



GOVERNORS'
INSTITUTE
on community design

Draft Recommendations Report

New Hampshire Department of Transportation
Accelerating Practical Solutions Workshop

April 2018

Contents

- Introduction 4**
 - Background..... 4
 - Workshop Summary 4
- Recommendations for NHDOT 7**
 - Summary of recommendations: developing an action plan 7
 - 1. Provide leadership on Complete Streets in working with localities 8
 - 2. Carry consideration of multimodal needs throughout project development..... 11
 - 3. Make the most of funding for Complete Streets 15
 - 4. Establish a process for making tradeoffs between different modal needs or objectives 21
 - 5. Expand community engagement practices 23
- Relevant resources 25**

Preface

The New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT) partnered with the Governors' Institute on Community Design (GICD) to help build awareness around the need to support all users of the transportation network, identify barriers in project development processes and design guidance to support Complete Streets, and identify policy gaps or changes needed to address those barriers. GICD facilitated an Accelerating Practical Solutions workshop for NHDOT decision-makers and other stakeholders on March 6, 2018 in Concord, NH.

The purpose of this report is to summarize the outcomes of the workshop, provide further information and resources to support NHDOT's decision-making, and support NHDOT and its regional and local partner agencies and other stakeholders collaborate on Complete Streets moving forward.

A resource team of facilitators and experts consisting of the following individuals led the workshop:

- Emiko Atherton, Director, National Complete Streets Coalition
- Mike Rutkowski, Steering Committee Member, National Complete Streets Coalition Steering Committee; Principal, Stantec
- Rayla Bellis, Program Manager, Smart Growth America

Attendees at the workshop included NHDOT leadership and staff, transportation staff and planners from local and regional partner agencies, and a few additional stakeholders from advocacy organizations.

Acknowledgements

The Governors' Institute on Community Design team thanks NHDOT Commissioner Victoria F. Sheehan for the invitation to work with the Department; Larry Kensington and Erik Paddleford with NHDOT for their leadership and assistance planning the workshop; Craig Tufts with CNHRPC for his assistance planning the case study; and the NHDOT decision-makers and stakeholders who attended the workshop for their participation in the discussion.

About GICD

The Governors' Institute on Community Design, a program of Smart Growth America, helps state leaders address economic development, housing, transportation, and other pressing issues that relate to how communities grow and develop. Visit www.govinstitute.org for more information.

The Governors' Institute has developed the Accelerating Practical Solutions program to help transportation agencies meet changing demands on their systems by defining the transportation problem to identify the most cost-effective solution to that problem. The program aims to build internal capacity to plan, design, construct, operate, and maintain context-sensitive transportation networks that work for all modes of travel.

The workshop and this report were developed with the support of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and U.S. Department of Transportation.

Introduction

Background

New Hampshire is facing changes that are impacting the role of the transportation network in meeting the needs of residents and contributing to the state's economic vitality. Nationwide, demographic shifts and changing market trends are driving an increased demand for development in walkable communities, including small towns. For New Hampshire, the state's aging population will also create specific mobility challenges that NHDOT needs to address in order to allow residents to age in place, reach their daily needs, and maintain a high quality of life. New Hampshire already has the third highest median age of any state in the country (42.8 as of 2015),¹ and residents over age 65 will make up nearly 30% of the state's population by 2040.² At the same time, funding for transportation remains constrained, and decision-makers face growing public scrutiny about how and where transportation dollars are spent.

NHDOT recognizes the need to expand its consideration of all community residents who use its road network to meet these changing needs and demands. While the Department does not have a statewide Complete Streets policy, it has incorporated a Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) approach into its project development process that expands the stakeholder engagement conducted throughout the process and puts a greater focus on tailoring projects to specific community needs.

NHDOT also has several initiatives underway that call to attention the need for increased safety and access for all roadway users. First, the Department is developing a new Pedestrian and Bicycle Design Criteria Guide. Second, the Department is expanding its "Suggested Minimum Design Standards for Rural Subdivision Streets" guidance to incorporate greater flexibility and the latest best practices from the Federal Highway Administration. Third, the Department's Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Advisory Committee recently added a transit representative and was renamed the NHDOT Complete Streets Advisory Committee.

NHDOT also recognizes that more work is needed to fully bring a Complete Streets approach into its decision-making process. NHDOT will need to evaluate its own project development process, as well as the way the Department works with its partners from local and regional agencies to consider and balance the needs of different modes.

Workshop Summary

In order to help address these needs and augment existing initiatives, GICD facilitated an Accelerating Practical Solutions workshop for NHDOT and local and regional partner agencies on March 6, 2018 in Concord, NH.

The GICD team developed the workshop in line with "Practical Solutions," an outcome-focused approach to decision-making for transportation project development and delivery. The goal of Practical Solutions is to precisely identify a transportation problem and then finely tune the scope of

¹ <http://overflow.solutions/demographic-data/what-is-the-median-age-of-the-residents-in-each-state/>

² <https://www.nh.gov/oep/data-center/population-projections.htm>

the solution to address the identified problem. This approach allows departments of transportation to address challenges and meet demand while seeking lower cost solutions, optimizing existing transportation systems, providing mobility options, reducing the need to build costly new infrastructure, and avoiding overdesigning.

