lone Star Chapter of the Sierra Club, provided some of the framework in creating Thunderhead's Campaign Planning Blueprint.

Of course, this Guide to Complete Streets Campaigns would not have been possible without the generous financial assistance from Planet Bike and the National Bicycle Dealers Association who believe in the power of effective change through the Thunderhead Alliance's 50 States/50 Cities Project.

If we forgot anyone, please forgive us and let us know. Then watch for your name in our next update.

Sue Knaup   Gayle Stallings   David Crites   Dave Snyder   Barbara McCann

First Edition: March 2005
Second Edition: March 2006

Thunderhead Alliance

Main Office:	Washington, DC Office:
928-541-9841	202-349-1479
P.O. Box 3309	1700 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Ste. 400
Prescott, AZ 86302	Washington, DC 20006

www.thunderheadalliance.org _ info@thunderheadalliance.org

(These excerpts are taken from the draft second edition of this Guide. Final publication is expected to be available in the Thunderhead members' web resources library and at all major on-line booksellers by summer 2006; ISBN: 0-595-39318-7.)

CHAPTER 1 – Introduction

Thunderhead Alliance

The Thunderhead Alliance is the national coalition of state and local bicycle and pedestrian advocacy organizations. 119 strong in 47 states and one Canadian province, Thunderhead's member organizations employ more than 187 full-time staff and reach a combined dues-paying membership of more than 94,000 people. Thunderhead's mission is to unite these organizations, help strengthen them, and create new ones where they are most needed.

Complete streets policies that require safe accommodation of all users of a street can eliminate most of this nation's barriers to bicycling and walking. Thunderhead's National Complete the Streets Campaign has a goal of helping our organizations win at least one complete streets policy, local or state-level, in all 50 states by 2008 in order to influence a federal-level complete streets policy through the reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU, the U.S. federal transportation law. This tapestry of local, state and federal policies will ensure that no transportation project can move forward without being complete!

If you are a leader or potential leader of a Thunderhead organization, this Guide to Complete Streets Campaigns is written for you. If you are not a leader of such an organization, this Guide will be your window into the world of bringing positive change to communities through professional bicycle and pedestrian advocacy. Read as if you are a leader of a Thunderhead organization and bring these elements of this powerful transportation reform campaign to your own officials. Sometimes all it takes is one determined, professional voice. And make sure to connect with your Thunderhead organization on our Links page at: www.thunderheadalliance.org/links.htm .

This Guide to Complete Streets Campaigns is a roadmap to winning a complete streets policy in your jurisdiction. It is also a guide to effective community organizing, as it is our hope that in winning a complete streets policy our Thunderhead member organizations will also gain strength, increase partnerships, and in many ways make their communities better with improved conditions for bicycling and walking.

The Concepts of Complete Streets and Complete the Streets Campaigns

Complete streets are thoroughfares that serve all users, moving by car, truck, transit, bicycle, wheelchair, or foot. Complete streets allow all their users to travel in a safe and welcoming way. You, as a leader of a Thunderhead organization, as a champion of bicycling and walking issues, as a bicyclist and pedestrian, will acknowledge that the vast majority of the current North American transportation system is not comprised of complete streets. Many streets lack sidewalks, few accommodate bicyclists well, most encourage traffic to travel too close and fast, many don't have curb ramps at intersections or across

driveways, and so on. We all know that these types of streets are less safe, less functional, and a hindrance to healthy communities and people.

The Cost Misconception: A common misconception is that complete streets cost more to build than incomplete streets. In fact, complete streets most often cost no more and many times can cost less than incomplete streets. For instance, a common street cross section that serves only cars is a four lane speedway with no shoulders, sidewalks or intersection treatments for people. Using the same right-of-way width, this design can be reshaped into two narrower through lanes, one center turn lane, and bike lanes and sidewalks on both sides. By using less width for the most expense elements, truck weight standard asphalt and subsurface, and adding less expensive sidewalks, this design, often referred to as a "road diet" when applied to existing roads, actually saves money. Not only that, this design has been proven to improve traffic flow and safety for motor vehicles by better controlling turning movements. Many other complete streets designs offer similar cost savings. You may even want to bring up the economic benefits of streets that attract visitors and offer access to more employees. Be sure to address this misconception early in your campaign so that you can focus your valuable time on instituting a policy for your communities.

Why Complete Streets Are Important
Bottom line: Bicyclists and pedestrians are dying! A full 13% of traffic deaths in the U.S. are bicyclists and pedestrians yet most roadways are still being built with only cars and trucks in mind.

CHAPTER 2 - Complete Streets Policies

Introduction
Complete streets policies represent a potentially powerful tool for you and your organization. They are the next step in transforming your streetscapes and your communities.

As the national coalition of state and local bicycle and pedestrian advocacy organizations, the Thunderhead Alliance invested in a national survey and analysis of complete streets policy statements, directives, legislation, resolutions, plans, ordinances, and design manuals that require routinely building and reconstructing streets to be safe and convenient for all users, including those on foot and bicycle. This chapter summarizes the results of the inventory of jurisdictions with some form of complete streets policy and adds information about policies we learned about or which were adopted since the survey was completed in December 2004. It makes specific recommendations for creating effective complete streets policies and campaigns.

Methodology
This analysis of complete streets policies was derived from a survey sent to leaders of Thunderhead organizations and state and local bicycle-pedestrian coordinators throughout the United States (see Appendix C for a copy of the survey form), as well as information informally collected on new and newly discovered policies. Respondents were self-selected, although an extra effort was made to get responses from jurisdictions where policies were known to be in place The fact that the responses came from both agency staff and

Thunderhead leaders means that, in some cases, different perspectives are reflected for a single policy. The two-part survey concentrated on the characteristics of the policy and on the steps taken that led to its adoption.

The baseline criteria for inclusion of a policy discussed in this chapter included: 1. calling for routine accommodation of walking and bicycling as a requirement, not as an option, and 2. covering all roads under the jurisdictions' control (this excludes bike/ped plans that only call for accommodation on certain streets). There was no evaluation on the effectiveness of these policies on the ground. However, since the survey came out, the National Complete Streets Coalition, a collaborative effort of organizations working for complete streets including the Thunderhead Alliance, has developed a standard for effective complete streets policies posted at: www.completestreets.org. For a list of active Coalition organizations see Chapter 5. Also, the Thunderhead Alliance has developed a Complete Streets Policy Checklist based on these recommended elements (see Appendix F) to help with evaluation of future policies. We have also become more familiar with what really works to create complete streets.

It should also be recognized that there is no perfect complete streets policy. Jurisdictions have taken a variety of different approaches, so these policies defy easy characterization. In addition, a policy that looks good on paper may have been essentially ignored within an agency, while a seemingly weak policy may have been implemented with gusto by local planners. So we define a good complete streets policy as one that achieves a planning, design and project development process with a constellation of new training, new procedures and design manual changes that put bicycling, walking, and transit on a par with motor vehicles. This chapter is the beginning of a learning curve, not a definitive account.

The Complete Streets Policy Checklist (Appendix F) still does not measure which policies are resulting in good outcomes on our roadways and in our communities. This will be an essential step for the future including performance measures. In addition, the analysis stops short of delving into the many design issues concerning completing the streets.