GICD developed the workshop agenda in partnership with NHDOT to help decision-makers identify the challenges they face in making context-sensitive decisions about how to meet the needs of different travel modes. The workshop's objectives were to:

- Build a common understanding of the benefits of Complete Streets and reasons to consider all modes of travel in transportation project development,
- Discuss ways the current project development framework and coordination procedures can be updated to support Practical Solutions and integrate consideration of all modes of travel, and
- Have a discussion with NHDOT decision-makers and local stakeholders about how to make tradeoffs between the needs of different travel modes and throughput versus local trips based on context.

After a welcome and kickoff from NHDOT Assistant Commissioner William Cass, Emiko Atherton provided an overview of the Practical Solutions approach and examples of state DOTs using the approach to achieve cost savings and outcomes that is more aligned with community goals. The presentation focused on the need to carefully define the context for each transportation project, the relationship between land use and transportation in supporting or undermining Complete Streets objectives, and the value of using a Practical Solutions approach.

Mike Rutkowski then presented on the benefits of Complete Streets. He began by discussing the historical factors that have led to car-oriented transportation systems and development patterns around the country. He then defined Complete Streets and discussed the value that designing for all modes of travel can provide for safety, public health, and economic competitiveness. He also noted that Complete Streets is a process, not a product, there will always be tradeoffs between different modes of travel, and those tradeoffs should be discussed openly. The presentation prompted a discussion about measuring the return on investment of Complete Streets, as well as a conversation about the perception that Complete Streets projects increase maintenance costs, a challenging issue in NH due limited funding for maintenance and an expectation that localities generally bear the responsibility for sidewalks.

Next, Bill Oldenburg, NHDOT's Assistant Director of Project Development, provided an overview of how the NHDOT project development process currently works. Local participants provided feedback that when projects go through NHDOT's full Context Sensitive Solutions engagement process, the localities tend to see great results in terms of broad support for the project and catalytic change for the community.

Emiko then facilitated a discussion in response to the presentation about opportunities to bring Complete Streets further into NHDOT's project development process. Some participants suggested that a statewide Complete Streets policy would provide a helpful framework for localities that want to do Complete Streets. NHDOT participants expressed concerns that this would create an overly prescriptive environment for municipalities and reiterated NHDOT's emphasis on letting localities define their own needs and solutions.

Based on this discussion, Emiko articulated several key questions to carry into the afternoon sessions:

- Who should be initiating Complete Streets projects? Who pays? Who should be responsible for maintenance?
- Where does decision-making power lie if there are conflicts between competing needs, roadway users, or priorities?
- Should communities be responsible for articulating what they want (and NHDOT responsible for responding)? If so, what is the best way for them to do that?

Following lunch, Emiko provided a brief presentation with more detailed examples of best practices from other state DOTs. This included an overview of the Massachusetts DOT's Complete Streets technical assistance and funding program designed to assist municipalities in moving through the steps to develop a Complete Streets policy, create a plan for prioritizing Complete Streets investments, and ultimately construct Complete Streets projects. Some participants suggested that a similar model might provide a way for NHDOT to offer leadership and support to localities without being overly prescriptive.

Mike Rutkowski then facilitated a table exercise to apply a Complete Streets decision-making approach to a local case study — the King Street corridor in the Town of Boscawen, NH. Mike Tardif, Executive Director of the Central NH Regional Planning Commission (CNHRPC), set up the case study by providing local context. King Street is a relatively rural corridor that includes the merging of State Routes 3 and 4 through Boscawen, which split on either end of town. The community is interested in making Complete Streets improvements along the corridor, though the specifics of the improvements are not yet defined. CNHRPC's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) includes a project for \$1.4 million, which has been submitted as a candidate for inclusion in the state's Ten Year Plan. CNHRPC has also been working with the community since 2016 to update the zoning along the corridor.

Participants split into table groups to 1) identify needs for the King Street corridor based on the limited context they had received, 2) brainstorm and draw potential improvements to meet the needs on large printed maps, and 3) note when they were making tradeoffs between different objectives or modes of travel.

Emiko then brought the participants back together as a full group to discuss the tradeoffs or tension points they observed. She also had participants write their thoughts on note cards to capture a broader range of perspectives. Finally, she led the group through a discussion to revisit the questions raised before lunch and identify barriers to address in current practices. The discussion centered on several themes:

- Who should initiate Complete Streets projects?
- Who should pay for Complete Streets improvements, and how should maintenance be handled?
- How should limited funds be prioritized?
- How can NHDOT and its partners collect more robust and meaningful public input?
- How to work within NHDOT's fluctuating political climate?
- How to measure and use return-on-investment?

Emiko again had participants write thoughts for each of these questions on notecards to capture a broad range of perspectives and ideas. To close the workshop, the GICD team summarized the day's discussions and shared and got feedback on next steps.

Recommendations for NHDOT

The following section provides recommendations for NHDOT based on the workshop discussions and the major questions identified above. Where noted, some of these recommendations also apply to NHDOT's local and regional partner agencies around the state.

Summary of recommendations: developing an action plan

GICD's first suggestion for NHDOT is to develop a more detailed action plan based on the recommendations in the following sections and identify a group to oversee the implementation of the action plan. GICD recommends that the existing Complete Streets Advisory Committee be tasked with taking this first step as well as guiding implementation of the other recommendations in this report.

Table I below summarizes action steps from the recommendations in the following sections and suggests timeframes for each action to maintain momentum from the workshop. It also suggests who should lead each action and who may be able to support implementation.

Table 1: Recommended actions and roles

Action Step	Who leads?	Who can help
Short term (6 months)		
Development of more detailed action plan	Complete Streets Advisory Committee	NHDOT leadership, participants from the workshop
Update guidance on community/stakeholder engagement	NHDOT Division of Project Development	RPCs, municipalities, advocates
Complete Streets considerations integrated into existing project development checklists at all stages	NHDOT Division of Project Development	Complete Streets Advisory Committee
Medium term (up to 1 year)		
Adoption of statewide Complete Streets Policy	NHDOT Commissioner of Transportation	Complete Streets Advisory Committee
Complete Streets technical assistance program for localities	NHDOT Division of Project Development	RPCs, health departments, AARP, Realtors
Procedural updates:	NHDOT Division of Project Development	Complete Streets Advisory Committee
Required state/local corridor visioning session when projects are accepted into 10-year plan		
Education meeting with localities during project scoping		
Scaled CSS engagement approach integrated into NHDOT project development procedure for all project types		
Develop methodology and guidance for analyzing return on investment of Complete Streets projects	NHDOT Division of Project Development	Local business community
Long term (1-2 years)		
Multimodal design guidance integrated directly into NHDOT's Highway Design Manual	NHDOT Division of Project Development	Complete Streets Advisory Committee
New project prioritization process that is performance-based and applies across modes	NHDOT Commissioner of Transportation	State legislature, Complete Streets Advisory Committee

1. Provide leadership on Complete Streets in working with localities

A major topic discussed during the workshop was NHDOT's reactionary, rather than proactive, role in implementing Complete Streets. Currently, the Department will work with localities on Complete Streets projects if the locality requests it, but NHDOT will not guide communities toward a Complete Streets approach out of a concern for overstepping the role of the state agency.

Below, GICD recommends a variety of steps for NHDOT to take that will provide more leadership and support to localities around Complete Streets. NHDOT can play an important role in supporting communities without being overly prescriptive and while still being responsive to unique local needs.

1a. Provide education on Complete Streets and its benefits during scoping

NHDOT should take a stronger role in educating localities during initial project scoping about the options available to them to address their identified needs. GICD recommends that NHDOT require a meeting at the beginning of the scoping process between NHDOT and the locality to provide an overview of the available options, potentially including visual examples from other localities or resources like the National Association of City Transportation Officials' design guidance³ and the Federal Highway Administration's rural design guidance.⁴ This step should be explicitly built into NHDOT's project development procedure and guidance documentation.

Some of the municipalities in New Hampshire are small with limited staff capacity and may not have a clear understanding of the needs of different types of roadway users. They may simply not know what to ask for from NHDOT when they articulate their goals for a project. Those municipalities with greater knowledge or capacity would still likely benefit from being presented with a menu of options to consider. This type of education upfront can also give local decision-makers the vocabulary to ask for the right things from NHDOT.

NHDOT should also provide more education to local decision-makers on the benefits of Complete Streets and help draw connections between local goals and economic benefits such as attracting private investment, tax base increase, residents, and tourists. The National Complete Streets Coalition's study, *Safer Streets, Stronger Economies* report provides case studies of economic returns from Complete Streets projects around the country and may be useful resource.⁵

1b. Provide direct technical assistance and capacity building

Beyond education, NHDOT should also provide more leadership to localities around Complete Streets through direct technical assistance and capacity building. As the state agency, NHDOT is in a good position to provide support and expertise to communities at various levels of knowledge and awareness. NHDOT can do so by pointing them to resources that can show them available

³ <https://nacto.org/publications/design-guides/>

⁴ https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/publications/small_towns/

⁵ <http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/safer-streets-stronger-economies.pdf>

design options as well as providing individual consultation or direct financial support to hire consultants.

NHDOT should also offer direct technical assistance through Complete Streets workshops in each of their districts on a regular schedule, such as twice per year. This can be done at relatively low cost once the curriculum is established. The Florida Department of Transportation does this periodically in each of its districts to continue educating localities and MPOs on Complete Streets implementation. For example, FDOT recently held district trainings for their local partners to educate them on how to use FDOT's new design manual, which the Department recently updated to better support Complete Streets.⁶

During the workshop, participants discussed MassDOT's Complete Streets funding and technical assistance program as a potential model for NHDOT that could help localities build their understanding of and capacity to design Complete Streets. While MassDOT received dedicated funding for the program through legislation, NHDOT could offer a modified version of the program to localities without a similar funding package, particularly the first two tiers discussed below.

Case Study: Complete Streets Technical Assistance and Funding

The Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) established a technical assistance and funding program designed to assist municipalities in the state in moving through a series of steps to develop a Complete Streets policy, create a plan for prioritizing Complete Streets investments, and ultimately construct Complete Streets projects.⁷

In 2013, MassDOT issued a Healthy Transportation Policy Directive "...to ensure all MassDOT projects are designed and implemented in a way that all our customers have access to safe and comfortable healthy transportation options at all MassDOT facilities and in all the services we provide."⁸ Building on this direction, the state legislature established the MassDOT Complete Streets Funding Program as a part of the state's 2014 Transportation Bond Bill.⁹ The program is designed to assist and reward municipalities demonstrating a commitment to integrating Complete Streets in their policies and practices.