What does the Federal Guidance policy say? Because a number of the state and local policies are based on statements in the USDOT Design Guidance, a review of that document is pertinent here (see Appendix F, Example 1 for the full Guidance text). While the language in TEA-21, where it originated, fell short of requiring states to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians, the subsequent Guidance recommends that each state make such accommodation routine. The policy states that:

...bicycle and pedestrian ways shall be established in new construction and reconstruction projects in all urbanized areas unless one or more of three conditions are met.

The USDOT Design Guidance also calls for paved shoulders on rural roads and designs that are accessible for disabled people. It recommends using the best currently available design standards and guidelines. In a more general discussion of the approach to implementation, it recommends re-writing design manuals to include safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities while applying engineering judgment to roadway design.

The USDOT Design Guidance lists additional steps that should be taken, including:
- planning for the long-term anticipating future bicycle or pedestrian use,
- addressing the need to cross roadways, and
- requiring that exceptions be approved at a senior level and documented with supporting data.

With regard to exceptions, the Guidance lists three. They are where:
- the costs are excessive (defined as more than 20% of project costs),
- there is an absence of need (including future need), and
- bicyclists or pedestrians are prohibited from traveling by law.

The Thunderhead Alliance has developed a list of ways to enhance this Guidance for use in developing new complete streets policies. See these recommendations later in this chapter.

We use the term 'policies' loosely, because they take many forms. At the state level, five states have passed legislation: Oregon, Florida, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Maryland. Two states have policies that were issued by their State Transportation Commissions (North and South Carolina). Most other states have DOTs that have issued internal policies or directives.

The policies at the city, MPO, and county level include city and MPO plans, local resolutions and ordinances, and local design manuals. Some of the newest policies are tax ordinances in San Diego and Sacramento, California (approved by voters in November 2004).

Another way to analyze the policies is to look at the split between those achieved primarily through public or inherently political processes (interaction with elected officials or other political bodies) and those achieved through internal agency processes. Of the 36 policies, 13 are laws, resolutions, or ordinances and 23 are internal policies, plans, or design manuals. In several cases the internal agency-driven processes were greatly influenced by outside agents, particularly bicycle and/or pedestrian advisory groups. These policies may have also had to go through a public approval process. In addition, a comprehensive complete streets policy may take shape at several levels: first as a general policy statement in a resolution passed by an elective body, then fleshed out with administrative policies set by the implementing agency.

It is encouraging to see that complete streets policies can be achieved in many different ways at different government levels. While the statewide policies would be expected to have the most widespread effect, they commonly affect only state-owned and state-maintained roads. Oregon's state law is an exception as it affects all roads, no matter the jurisdiction. Other state polices may influence local communities and lead to the creation of more local policies. In California for example, Deputy Directive 64 seems to have spurred additional local action.

We have also discovered some complete streets policies that we call 'paper policies' because they look good on paper but are not being implemented. Bringing these policies to light is important in helping Thunderhead leaders and agency officials begin to work on their full implementation. See the implementation chapter for more details.

In the more detailed table below, you will find paper policies listed below model policies. The model policies are highlighted due to the fact that the leaders of the Thunderhead organizations serving those areas have found them to be helpful to their bicycle and pedestrian advocacy efforts. The paper policies have not yet been helpful to the Thunderhead leaders.

When were policies adopted? The move toward complete streets has been growing. Most have come about since 2001, and a significant portion were adopted in 2004 and 2005. This is in part a testament to the influence of the 2000 USDOT Design Guidance, "Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel," which was issued in response to language included in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). This Guidance is an important base for many complete streets policies. A few of the inventoried policies precede

this era. For example, Oregon's was enacted in 1971 and offers an opportunity to evaluate longer-term impacts of these policies.

What do the state and local policies say? It is important to note that of all the policies included in the survey, only a few of the policies, laws, resolutions, ordinances, plans, or design manuals use the term 'complete streets.' Nonetheless most of these policies have great language setting out their vision. A few examples follow.

> *...bicycling and walking accommodations should be a routine part of the Department's planning, design, construction and operating activities.*
> (SC Department of Transportation Commission resolution)

> *Bicycle and pedestrian ways shall be established in new construction and reconstruction of road and bridge projects unless one or more of four conditions are met.* (Cleveland, Ohio MPO)

> *Footpaths and bicycle trails {bikeways and walkways} including curb cuts or ramps as part of the project, shall be provided wherever a highway, road or street is being constructed, reconstructed or relocated.*
> (Oregon statute)

> *This document outlines an approach to designing streets that are more "complete" in the sense of accomplishing all of the goals associated with the dominant form of public space in urban societies – our streets. ... Complete streets are those that adequately provide for all roadway users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit riders, and motorists, to the extent appropriate to the function and context of the street.*
> (Sacramento, CA Best Practices for Complete Streets)

Policy Issues

Does the policy really *require* accommodation? Many jurisdictions have plans and policies that express a *desire* to ensure the road serves all users. The most basic element of any complete streets policy is that it ensures that roads are built with everyone in mind. In some cases, policies use the word "consider." For example,

> *The Department fully considers the needs of non-motorized travelers (including pedestrians, bicyclists and persons with disabilities) in all programming, planning, maintenance, construction, operations and project development activities and products.*
> (CalTrans Deputy Directive 64)

This should raise a red flag for Thunderhead leaders, because 'consideration,' in the words of one Thunderhead leader, can give agencies "tons of wiggle room." That said, the California policy has been used effectively by Thunderhead leaders to press for localized complete streets initiatives. The way to turn 'consideration' into a more robust policy is to establish clear guidelines for what it means: filling out a checklist, getting approval of

exceptions, etc. Better yet, avoid the terms "consider" and "consideration" choosing instead stronger language such as "shall be included in every project."

And always be sure to read beyond the initial lofty statement. Even with strong language in the initial statement, some policies may not function as complete streets policies. For example, while Arizona has a policy which states "It is Arizona DOT's policy to include provisions for bicycle travel in all new major construction and major reconstruction projects on the state highway system," the many exceptions and restrictions that are listed just after this statement set up hurdles that make it clear that providing complete streets will occur only in special circumstances, not as a matter of course.

> Our RECOMMENDATION is that you use stronger "shall be established" or "shall be included" language instead of "consider." These will, in effect, require accommodation to be a routine part of all road design and re-design.

Exceptions: A more precise way to get at whether policies truly require complete streets is by looking at any specific exceptions, and how those exceptions are handled. By setting a rigorous, formal process for approving exceptions, agencies create a process that helps ensure compliance. Some of the policies list specific exceptions, including:

- excessive cost,
- absence of need,
- lack of right of way, and
- no need during simple repaving projects.

Other exceptions specified in some policies are public safety, environmental considerations, project purpose and scope, low traffic volumes, and conflicts with local plans. These exceptions go far beyond the USDOT Design Guidance, which lists three limited exceptions. As discussed previously in this chapter , these are:

- excessive cost,
- absence of need, and
- where bicyclists and pedestrians are prohibited.

The USDOT Guidance defines excessive cost as more than 20% of project costs and specifies that need should be defined in terms of potential *future* pedestrian or bicycle travel (we all know about the potential for significant latent demand).