MassDOT conducted a robust stakeholder process for more than a year to design the program. This included engagement with local public works and planning officials, regional planning agencies, the Massachusetts Bicycle and Pedestrian Board, the MA Healthy Transportation Compact Advisory Group, the MA Partnership for Health Promotion and Chronic Disease Prevention's Built Environment Community of Practice, and the Transportation Managers Group. MassDOT also conducted training sessions with select communities and agencies throughout the State to enhance Complete Streets awareness and better educate practitioners of the planning and implementation process.

The resulting program, launched in February of 2016, includes three tiers designed to assist municipalities based on where they are in the process of developing Complete Streets policies and integrating Complete Streets into their practices:

⁶ <http://www.fdot.gov/roadway/CSI//CSIWorkshop.shtm>.

⁷ <https://masscompletestreets.com>

⁸ <https://www.massdot.state.ma.us/Portals/0/docs/GreenDOT/DirectiveHealthyTransportation.pdf>.

⁹ <https://malegislature.gov/Bills/188/H4046>

- Tier 1 – Complete Streets training and policy development
- Tier 2 – Funding for technical assistance to develop a Complete Streets Prioritization Plan
- Tier 3 – Project construction funding

Under the program, municipalities must complete each tier to be eligible for the next tier. For example, in order to be eligible for technical assistance in Tier 2, each municipality is required to attend training offered by MassDOT and develop a Complete Streets policy. Municipalities can submit policies to MassDOT for review and scoring using criteria developed by MassDOT based on the National Complete Streets Coalition’s Ten Elements of an Ideal Policy. Each policy is required to score at least 80 out of 100 points to receive approval, while policies that score fewer points are returned to the municipality for revision.

Tier 2 of the program includes up to \$50,000 per municipality for technical assistance to support development of a prioritized list of Complete Streets investments in the form of a “Complete Streets Prioritization Plan.” Each plan must include a targeted investment approach to improve safety, mobility and accessibility, and must identify locations, infrastructure needed, cost estimates, and timing for the desired improvements. The Prioritization Plan must also align with the municipality’s master plans and roadway maintenance schedule.

Tier 3 of the program provides up to \$400,000 per municipality per year in funding for construction of specific Complete Streets infrastructure projects identified in the Prioritization Plan. Municipalities submit an application for funding annually highlighting five projects for which they would like to receive funding. They can receive funding for numerous less expensive projects up to the funding cap or a single larger project.¹⁰

MassDOT allocated \$12.5 million for the first two years of the program. As of April 2018, MassDOT has approved 157 policies, 95 Prioritization Plans, and 71 Complete Streets construction projects.¹¹

1c. Leverage resources and expertise from other agencies or partners to provide training and education

Capacity building for localities does not need to come at a major expense to NHDOT. The Department should seek partners who share an interest in the goals of Complete Streets and could fund training for localities.

For example, decision-makers in the public health field tend to be advocates for Complete Streets because of the connection between the built environment and availability of safe and convenient biking and walking options and incidence of chronic diseases like asthma and diabetes in communities. While partnering with public health organizations will not help NHDOT pay for infrastructure investments, public health stakeholders are frequently willing to contribute funds towards education and training. There are many examples from around country of health organizations and agencies providing funding for Complete Streets workshops. Voices for Healthy Kids funded a recent Complete Streets workshop for Tucson, AZ that included participation from

¹⁰ <http://www.massdot.state.ma.us/Portals/8/docs/CompleteStreets/FundingProgramGuidance.pdf>

¹¹ <https://masscompletestreets.com/Map/>

the local DOT, and the Winter Park Health Foundation in Florida funded a series of three workshops for eight municipalities in Central Florida focused on Complete Streets implementation. Likewise, AARP chapters see clear benefits of Complete Streets in terms of preserving mobility and quality of life for seniors aging in place and can be great partners in providing resources for training and education.

In addition to potential funding partners, NHDOT could look to other agencies like the Regional Planning Commissions to provide the expertise and capacity needed to deliver local training. The RPCs will benefit from having more knowledgeable local municipalities to work with and some may be eager to partner.

1d. Adopt a statewide Complete Streets policy

Several stakeholders from localities at the workshop noted that a statewide Complete Streets policy could provide a beneficial framework for municipalities. GICD recommends that NHDOT take this step. More than half of the states nationwide have a state Complete Streets policy in place, whether enacted internally by the DOT or through legislation.¹² A policy can be flexible and allow ample room for localities to develop their own context-specific policies. Some states, like Florida, have seen a number of localities adopt policies directly in response to the new state Complete Streets policy because it provides a useful starting point to work from and assures localities that the state will support, rather than work at odds with, their Complete Streets efforts.

The National Complete Streets Coalition provides guidance for developing Complete Streets policies that are flexible and context-sensitive, yet also include the necessary elements and level of detail to set the agency up for successful implementation.¹³

1e. Offer Complete Streets policy and design guidance

Even if NHDOT does not adopt a policy at the state level, it can still support the municipalities by offering policy development guidance to provide some of the desired statewide framework. This could take the form of written guidance, as well as training (see the example from MassDOT above). This would allow the localities to tailor policies to their own unique needs and contexts while still providing a starting point and solid foundation to work from for those that are uncertain how to craft a Complete Streets policy. The same goes for multimodal design guidance – NHDOT should build a requirement into scoping conversations that project development teams proactively share NHDOT's guidance with local communities to give a greater sense of the options available to them.

2. Carry consideration of multimodal needs throughout project development

One of the biggest challenges project teams encounter in addressing the needs of all users is failing to provide the flexibility upfront in how they articulate the project purpose to allow for consideration of multimodal approaches as potential solutions. Too often, gaps in multimodal access come up during the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) stage of project development or the design processes through local requests after the project budget has been set and the scope is relatively difficult to change.

¹² <https://smartgrowthamerica.org/program/national-complete-streets-coalition/policy-development/policy-atlas/>

¹³ https://smartgrowthamerica.org/app/uploads/2017/12/CS-Policy-Elements__2017.11.30.pdf

Likewise, while multimodal needs along a corridor are often identified during planning, some of those needs can get lost or minimized as the project development process continues due to decision-making silos between planning and project delivery, cost constraints, or right-of-way concerns. Continual communication of the project need and well-defined problem statement up front in the planning process is necessary, and should be continued through to the construction phase.

The following steps can help NHDOT integrate multimodal considerations throughout its existing project development procedures.

2a. Bring elements of NHDOT's CSS process into all types of projects

NHDOT uses a “Context Sensitive Solutions” (CSS) approach in project development for some projects. The Department’s CSS approach involves more extensive community engagement upfront to identify the problem statement and a vision statement before a project is scoped. It also involves more detailed evaluation of the project context during scoping and a more robust process for evaluating alternatives developed and selecting the best alternative using evaluation criteria defined in partnership with stakeholders.¹⁴

As noted previously, some of the workshop participants provided feedback that NHDOT’s CSS process for determining context and conducting engagement throughout project development has produced good results, from building broad community buy-in to catalyzing other initiatives such as a zoning update. For example, during the workshop, Bill Oldenburg presented on the Pelham Main Street project, which was a great example of a well-planned, collaborative process that resulted in a “win-win” for everyone involved.

NHDOT should replicate elements of the CSS process in the project development process for other types of projects, including state of good repair projects. Bringing some of the same engagement practices used upfront during scoping into the process for repair projects gives localities the chance to raise needs or issues that could be addressed as part of the project (potentially with a local funding match). For example, simply restriping during resurfacing to narrow travel lanes, add bicycle accommodations, or enhance pedestrian crossings can lead to significant improvements in pedestrian and bicycle safety. These types of investments are also relatively low-cost and easily reversible if they do not produce the expected outcomes. Without engagement upfront to understand the project context, these needs will not come to light until much later in the process, meaning that NHDOT would need to increase the project delivery time or costs to accommodate them.

NHDOT already has draft guidance on how to scale the CSS approach for different types of projects,¹⁵ which provides a good starting point. NHDOT should prioritize integrating this guidance directly into the Department’s existing project development procedures and enforcing the routine use of the approach. This should include incorporating it directly into the Department’s documentation of the project development process so that there is one document (not a separate

¹⁴ <https://www.nh.gov/dot/org/projectdevelopment/highwaydesign/contextsensitivesolutions/index.htm>

¹⁵

<https://www.nh.gov/dot/org/projectdevelopment/highwaydesign/contextsensitivesolutions/documents/CSSScaling.pdf>

CSS process document), continuing to provide training to engineers, and rewarding exemplary use of the CSS approach in the department's internal review processes.

Case Study: Incorporating Complete Streets into repair projects

Staff within the Planning Department of the City of Longwood noticed an upcoming resurfacing project on Church Avenue on a meeting agenda and reached out to the city's Public Works Department about the possibility of doing the project better. Public Works was on board, and the City ultimately used the resurfacing project as a Complete Streets pilot, adding sidewalks and bike lanes which now connect neighborhoods on the corridor to a major park downtown and the nearby rail station. The project was successful thanks to supportive decision-makers, but had already gone through initial scoping by the time planning staff become aware of it, and integrating the sidewalks and bicycle lanes happened relatively late in the process.

The Longwood agencies now communicate upfront to consider how each street could be improved during resurfacing, as well as during other projects that temporarily disrupt the street, such as utility replacement. When those types of cross-agency conversations happen upfront before projects have been programmed, improving walking, biking, and transit access can be built into the project from the beginning, rather than added later with an associated increase in cost.

2b. Expand guidance and checklists for asking the right questions during scoping

Project teams need a clear understanding upfront of all of the needs of the well-defined problem statement, as well as various travelers along the corridor to accommodate them. This requires thorough community and stakeholder engagement. This makes it possible to determine from the beginning which types of roadway users are currently using the facility and whether there might be latent demand for walking and biking if conditions were safer or if new development will be introduced.

NHDOT should require that project teams answer specific questions about the needs of different users and how they should be met at various stages of project development. It will be easier for project teams to consistently ask themselves and local partners the right questions upfront across project types if they have guidance on what those questions should be. NHDOT already uses checklists during various phases of project development and delivery, so simply updating those checklists with additional considerations could go a long way.