Remember the Cost Misconception: A common misconception is that complete streets cost more to build than incomplete streets. In fact, complete streets most often cost no more and many times can cost less than incomplete streets. For instance, a common street cross section that serves only cars is a four lane speedway with no shoulders, sidewalks or intersection treatments for people. Using the same right-of-way width, this design can be reshaped into two narrower through lanes, one center turn lane, and bike lanes and sidewalks on both sides. By using less width for the most expense elements, truck weight standard asphalt and subsurface, and adding less expensive sidewalks, this design, often

referred to as a "road diet" when applied to existing roads, actually saves money. Not only that, this design has been proven to improve traffic flow and safety for motor vehicles by better controlling turning movements. Many other complete streets designs offer similar cost savings. You may even want to bring up the economic benefits of streets that attract visitors and offer access to more employees. Be sure to address this misconception early in your campaign so that you can focus your valuable time on instituting a policy for your communities.

When America Bikes, the coalition of eight national bicycle advocacy organizations working on the reauthorization of TEA-21, the federal transportation law, was seeking to place complete streets language in the new law, costs seemed to be a primary issue with members of Congress. America Bikes collected statements from DOT officials who said that integrating bicycle and pedestrian provisions from the beginning should not significantly increase costs. Of course one of the beauties of a complete streets policy should be that bicycle and pedestrian facilities are no longer fighting for the small pie of funds specifically designated for bicycling and walking (such as Enhancements or CMAQ), but are simply part of general transportation spending.

In line with these statements, cost did not seem to be a primary implementation issue for survey respondents. A few respondents did note that once initial budgets are set, including bicycle or pedestrian provisions can become almost impossible. Others noted that right-of-way acquisition can be the most expensive part of a road project, so wider roads with bike lanes may be a barrier. In such cases, reducing the number of travel lanes, otherwise known as a road diet as mentioned above, can complete the street actually at a cost savings.

It should be noted that the most common exception allowed is 'excessive cost,' often set at 20 percent of project cost. Michael Ronkin said it is important to be specific about what constitutes 'total project cost' since many projects are broken down into smaller parts. Sidewalks may be a significant cost if the project is defined as paving of a one-mile road subsection, but may make up a smaller portion when the project is defined more broadly to include all improvements in the whole corridor.

> Our RECOMMENDATION to you is that if your policy includes an "excessive cost" exception, make sure that it clearly states the broadest scope of the project so that sub-section cost breakouts are not possible.

Exceptions Approval Process: The next question is whether the policies require any formal approval when exceptions are made and all modes are *not* accommodated. The USDOT Guidance recommends that such exceptions should include documentation and require approval from senior management. Just nine of the 36 policies require such formal justification. The survey form did not ask about the exact method for documenting justifications, but in some cases survey respondents mentioned that there are design exemption forms or required checklists. Thunderhead leaders noted that a formal exemption process was valuable. One leader put it this way:

At least now, the engineers have to file a formal 'design exemption'
outlining the reasons for not including bike or ped accommodation instead
of just not doing it.

> Our RECOMMENDATION is that you should work for policies that have a limited set of exceptions, if any, and that require a formal approval process for each exception. Policies should reverse the current norm from having to justify accommodating all modes to having to justify NOT accommodating them.
>
> While a reluctant agency can still find ways to use exemptions and other language to exclude accommodation, the process gives Thunderhead leaders both leverage and the opportunity to work with and change the attitudes of reluctant engineers and planners. At the end of this chapter, there are further recommendations for crafting policy language, as well as examples of good language already in use.

Design specifications: Another issue is how prescriptive the policies are with regards to actual street design. Few of the policies provide specific language on what types of accommodation should be undertaken (e.g. when and where to build bike lanes or add sidewalks with curb-and-gutter, etc) unless the policy is itself a design manual. Most of the documents are, instead, broad policy statements that refer to other guidelines or design manuals for design specifics. In some cases, jurisdictions have achieved complete streets by revising their standard street cross-sections to include other modes. The USDOT Guidance recommends that agencies should "design facilities to the best currently available standards and guidelines," mentioning AASHTO and ITE standards.

> Our RECOMMENDATION is that you steer away from specifying design standards in your policy, especially in an initial complete streets policy campaign. The discussion of the intent (a commitment to build streets for all users) should be separated from the design discussion. As Thunderhead leaders, your role is to push for the *vision* of complete streets. Getting bogged down in arguing about narrow specifications could be deadly to the overall effort.

What modes do the policies cover? The ideal complete streets policy makes clear that roads must be built and reconstructed to serve all users including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, and travelers of all ages and abilities. Few of the existing 36 policies are that comprehensive. Several of the policies discuss accommodating transit and people with disabilities, but many do not. The USDOT Design Guidance makes specific reference to accommodating people with disabilities as follows:

> *The 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act, building on an earlier law*
> *requiring curb ramps in new, altered, and existing sidewalks, added*
> *impetus to improving conditions for sidewalk users. People with*

*disabilities rely on the pedestrian and transit infrastructure, and the links between them, for access and mobility. (*USDOT guidance)

A few notable examples incorporate transit elements. For example, see San Francisco's Transit First policy. The Sacramento Transportation and Air Quality Collaborative's "Best Practices for Complete Streets," includes a section on designing the road for transit users, noting that, *"The key design issue in planning for transit is the out-of-vehicle time (time spent waiting and time spent walking to and from the transit stop) which often plays a more important role in the decision to use transit than time spent in the vehicle itself."*

> Our RECOMMENDATION is that you seek complete street policies that incorporate transit and active living. Why? This is one of the most significant differences between 'routine accommodation' and 'complete streets.' If complete streets by definition provide safe travel for all users, and if part of the intent of pursuing complete streets is to build alliances beyond bicycle and pedestrian concerns, advocacy leaders seeking to build alliances in a broad complete streets campaign will need to amend the language to discuss other issues.

Essentially, planning for transit is planning for pedestrians, and even for bicycle users, as bike-on-bus programs continue to expand.

The US DOT Design Guidance advocates this approach. In a section called "Rewrite the Manuals" Specific bicycle/pedestrian manuals are portrayed as an interim step toward a recommended total re-write of general street design manuals. At the same time, the Guidance also recommends allowing 'engineering judgment' to guide decisions on a case-by-case basis. All of the examples given show circumstances in which ***more*** bike/ped accommodations should be made than those identified by design standards.

> Our RECOMMENDATION is that you follow Oregon's example, if possible, and keep your policy language non-specific to responsible agencies.

What roads are covered? Most of the 36 policies cover only those roads that are under the direct responsibility of the agency in question. For example, many of the state DOT policies only cover state-owned roads. In the case of MPOs, they tend to cover roadway projects funded through MPO-disbursed funds (which are usually federal transportation dollars). The new sales tax ordinances in Sacramento and San Diego counties apply to all the projects funded under the ordinances. A few of the local policies are directed at developers building new subdivisions. Michael Ronkin, Oregon DOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager, notes that the passive grammar of Oregon's state law has helped ensure that it applies to every road. Oregon's law says, "wherever a road is constructed" without referring to the agency responsible for building or maintaining it.

<u>Funding:</u> Most of the policies identified do not include specific funding provisions. The USDOT Design Guidance does not mention funding (except a suggested restriction on excessive cost). The notable exception is Oregon, which set aside one percent of its state transportation funds for bicycling and walking facilities. More often, the policies make bicycle and pedestrian accommodation a prerequisite for funding that already exists – the MPO policies and the tax ordinances specify that funded projects must accommodate travel by alternative modes, usually foot and bicycle. The other policies usually assume that funding will come from standard sources. But, again, remember the misconception that complete streets always cost more. See more about this misconception earlier in this chapter.