The Minnesota DOT developed guidelines and checklists for asking the right questions during scoping as part of the Department's broader Complete Streets efforts that could provide valuable models.

Case Study: using checklists to identify Complete Streets needs

The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) has a series of project Scoping Worksheets¹⁶ with detailed checklists of considerations to help identify the needs for a project and other context. These include checklists of stakeholders to engage, local businesses to consider, and possible issues that should be identified in advance (land owner issues, access issues, utility issues, etc.), among others. They also include a list of planning documents and

¹⁶ MnDOT's scoping worksheets are available at: <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/pm/documents/scoping-worksheets.doc>.

user groups to consult, and a form for documenting “needs” and “wants” from each user group upfront.

In addition to the Scoping Worksheet, MnDOT has also developed a Planning Worksheet Scoping Guide.¹⁷ Project managers answer a short series of yes or no questions about the project such as the following, which guide them to consult specific stakeholders and emphasize the needs of specific modes of travel:

- Is there a school within a 1-mile radius of the project?
- Are there medical facilities within 1 mile of the project?
- Is the project occurring near significant freight or truck traffic generators, or near a significant freight route?
- Is the project occurring on a portion of a Scenic Byway?

While currently optional, these worksheets and checklists carry the dual benefits of encouraging project teams to do their due-diligence to understand the project context upfront while also providing documentation of that context that can be referenced and updated later in the project development process.

2c. Integrate Complete Streets design guidance into NHDOT’s main highway design manual

Workshop participants noted that NHDOT is currently developing draft multimodal design guidance. This is a great step, but if this guidance is in a separate document than NHDOT’s main Highway Design Manual, it will perpetuate the mindset that multimodal design features are “add-ons” to a project rather than considerations that should be addressed upfront and included in a project scope from the beginning, when appropriate for the context.

NHDOT recommends integrating the multimodal design guidance directly into NHDOT’s Highway Design Manual rather than as a separate document that engineers must take the initiative to use.

Case Study: Updating the Florida Design Manual to include Complete Streets considerations throughout

When the Florida Department of Transportation adopted a Complete Streets policy in 2014, leadership recognized that implementing the policy would require updating the way the Department does business at all levels of decision-making. They developed a Complete Streets Implementation Plan through a stakeholder engagement process that outlined five steps for implementation:

- Revising guidance, standards, manuals, policies, and other documents
- Updating other decision-making procedures
- Modifying approaches for measuring performance
- Managing internal and external communications
- Providing ongoing education and training on Complete Streets

¹⁷ MnDOT’s Planning Scoping Worksheet Guide is available at <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/planning/completestreets/docs/PlanningScopingWorksheetGuide.pdf>.

One of the first steps FDOT took in their implementation initiative was conducting a process to review and update the Florida Design Manual, previously referred to as the Plans Preparation Manual, so that all relevant chapters included reference to multimodal needs.

FDOT adopted eight context classifications to guide road design decisions. Under the new system, planners and engineers consider existing and future characteristics such as land uses, building configuration, and street connectivity to ensure that roads are designed for the right vehicle speeds, road users, and trip types. The classifications, which include “rural town,” “suburban commercial,” and “urban core,” determine allowable design speeds, lane widths, and other design controls and geometrics within the updated Florida Design Manual.¹⁸

3. Make the most of funding for Complete Streets

During the workshop participants raised limited funding as one of the key barriers to implementing Complete Streets. The most impactful thing NHDOT can do to address this is recognize all of the available funding pots that can support Complete Streets improvements and establish a project prioritization process that enables that to happen more readily.

NHDOT can also build a stronger case for Complete Streets investments to elected officials and the public to increase funding for Complete Streets. NHDOT may also consider refining the way project needs and scopes get defined to support identification of lower-cost solutions, which can lead to cost savings overall and make it easier to determine when a multimodal investment might help meet the identified need. This can also lead to a more streamlined project development and delivery process, addressing another barrier participants identified during the workshop: frequent political turnover and shifting priorities.

3a. Recognize that more of the budget can be used for Complete Streets projects and establish a project prioritization process to enable that

State DOTs often assume that providing ample funding for Complete Streets projects would require a new dedicated funding source. While dedicated funding can present some advantages (see MassDOT’s approach above), in reality NHDOT can make Complete Streets improvements using many existing funding programs as integrated pieces of broader projects, including by considering Complete Streets improvements during routine resurfacing.

GI CD recommends that NHDOT establish one project selection process that applies across modes of transportation. Further, such a process should prioritize projects based on their expected performance in achieving state goals, including Complete Streets-focused goals. A number of states around the country have recognized a need to integrate performance measures directly into budgeting and project selection decisions to demonstrate that limited funds create the best possible return for the state’s investments. The Virginia DOT’s Smart Scale process (described below) is a great model of objective-drive project selection, and applies to all capital projects in the state across modes of transportation.

Case Study: Project prioritization across modes

¹⁸ <http://flcompletestreets.com>

In 2014, the Virginia legislature unanimously passed House Bill 2 (HB2) requiring VDOT and the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) to develop a quantifiable and transparent prioritization process for making funding decisions for capacity enhancing projects within the state's six-year improvement program. VDOT and the CTB established the new project scoring framework, now called Smart Scale, to ensure that the state picks the right transportation projects for funding and makes the best use of limited tax dollars.

The legislation explicitly established six factors to be used in the scoring process, but tasked VDOT and the CTB with developing the methodologies for measuring each. The factors include: congestion mitigation, economic development, "accessibility," safety, environmental quality and (in areas over 200,000) coordination with land use.

In response to the legislation, VDOT and CTB researched best practices from other state DOTs and MPOs, held a peer exchange workshop, and held extensive outreach meetings with key stakeholders. From this, they developed six guiding principles for the application of the scoring framework:

- Analyze what matters to people and has a meaningful impact
- Ensure fair and accurate benefit-cost analysis
- Be both transparent and understandable
- Work for both urban and rural areas
- Work for all modes of transportation
- Minimize overlap between measures

The new scoring approach applies to all new capacity projects that receive state funding across transportation modes, which represent about half of VDOT's overall program (a different scoring process applies to state of repair projects).

VDOT first screens projects for eligibility based on whether they meet an identified need in the state's long-range plan. All projects that pass the eligibility screening are scored by VDOT to determine their cumulative benefits in the six factor areas based on a combination of state and locally submitted data. VDOT assigns up to 100 points to each project under each of the six scoring factors.

VDOT then divides the total benefit score by the cost requested from the state to determine the final Smart Scale score and rank compared other projects. This approach provides a number of benefits, including encouraging localities to make their projects more competitive, either by identifying innovative ways to accomplish their objectives through smaller improvements or by identifying local matching funds to offset the funding needed from the state.

VDOT has conducted three rounds of project scoring so far using the new approach, and has made minor adjustments to the scoring methodology with each round of prioritization. VDOT also continues to conduct meetings with stakeholders to build buy-in and address concerns, including VDOT staff across the Commonwealth, metropolitan planning organizations, planning district commissions, and counties, cities, and towns.

The Smart Scale project prioritization process has largely been greeted positively for taking politics out of the process and has made clear to the taxpayers why projects are funded and how projects not chosen for funding can be improved in order to receive funding in the future.

It has allowed the state to put priorities like multimodal accessibility to jobs on par with other, more typical transportation measures, like congestion mitigation and safety.

3b. Analyze return on investment to build the case to potential partners and decision-makers

NHDOT and its local partners can build support for potential Complete Streets projects and potentially secure additional funding by expanding its ability to sell the projects to elected officials and other decision-makers. Evaluating economic impact or return-on-investment is one of the most compelling ways to do this. By demonstrating the expected economic returns from a project, NHDOT and its local partners can build the case for Tax Increment Financing districts and other mechanisms for getting those who will benefit most from the investment to contribute funding for it, including for ongoing maintenance.

NHDOT should also consider conducting before and after studies for successful Complete Streets projects to build a broader case for the benefits of Complete Streets and generate momentum. Before and after studies can be a powerful tool to show elected officials the value of Complete Streets, particularly for pilot projects or temporary installments that are low cost but help build buy in for more transformative change.

Case Study: Complete Streets projects around the country bring private investment

When Dubuque, IA was planning the redevelopment of its historic Millwork District, local leaders knew the project's success hinged on whether people would want to walk or bike there. So the city took a long look at the District's four main avenues—Jackson, Washington, 9th and 10th streets—and figured out how to make them work better for people walking and biking. They replaced sidewalks, made it easier to cross the street, added new street lights, painted “sharrows,” and created a multi-use trail. Within a year, bicycling use increased by 273 percent—and that was just the beginning.

Since the project's completion, the neighborhood has experienced more than \$34 million in new private investment, with another \$150 million in the pipeline. The first warehouse to be redeveloped is leasing 72 residential units, 39,000 square feet of retail and commercial space, and 20,000 square feet for an incubator for arts and nonprofit organizations. The fact that the neighborhood's streets work for everyone who uses them is a key part of this success.

Other communities around the country have seen significant private investment along their Complete Streets projects:

- Private companies invested \$160 million in the Uptown District in Normal, IL after that area's Complete Streets project was completed. The new roundabout that replaced a complicated intersection now serves as the heart of the uptown District and is a place that residents of all ages can enjoy. “People love Uptown Normal,” said Normal Mayor Chris Koos. “They ride the bus, they bike the trail, they shop, they socialize, and they recreate in a wonderful urban center.”
- Both Washington, DC and Raleigh, NC saw new or renovated apartment buildings and hotels built along their Complete Streets projects, totaling \$63.3 million and \$25.5 million, respectively.

- And in Cleveland, OH—a city recovering from population loss and widespread disinvestment—private companies invested an astonishing \$5.8 billion along Euclid Avenue’s HealthLine. Several Cleveland-based institutions, including the Cleveland Clinic and University Hospital, have built new projects in tandem with the new bus rapid transit line making Euclid Avenue a “front door” for people visiting the area. Cleveland’s reconstruction of Euclid Avenue as a Complete Street, along with investment in bus rapid transit, also improved access to two employment hubs that together are home to more than 170,000 jobs.¹⁹

Getting the most out of Complete Streets investments means measuring performance before the projects are started and after they are completed to show the positive impact on economic activity and private investment, and monetized benefits for safety, health, and other outcomes. Doing this means collecting baseline data relevant to the project goals before the project starts, establishing a process and timeline for collecting data again once the project is complete, and publicizing positive results by working with local media, advocates, or other messengers. This can also include collecting and publicizing before and after data based on surveys of business owner and resident satisfaction.