> Our RECOMMENDATION is that you think through funding issues ahead of time and identify, if possible, a funding stream for the policy for those complete streets projects that will add costs. This, along with a strong message that complete streets often do not cost more than incomplete streets, will help you secure your policy.

One Thunderhead leader mentioned that their state's restriction on spending gas-tax money only on roads may get in the way of local jurisdictions' implementation on their new MPO policy. Thirty states have such a restriction on the books, but it is unclear whether they have actually prevented funding of bicycle and pedestrian projects.[1]

So, what is a good policy?
All of this discussion makes complete streets policies seem pretty complex. To simplify things, we tried to distill the elements that do the most to contribute to that change in agency culture that leads to full integration of all modes. They include: inclusion of as many modes as possible; a process that requires any exceptions to be approved at a higher level, and a clear definition of those exceptions. We also checked on what implementation steps have been undertaken, and whether Thunderhead leaders deem the policy useful (even if it is not perfect). The table below gives the results of this scan highlighting those policies that have been helpful as models. You will find these model policies marked on the map for Thunderhead's National Complete the Streets Campaign at: http://www.thunderheadalliance.org/completestreets.htm . Our goal for this campaign is to help our organizations win at least one model complete streets policy, local or state-level, in all 50 states by 2008 in order to influence a model federal-level complete streets policy through the reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU.

---

[1] A list of state restrictions can be found in the Brookings Institution report, *Fueling Transportation Finance: A Primer on the Gas Tax* http://www.brookings.edu/es/urban/publications/gastax.htm.

Complete Streets Policies Table
Model policies followed by "paper" policies

State	Project title	Users?	Senior-level approval required for exceptions?	Extra Exceptions allowed (beyond cost, no need, prohibited)	Implementation steps undertaken	Thunderhead org leaders have found policy helpful
Model Policies						
CA	California Dept of Transportation Deputy Directive 64 internal policy	ped, bike, disabled	no	exceptions not specified	updated procedures; more?	yes
CA	Sacramento routine accommodation sales tax initiative	bike, ped	no	none specified	unknown	yes
CA	Sacramento	bike, ped				yes
CA	Bay Area MPO (MTC) Second Cycle Programming Policies, screening criteria	bike, ped	no	exceptions not specified	unknown	yes
CA	Santa Barbara Circulation Element, General Plan	all	no	insufficient ROW do not plan separate bike facilities on roads with 25 mph limits	unknown	yes
CA	San Diego City Street Design Manual		yes	Excessive cost Insufficient ROW	re-written manual	yes
CO	Colorado Springs Complete Streets Amendement to the Intermodal Transp. Plan	ped, bike, transit	not stated	unsafe impractical	rewriting manuals	yes
CO	Ft. Collins Colorado	ped, bike, transit	yes	none	restructured procedures - (LOS) rewritten design manuals	yes
CO	Boulder Multimodal Corridors & Transportation	ped, bike, transit	yes	none	restructured procedures re-written manuals	yes

State	Project title	Users?	Senior-level approval required for exceptions?	Extra Exceptions allowed (beyond cost, no need, prohibited)	Implementation steps undertaken	Thunderhead org leaders have found policy helpful
	Network Plans				training	
FL	West Palm Beach FL Transportation Element	ped, bike	not stated	exceptions not specified		**yes**
FL	Florida Bicycle & Pedestrian Ways statute	ped, bike	yes	excessive cost absence of need where contrary to public safety	unknown	**yes**
IL	DuPage County Healthy Roads Initiative	ped, bike	not stated	exceptions not specified	unknown	**yes**
MA	Bicycle-Pedestrian Access Law, Massachusetts staet legislature (Chapter 90E)	ped, bike	Yes	discretion of commissioner, safety environmental quality ROW conflicts	unknown	**yes**
MO	St. Louis Legacy 2030 Long-Range Plan	ped, bike, transit	not stated	no exceptions specified	checklist	**yes**
MO	Columbia Missouri Model Street Standards	ped, bike	No			**yes**
MO	St. Joseph MO bike-ped plan	ped, bike	yes	shoulders on rural roads	unknown	**yes**
NC	North Carolina DOT Bicycle Policy	ped, bike	No		unknown	**yes**
OH	Columbus Ohio MPO (MORPC) Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Policy	ped, bike	yes		unknown	**yes**

State	Project title	Users?	Senior-level approval required for exceptions?	Extra Exceptions allowed (beyond cost, no need, prohibited)	Implementation steps undertaken	Thunderhead org leaders have found policy helpful
OH	Cleveland Ohio MPO (NOACA) Regional Transportation Investment Policy	ped, bike	yes	extreme topography/natural resource constraints low ADT - below 1,000 simple resurfacing projects	unknown	**yes**
OR	Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Statutes	ped, bike	yes	public safety	restructured procedures re-written manuals training	**yes**
SC	South Carolina DOT Commission Resolution	ped, bike	not stated	exceptions not specified	restructured procedures training	**yes**
TN	Tennessee DOT Bicycle and Pedestrian policy	ped, bike	yes	bridges insufficient ROW repaving	unknown	**yes**
VA	VDOT Policy for Integrating Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations	ped, bike	Yes	environmental impacts safety purpose & scope of Project	none	**yes**
VT	Vermont Bicycle Pedestrian Plan	ped, bike	not stated	not specified	training	**yes**
Paper Policies						
CA	SF Transit First policy city ordinance	ped, bike, transit	not stated	not specified	unknown	no
CA	San Diego County Transnet Tax Extension provision	ped, bike	not stated	exceptions not specified	unknown	too early to say
FL-AL	Florida-Alabama Transportation Planning Organization (TPO (bicycle plan)	ped, bike	not stated	no exceptions specified	updating procedures	too soon to tell
FL	St. Petersburg "citytrails" plan					no

State	Project title	Users?	Senior-level approval required for exceptions?	Extra Exceptions allowed (beyond cost, no need, prohibited)	Implementation steps undertaken	Thunderhead org leaders have found policy helpful
KY	Kentucky Pedestrian and Bicycle Travel Policy	ped, bike	not stated	exceptions not specified	none	no
MD	Maryland Transportation Code Ann. 2-602	ped, bike	not stated	exceptions not specified	none	unknown
MO	p. 24-25 of MoDOT's Practical Design Implementation Manual	ped, bike				Not yet
NC	Charlotte Urban Street Design Guidelines internal policy	ped, bike, transit	yes	None	restructured procedures	not yet
PA	Penn Bicycle & Ped Checklist Training (App. J to PennDOT Design Manual)	ped, bike	no	exceptions not specified	checklist	no
RI	Rhode Island state law and policy	ped, bike	no	public safety, environmental or scenic quality, ROW conflict at Director's discretion	unknown	no
TN	Knoxville MPO Bicycle Accomm. Policy		yes		unknown	not yet
TX	Capital Area MPO, Texas Mobility Plan 2030	ped, bike	not stated	demonstrated alternative plan	unknown	unknown

Overall Recommendations for Policy Development

First, here are some concluding policy observations:

1. Policies take many forms and have been adopted at all levels of government, with adoption accelerating in recent years.
2. Policies vary in how strict they are in requiring accommodation. Some have set specific exceptions. Most policies do not themselves give design specifications.

Despite imperfections, Thunderhead leaders see policies as providing important leverage for their efforts.

3. Most policies focus almost exclusively on bicycling and/or walking and do not significantly discuss transit users, people with disabilities, or other user groups.
4. Implementation issues are significant; the work does not end with policy adoption.
5. No policies include effective performance measures, and little data is being collected on how well they are working.

Also, we recommend including these elements specified in the "Elements of Complete Streets Policies" on the complete streets web site: www.completestreets.org :

ELEMENTS OF COMPLETE STREETS POLICIES

1. The Principle
- Complete streets 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.
- Creating complete streets means changing the policies and practices of transportation agencies.
- A complete streets policy ensures that the entire right of way is routinely designed and operated to enable safe access for all users.
- Transportation agencies must ensure that all road projects result in a complete street appropriate to local context and needs.

2. Elements of a Good Complete Streets Policy
A good complete streets policy:
- Specifies that 'all users' includes pedestrians, bicyclists, transit vehicles and users, and motorists, of all ages and abilities.
- Aims to create a comprehensive, integrated, connected network.
- Recognizes the need for flexibility: that all streets are different and user needs will be balanced.
- Is adoptable by all agencies to cover all roads.
- Applies to both new and retrofit projects, including design, planning, maintenance, and operations, for the entire right of way.
- Makes any exceptions specific and sets a clear procedure that requires high-level approval of exceptions.
- Directs the use of the latest and best design standards.
- Directs that complete streets solutions fit in with context of the community.
- Establishes performance standards with measurable outcomes.

2.5 Implementation
An effective complete streets policy should prompt transportation agencies to:
- Restructure their procedures to accommodate all users on every project.
- Re-write their design manuals to encompass the safety of all users.
- Re-train planners and engineers in balancing the needs of diverse users.

- Create new data collection procedures to track how well the streets are serving all users.

Sample Policies

Many Thunderhead leaders and agencies have asked for sample complete streets policy language. Such samples are difficult to craft, as every jurisdiction has unique needs. A solid complete streets policy should:

a. require accommodation as a routine part of all road design,
b. set a clear procedure for specific exceptions that requires formal, high-level approval, and
c. direct agencies to use the best available design standards and guidelines.

For more details, see "Elements of a Complete Streets Policy" (above and on the complete streets web site). Links to a variety of existing policies can be found in the appendices of this Guide and on the complete streets website; finding a policy close by can be an effective starting point. Also see the Complete Streets Policy Checklist (Appendix F).

Starting with the US DOT Design Guidance

Since 2000, most of the strong complete streets policies have been modeled after the USDOT Design Guidance: Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel (see Appendix E, Example 1) which includes a solid policy statement that can, and has been, adapted for a number of different formats and holds credibility with transportation agencies. Here are some ways it can be improved upon.

- Add a compelling case statement at the top. See Appendix E, Example 2, the introductory text to the MORPC Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Policy. We suggest using the phrase 'complete streets' instead of 'routine accommodation.'

- Make sure you use stronger "shall be established" or "shall be included" language. Do not allow your agency, as some have done, to borrow the weaker points and very weak "consider" language from TEA-21.

- Look at eliminating a specific percentage for excessive cost, or specify that the percentage covers the entire project, as opposed to a single road segment. The 20 percent, oft-used figure for excessive cost has been disputed in some cases.

- Elevate two important points that are somewhat buried in item 4 of the USDOT Design Guidance:
    - that 'scarcity of need' should be considered in terms of future, rather than current use, and

- that exceptions should be approved at 'a senior level' and build on this by requiring the agency to justify not accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians through a detailed process.

- Add language to clarify the need to accommodate transit vehicles, transit users, as well as people with disabilities. To date, only a few policies include transit, and none follow the format of the Design Guidance.

- Consider adding language on measurement of progress toward creating complete streets.

Thunderhead leaders who are looking for a more general resolution on complete streets may want to consider the South Carolina Department of Transportation Commission's resolution (Appendix E, Example 3).

> Our RECOMMENDATION is that you strengthen your organization by using complete streets to build coalitions with natural allies: public health groups, smart growth groups, transit groups, children or senior advocacy groups. See Chapters 4 and 5.

Opposition: Seven respondents in the survey indicated public resistance, including landowner resistance to wider right-of-ways, worries about costs, and concerns about safety or appropriateness of accommodation. The most organized public resistance appears to be in Santa Barbara, where their circulation element, in place since 1995, has inspired a website called Cars are Basic: http://www.silcom.com/~cab/cab.htm.

Some respondents mentioned resistance from specific groups, including from within the DOT, from the local congestion management association (which saw the move as competing for funds), and from the development industry (in those cases where the developers are responsible for providing the roads).

A few sample comments from the survey:

People from our Board and Transportation Advisory Committee, in particular, county engineers, were leery. They insist we need a map with lines on it so they know where they really have to put facilities. At this time, NOACA doesn't have such a map and the BAC met recently to consider the idea and rejected it as inconsistent with our policy. (Cleveland MPO)

Opponents have argued that Florida DOT implementation is wasteful (i.e., that bicycle lanes are underused, relative to cost) or is unsafe -- many members of the public feel that cyclists are more appropriately accommodated on separated paths. (Florida)

There is a fear that bike lanes would invite children and inappropriate users to particularly busy roads. (Illinois)

The good news is that in many cases the policies are not opposed, but may be resisted by planners or engineers mainly because they are not quite sure how to go about it. In South Carolina, initial resistance softened as the engineers applied themselves to the task of figuring out *how* to make accommodation. Thunderhead leaders can address this issue early by providing agency officials with options for training; contact the Association of Bicycle and Pedestrian Professionals for more information about consultants who can provide such assistance.

> Our RECOMMENDATION is to be alert to the concerns of opponents in your early outreach efforts, and when possible find ways to directly address their concerns. See "Element 3 – Gauge Your Resources" in Chapter 4 for advice on opposition.

Keys to Policy adoption success: The survey asked Thunderhead leaders to summarize the roots of successful policy adoption in three key points. A few of their answers:

1. *Supportive, sympathetic staff at MPO.*
2. *Adoption of routine accommodation at rival MPO in northeast Ohio in fall of 2003, challenging leadership position of our MPO.*
3. *Threat to federal funding for local transportation projects if they do not adopt routine accommodation policy.* (Columbus Ohio MPO)

1. *Strong grass-roots support.*
2. *Constantly positive image in the media (we never engaged in public criticism of anyone).*
3. *Working the media.* (Columbia MO)

1. *Existence of DD64 [California statewide policy].*
2. *Supportive MTC [MPO] chairman who is a friend.*
3. *MTC prides itself on being progressive.* (CA Bay Area MPO)

In a broader sense, Thunderhead leaders should also see complete streets as just one part of making communities better for bicycling and walking. Much of what encourages people to walk, bicycle and use transit are the variety of destinations within a reasonable distance. Without land-use changes, sprawl will continue to erode the ability to walk and bicycle. Complete streets are a part of this mix because they are a way to make common cause with other organizations working for healthier communities that offer residents more choices and better access.

CHAPTER 3 - Implementation

Complete Streets Implementation Issues
Once a policy has been adopted, the hard work begins: effective implementation. A few of the policies identified in this Guide are no more than 'paper polices.' They hold promise, but little or nothing has been done to implement them and integrate new

practices into agency procedures. In some cases, few people even seem to know about them. See the detailed table in Chapter 2 for a list of these policies.

Your complete streets policy campaign will initially target a specific public policy decision by the legislature or the transportation agency. It is important however that throughout the campaign you keep your eye on your ultimate goal – major changes in the way all transportation decision-making is done to achieve a balanced multi-modal outcome.

For most transportation agencies, fully implementing complete streets will mean a fundamental shift in previous procedures and assumptions. Most agencies have focused on maximizing automobile throughput, and many engineers are trained primarily to achieve this goal. A shift that requires a broad assessment of the needs of all road users does not fit easily into this paradigm.

As with any bureaucracy, a transportation agency can have systemic inertia that is comprised of individual attitudes, long-standing habits and procedures, incomplete technical knowledge, and entrenched relationships. Any broad policy change at the top will travel a long road with many smaller policy and procedural changes along the way. The motivation of the leadership of the agency to implement this policy is going to make a big difference. The way the initial policy came about will also make a big difference. If a complete streets policy was forced on a recalcitrant agency, the battle for implementation will probably be long. If the legislative or policy campaign was used to get agency officials to see value in the policy, implementation will probably be easier.

In the survey, respondents identified a number of barriers to implementation. Some said agency implementers were not aware of the policies or could not agree on what they mean. Some said no steps were established to move toward implementation, including a failure to choose or create design standards. A couple of respondents noted the difficulty of increasing the width of a right-of-way, particularly in infill areas. Other implementation issues included a failure to include facilities in initial budgets, a lack of MPO input into design, and a resistance of the state DOT in working with a local jurisdiction. Some respondents in areas with a policy directed at new development noted that it is difficult to ensure that development agreements for specific projects include complete streets, since governments are often reluctant to make such requirements of developers (note that even when such requirements come in to existence, many developers will then work hard at seeking exceptions). Thunderhead leaders also mentioned a simple lack of resolve or a bias against bike lanes as implementation barriers, while some staff respondents cited resident resistance to the changes, particularly those that increased road width.

When creating your Complete the Streets campaign, consider implementation part of the campaign. Chapter 2 reviewed some of the barriers to implementing existing complete streets policies. They range from the avoidance of turning a policy document into effective procedures, to the misconceptions of costs, to standard agency resistance. Some agency implementers will claim that they are not aware of the policies or that there is no

agreement on what the policies mean. In this chapter, we will focus on working with your agency to set up an effective implementation procedure.

Keep in mind that even once the policy and procedures are in place, your organization will likely find itself fighting some familiar battles over transportation projects. It might help to think of a solid complete streets policy not as the complete solution, but as an important step in your advocacy. How can you make that tool most effective?

From Policy to Procedure
An effective, well-designed complete streets policy should prompt the following internal agency changes.

- Restructuring procedures to favor multi-modal planning.
- Re-writing design manuals.
- Retraining planners and engineers.
- Re-tooling measures to track outcomes (there is the possibility that they may not be tracking any outcomes now).

> Our RECOMMENDATION is that you simply understand that there will be some barriers. You will need to stay involved, even help, in the initial implementation stages and then check back periodically.

Your influence over this internal process may be formal, through an advisory committee, or informal, through your relationships with agency staff. Respect the agency's process and try to position yourself as a resource. You may be able to increase the credibility of your suggestions by referring to experience at other agencies and the recommendations made in the USDOT Design Guidance.

Your ongoing relationship with the legislators and elected officials that led to the initial policy change is a key to your influence on the agency. You will build respect and influence if you are seen as the one who communicates progress, or lack of progress, back to the people that they are accountable to.

Your strong relationship with and handling of the media also impacts your influence on an agency and with legislators and elected officials.

Restructuring procedures: Some agencies will see an opportunity in a complete streets policy to take a whole new approach to transportation planning, moving away from the traditional focus on volume-to-capacity ratios and Level of Service determinations. For example, Charlotte, North Carolina, in an effort to turn their paper policy into a model is instituting a new six-step planning process that begins by establishing the land use and transportation context of the project, identifying gaps and deficiencies in the network for all users, and then engaging in a clear process to meet the challenge of balancing the needs of all users. Boulder, Colorado has also developed a planning process to conduct an

initial evaluation of the needs of *all* users. Thunderhead leaders can make agencies aware of these opportunities to create fundamental change.

Other agencies will prefer to look for ways to adjust their existing procedures to remind them to take other users into account when working on projects. They may create checklists or similar tools.

Agencies must also establish a formal procedure for handling any exceptions that may have been included in the policy. This procedure must include high-level sign-off on a compliance document (as stated in the USDOT Design Guidance).

Re-writing design manuals: Note that the USDOT Guidance encourages a re-write of the *primary* design manual, and it suggests that the creation of separate bicycle-pedestrian manuals is only an interim step. A number of jurisdictions have created new design manuals that your agency can use as a model. The Transportation and Air Quality Collaborative in Sacramento, California is notable for developing 'best practices' guides for bicycles, pedestrians, transit – and a separate 'complete streets' best practices guide for putting them all together.

Training: The USDOT Design Guidance recommends "intensive re-tooling and re-training of transportation planners and engineers with the new information required to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians." Training has already been a valuable outcome of existing policies. For example, California's Deputy Directive 64 inspired a series of trainings for engineers and the Palmetto Cycling Coalition is working with the League of American Bicyclists to plan trainings for South Carolina DOT personnel. You can help your agency connect with a number of organizations and consultants that offer bicycle and pedestrian training courses. Thunderhead organizations can also offer assistance by helping organize trainings (make sure to charge market rate consulting fees) to educate agency employees on implementation issues.

You may also simply need to push the agency to publicize the new policy.

New outcome measures: The best way to test these policies would be to look at what is happening on the ground. However, the most common answers to questions about outcomes in the survey were that it is just too soon to tell if the policies have succeeded, or that no records were being kept. Disappointingly, few localities are collecting any information about outcomes, whether you define those outcomes in terms of roads 'completed,' increases in walking or bicycling, or decreases in crashes. Even in exemplary Oregon, statistics are few at the state level. Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Manager, Michael Ronkin, observed that the state experienced a slight decline in bike/ped commuting from 1990 to 2000, but less than the rest of country; and that crashes are lower than other Western states. He also observed that statistics are extraordinarily difficult to keep. Thunderhead's Benchmarking Project that gathers and compares bicycling and walking data sets from across the country is designed to be a valuable tool in assessing the effectiveness of these policies. This is the only such measurement project that strictly adheres to government endorsed data sets that are uniform across all states.

For more information on Thunderhead's Benchmarking Project see:
www.thunderheadalliance.org/benchmarking.htm .

An evaluation of the actual effectiveness of the policies included in the survey has not yet occurred. More investigation is needed on the impact of these policies and how to make them work. Thunderhead leaders indicated that even if their policy was not well implemented, it provides additional leverage in advocacy efforts. For example:

> *Internal [CalTrans] allies have seized momentum created by DD-64 to institute a series of bike/ped design trainings for DOT planners and designers.* (California)

> While few of the current complete streets policies have any sort of metrics, our RECOMMENDATION is that you try to get them included in yours. A very important element of future campaigns will be to include progress indicators or outcome measures, especially those that will easily plug into Thunderhead's Benchmarking Project.

Very few existing policies make any serious attempt to measure new outcomes from the transportation planning process. In fact, most don't even require measuring such conventional outcomes as crash statistics. However, we need these types of measures to document change and to create accountability. Here are a few brief suggestions:

- A new measurement system has been developed in Florida, where planners are using multi-modal level of service (LOS) to measure system quality. Details can be found at www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/systems/sm/los/default.htm.

- A National Highway Cooperative Research Program project on multi-modal LOS is due out March 2005. For details, please see www4.trb.org/trb/crp.nsf/All+Projects/NCHRP+3-70.

- However, don't think that a measurement has to be complex. The Thunderhead Benchmarking Project compares basic statistics about the bicycling, walking, and health environment and will serve as a national measuring tool for all complete streets policies. The League of American Bicyclists' Bicycle-Friendly Communities program also asks for basic statistics.

- Another approach is to create performance goals oriented to the end user, such as, "Can every child safely walk or bicycle from their home to the neighborhood school?"

Staying in close contact while the agency is setting up procedures could make the difference between a good policy, and one that does little to change the status quo. Be sure you have energy, time and resources ready for this stage.

Thunderhead leaders can influence the internal implementation process through a formal advisory committee, or through informal relationships with agency staff. Thunderhead leaders who respect the agency's process can position themselves as a resource, helping bring agency officials' attention to the growing number of documents available to help them implement complete streets.

Making Change on the Ground
Once procedures have been set, the next step is seeing the policy in practice. Continued challenges mentioned by survey respondents included budget issues in regards to projects already underway, right of way acquisition (or lack thereof, also regarding projects underway), public opposition, and tension between different agencies.

As a relatively new concept, we are still learning how to ensure that complete streets policies operate 100% effectively. And unfortunately at this point, little can be learned from the limited number of jurisdictions with policies as few of them are making any meaningful attempts to measure their success. As Complete the Streets campaigns mature, Thunderhead leaders will play a vital role providing important insight on what does work to move complete streets policies from paper to pavement, and what does not.

More implementation ideas can be found in some of the complete streets policies listed in Appendix D.

CHAPTER 4 - Campaigns
(blueprint for success)
Introduction
While this Guide focuses on complete streets campaigns, this chapter provides a blueprint for crafting and winning any kind of bicycle and/or pedestrian advocacy campaign. In each of seven basic elements of successful campaigns, this chapter will provide some core principles of effective campaigning to help you make the right choices at the right time — the heart and art of strategic campaigning.

Thunderhead Alliance Campaign Planning Blueprint
Successful campaigns are well thought out in advance and organized around a clear message and specific goal. Thunderhead's Seven Elements of Successful Campaigns are the basis of our proven Thunderhead Training Curriculum and will help you "keep your eyes on the prize."

1. Issue Focus: Selection and Definition
2. Organizational and Campaign Goals (Short-, Medium-, and Long-term)
3. Resource Assessment
4. Strategic Targets
5. Communication

6. Tactics & Timelines
7. Budget and Fundraising Resources

(This Chapter includes in depth analysis of successful campaigns and step-by-step guidance on how you can develop your own successful campaign. Make sure to get the full Guide before starting. You can also contact Thunderhead for specific materials you need. Please also check our Trainings page: http://www.thunderheadalliance.org/trainings.htm and register for a Thunderhead Training where you will be guided through this process with our expert coaches as you work with leaders of Thunderhead organizations from across the country.)

CHAPTER 5 - Communications
(a toolkit)

Introduction

Complete streets is more than just a new name for what was once referred to as routine accommodation. The phrase is useful not just as a description of a policy, but also as an independent communications tool. This phrase is active, flexible, and imbeds a fundamental message we want to send: that streets are not complete until they are safe and convenient for travel by foot or bicycle, as well as for transit users, people with disabilities, and people in automobiles. A street without such safe passage is by default 'incomplete.' This puts us a step ahead of opponents who would like to characterize complete streets policies as mandates that are an "expensive special" accommodation. Since most Americans walk, and many bicycle, use transit, or have disabilities, this is an important reframing of the way we view the road network.

Even if you are not actively pursuing a specific complete streets policy, using the term can advance bicycle and pedestrian advocacy. This chapter is designed to help you do that.

The Cost Misconception: A common misconception is that complete streets cost more to build than incomplete streets. In fact, complete streets most often cost no more and many times can cost less than incomplete streets. For instance, a common street cross section that serves only cars is a four lane speedway with no shoulders, sidewalks or intersection treatments for people. Using the same right-of-way width, this design can be reshaped into two narrower through lanes, one center turn lane, and bike lanes and sidewalks on both sides. By using less width for the most expense elements, truck weight standard asphalt and subsurface, and adding less expensive sidewalks, this design, often referred to as a "road diet" when applied to existing roads, actually saves money. Not only that, this design has been proven to improve traffic flow and safety for motor vehicles by better controlling turning movements. Many other complete streets designs offer similar cost savings. You may even want to bring up the economic benefits of streets that attract visitors and offer access to more employees. Be sure to address this misconception early in your campaign so that you can focus your valuable time on instituting a policy for your communities.

When you are discussing bicycle and pedestrian friendly changes with decision makers, talk about remolding the same street materials into complete streets. Consider writing an article for your newsletter explaining the idea to your members, or updating your website. Use the term when speaking with reporters, in written testimony, and in meetings and conversations. In short, you will play a vital role in helping us propagate this term by using it whenever you can. We need this phrase to become the shorthand for our nation's transportation network that truly welcomes people on foot and bicycle.

This complete streets communications toolkit includes four components.
1. The basics for using complete streets.
2. Using complete streets in everyday communications.
3. The complete streets response to a cyclist or pedestrian death or injury.
4. Using complete streets to build coalitions.

The Basics for Using Complete Streets
The term complete streets is a description of streets that have been built for safe and convenient travel by all road users. It also describes policies that call for routinely providing for all modes when building and reconstructing streets. While the principle will most often be invoked for better walking and bicycling, complete streets should also provide safe and convenient transit access and provisions for people with disabilities. Making common cause with these users is an important element in promoting complete streets policies.

Note that complete streets is not capitalized in general use. The phrase is not proprietary and we wanted to discourage any trend toward a narrow definition of the ultimate 'Complete Street.'

A *campaign* to institute a complete streets policy can have a more formal name: Complete the Streets. Complete streets was initially coined by America Bikes in 2004 as part of the campaign to reauthorize the federal transportation law, and this campaign used the following two taglines:

- Complete the Streets - for safer bicycling and walkable communities.
- Complete the Streets - for safer bicycling and walking.

You can use these tags, but feel free to follow Complete the Streets with other secondary phrases. Already one organization has modified it for their campaign's name to include the health message: "Complete the Streets for Active Communities." You will want to choose one phrase and stick to it. Consistency is vital in good communications work.

The National Complete Streets Coalition, a collaborative of organizations working towards complete streets including the Thunderhead Alliance, has created some tools for those interested in advancing the complete streets cause. Many resources and a customizable PowerPoint presentation explaining the principle are available on the coalition's website www.completestreets.org

Using Complete Streets in Everyday Communications
You need to begin the complete streets transformation right away. Start by updating your existing communications. Then use it in new communications. Get your allies to start using complete streets; and have resources available for others to use.

Adjust your current communications: If you've been using the term 'routine accommodation' simply replace it with 'complete streets' in your communication materials. Look at:
- policy statements,
- brochures describing your organizational goals,
- newsletter articles, and
- website.

While you may have become comfortable using 'routine accommodation,' try your best to eliminate it in all of your communication materials. It does not resonate with decision makers or the general public like complete streets does.

Look for new places to use the phrase: Next, you need to seek out those materials and situations where you can promulgate complete streets. Think of things like:
- letters to the editor, and
- public hearing testimony.

Here is an example:

> *"If there is inequity in the transportation system, it lies in the fact that we as Americans fail to complete our streets for safer bicycling and walking."*
> *(letter to the editor, Asbury Park Press, by John Boyle, Bicycle Coalition of Greater Philadelphia 1/22/04)*

Ask your allies to use it: You have allies who want you, and our bicycle and pedestrian issues, to succeed. Asking them to use complete streets in their meetings, memos and discussions is a direct opportunity and easy way that they can help. Ask allies like:
- bicycle/pedestrian planners,
- MPO officials,
- elected officials,
- smart growth advocates, and
- safety advocates.

Disseminate complete streets resources: You can also put some of your organization's resources to work highlighting the principle. Consider:
- adding a link on your web site to Thunderhead's National Complete the Streets Campaign web page: www.thunderheadalliance.org/completestreets.htm as well as one for the coalition: www.completestreets.org
- presenting or posting to your website the complete streets PowerPoint (with updated, local images and information),

- creating a brochure or webpage about complete streets for your communities, and
- collecting photos of complete streets and streets needing to be completed in your community.

Avoiding pitfalls: In your communications work, don't get bogged down trying to do the job of an engineer or planner. Stay focused on communicating the principle of complete streets. Complete streets policies are by necessity flexible and do not prescribe a single type of accommodation.

If reporters or officials try to pin you down about whether a complete streets policy will result in a specific type of facility, defer to the expertise of planners and engineers and focus on achieving the *outcome* of complete streets. Say to them, for example:

> *"I'm not sure what the best answer is for Smith Street, but I know the engineers and planners can come up with a solution that makes sure this important roadway is a complete street with safe provisions for people on foot and bicycle."*

Be careful not to use complete streets to describe "poser" policies that leave so much wiggle room that they become meaningless, or that restrict accommodation only to roads in a bicycle or pedestrian plan. If you believe your complete streets policy is a strong policy, focus on how the policy will result in change on the ground.

APPENDIX E

Policy Examples

Example 1: United States Department of Transportation Design Guidance (Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel)

1. Bicycle and pedestrian ways shall be established in new construction and reconstruction projects in all urbanized areas unless one or more of three conditions are met:
    *   Bicyclists and pedestrians are prohibited by law from using the roadway. In this instance, a greater effort may be necessary to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians elsewhere within the right of way or within the same transportation corridor.
    *   The cost of establishing bikeways or walkways would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use. Excessively disproportionate is defined as exceeding twenty percent of the cost of the larger transportation project.
    *   Where scarcity of population or other factors indicate an absence of need. For example, the Portland Pedestrian Guide requires "all construction of new public streets" to include sidewalk improvements on both sides, unless the street is a cul-de-sac with four or fewer dwellings or the street has severe topographic or natural resource constraints.

2. In rural areas, paved shoulders should be included in all new construction and reconstruction projects on roadways used by more than 1,000 vehicles per day, as in States such as Wisconsin. Paved shoulders have safety and operational advantages for all road users in addition to providing a place for bicyclists and pedestrians to operate.

    Rumble strips are not recommended where shoulders are used by bicyclists unless there is a minimum clear path of four feet in which a bicycle may safely operate.

3. Sidewalks, shared use paths, street crossings (including over- and undercrossings), pedestrian signals, signs, street furniture, transit stops and facilities, and all connecting pathways shall be designed, constructed, operated and maintained so that all pedestrians, including people with disabilities, can travel safely and independently.

4. The design and development of the transportation infrastructure shall improve conditions for bicycling and walking through the following additional steps:
    *   Planning projects for the long-term. Transportation facilities are long-term investments that remain in place for many years. The design and construction of new facilities that meet the criteria in item 1) above should anticipate likely future demand for bicycling and walking

facilities and not preclude the provision of future improvements. For example, a bridge that is likely to remain in place for 50 years, might be built with sufficient width for safe bicycle and pedestrian use in anticipation that facilities will be available at either end of the bridge even if that is not currently the case.

- Addressing the need for bicyclists and pedestrians to cross corridors as well as travel along them. Even where bicyclists and pedestrians may not commonly use a particular travel corridor that is being improved or constructed, they will likely need to be able to cross that corridor safely and conveniently. Therefore, the design of intersections and interchanges shall accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians in a manner that is safe, accessible and convenient.
- Getting exceptions approved at a senior level. Exceptions for the non-inclusion of bikeways and walkways shall be approved by a senior manager and be documented with supporting data that indicates the basis for the decision.
- Designing facilities to the best currently available standards and guidelines. The design of facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians should follow design guidelines and standards that are commonly used, such as the AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, AASHTO's A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, and the ITE recommended practice Design and Safety of Pedestrian Facilities.

Example 3: South Carolina Department of Transportation, Transportation Commission
Resolution (on bicycling and walking)

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, increasing walking and bicycling offers the potential for cleaner air, greater health of the population, reduced traffic congestion, more livable communities, less reliance on fossil fuels and their foreign supply sources and more efficient use of road space and resources; and

WHEREAS, in 2001 crashes involving bicyclists and pedestrians represented 13 percent of the traffic fatalities in S.C. and in the U.S.; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in its February 24, 1999 Policy statement "Guidance on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Provisions of the Federal-Aid Program" urges states to include bicycle and pedestrian accommodations routinely in their programmed highway projects; and

WHEREAS, bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs are eligible for funding from almost all of the major Federal-aid funding programs; and

WHEREAS, the South Carolina Department of Transportation Commission is strongly committed to improving conditions for walking and bicycling; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) calls for the mainstreaming of bicycle and pedestrian projects into the planning, design and operation of our Nation's transportation system;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the South Carolina Department of Transportation Commission in meeting duly assembled this 14th day of January 2003, affirms that bicycling and walking accommodations should be a routine part of the department's planning, design, construction and operating activities, and will be included in the everyday operations of our transportation system; and

THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the South Carolina Department of Transportation Commission requires South Carolina counties and municipalities to make bicycling and pedestrian improvements an integral part of their transportation planning and programming where State or Federal Highway funding is utilized.

Complete Streets Policy Checklist

Pre-screen: Does the policy *require* that road projects be designed to accommodate all users? *If not, it does not qualify as a complete streets policy.*

☐ **1. Policy intent:**
Is the policy part of a broader goal of providing a complete transportation network for all modes such as through the current strategic plan, transportation system upgrades, new administration's goals, etc.?

2. Policy Coverage:
☐ **2a.** Does the policy cover motorists, bicyclists, pedestrians, transit users, and disabled users?

☐ **2b.** Does the policy cover:
-all roads, regardless of responsible agency? (best)
OR:
-roads managed by single agency or roads seeking a specific funding source?
AND/OR:
-roads installed by private developers?

☐ **2c.** Does the policy cover:
Construction? Reconstruction? Widenings? Other improvements? Repaving? Bridges? Stand-alone retrofit projects?

☐ **3. Policy requirements** (beyond pre-screen requirement above):
When projects do not meet this standard, is there a formal process for approval of clearly stated exceptions placing the burden of proof on not accommodating all users?

☐ **4.** Does the policy direct the use of the latest and best design standards?

☐ **5.** Does the policy set performance standards?

☐ **6.** Does the policy including a funding mechanism?

☐ **7. Implementation**
Has the policy resulted in:
-restructured procedures?
-re-written design manuals or cross-sections?
-sessions for training planners and engineers?
-new data collection procedures?
-the creation of complete streets?