Case Study: Building support for Complete Streets through partnerships

In Alexandria, MN, Blue Cross provided funding to support the planning of a downtown revitalization effort, including Complete Streets improvements to Broadway Street, one of the city’s main thoroughfares. Construction of the project was completed in 2014. The process included a robust engagement process of the businesses in the area. Blue Cross also commissioned a multi-year study to measure the economic benefits of a more walkable downtown. The results of this study as of 2017 indicate a major improvement in business owners’ opinions of the project since its completion. Of those surveyed, 88% responded that the appearance of the street had improved, 51% noticed an increase in pedestrian traffic, and 49% noticed an increase in tourist traffic visiting the area. Traffic crashes also decreased in both 2015 and 2016.²⁰

Smart Growth America has produced several resources providing guidance and examples for analyzing the economic benefits of Complete Streets projects after they have been completed, most notably the 2016 report, *Safer Streets, Strong Economies* mentioned above, which profiles a number of regions and communities that have assessed the economic benefits of their past or proposed multimodal projects.²¹ Smart Growth America’s guide, *Evaluating Complete Streets Projects: A guide for practitioners*, is another useful resource that provides specific performance measures transportation agencies can use based on a variety of goals.²²

¹⁹ More information about these Complete Streets projects is available within Smart Growth America’s report *Safer Streets, Strong Economies*: <http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/safer-streets-stronger-economies.pdf>

²⁰ http://walkingsummit.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Broadway-St-Follow-up-Presentation-Widescreen-2-20-17_jmm1.pdf

²¹ <http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/safer-streets-stronger-economies.pdf>

²² <https://smartgrowthamerica.org/resources/evaluating-complete-streets-projects-a-guide-for-practitioners-2/>

3c. Put the work in upfront to get the scope and budget right

During the workshop, GICD noted that considering the needs of all users upfront in planning and early project scoping can reduce project costs down the line – otherwise, multimodal features become “add-ons” to the scope later in the process when communities raise needs or concerns that cause the project to go over budget.

Workshop participants raised the value of investing a little more upfront to bring on additional capacity or consultants who can assist localities in developing the project scope and getting an accurate budget estimate. GICD recommends that NHDOT provide leadership in recommending this to localities as part of the process for receiving submittals for the 10 Year Plan. It may also reduce the need for NHDOT to go back to localities and ask for budget revisions or clarifications due to poor initial estimates.

NHDOT should also work with its partners and stakeholders to refine how the needs behind proposed projects get articulated to support identifying lower-cost strategies. Tailoring a project to a well-defined and supported set of needs helps agencies avoid over-engineered solutions that are high in cost, high in environmental impact, and can induce demand requiring further intervention and expenditure.

GICD suggests providing general guidance to its staff and localities on defining the project purpose and need. WSDOT’s guidance below provides a good example.

Case Study: Defining Purpose and Need

The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) has integrated guidance on identifying and documenting the need for a project in the agency’s Design Manual as a part of WSDOT’s Practical Solution’s initiative. The manual provides guidance on how to develop a Project Need Statement in clear and simple terms that is quantifiable and performance-based and does not prescribe a solution. It also outlines an approach for translating the identified needs into specific performance metrics and targets.²³

NHDOT can also provide localities with guidance and technical assistance on how to develop innovative, low-cost solutions based on the project need they have identified. The Virginia DOT has done a lot of work in this area and has produced a number of successful project examples.

Case Study: Helping localities identify innovative, lower-cost solutions

As part of the Smart Scale program discussed above, VDOT accounts for both the benefits of each proposed project (based on 6 policy goal areas established by the state legislature), and the cost. VDOT divides the cumulative benefits score by the requested contribution from the state to determine a project’s overall rank compared to other projects submitted. As a result, the funding contribution requested from the state has a significant impact on a project’s competitiveness for funding. Local projects are most competitive if they either accomplish the identified objectives at relatively low cost or include local matching funds to offset the funding needed from the state

²³ <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M22-01.htm>

VDOT has found through the scoring process that traditional highway widening projects do not tend to rank well in Smart Scale. This is because they are generally not cost-effective in terms of the benefit in reduction in delay compared to the project cost. By contrast, projects that include lower-cost and more targeted strategies for addressing the specific congestion issues such as signal timing improvements and intersection treatments tend to perform significantly better.

Based on these findings, VDOT has developed a program, Strategically Targeted Affordable Roadway Solutions (STARS), to help localities develop projects that will be more competitive to receive state funds. The objective of STARS is to develop comprehensive, innovative transportation solutions to relieve congestion bottlenecks and solve critical traffic and safety challenges. VDOT has created a streamlined STARS project development process to assist localities with data analysis and mapping, scope projects, and submit them for scoring in Scale over the course of one year. The process includes bringing together VDOT engineers and specialists with different areas of expertise to help localities evaluate potential solutions more carefully and build stakeholder consensus.²⁴

3d. Revisit the goals and needs of projects that have been in the statewide plan for a long time

NHDOT should consider facilitating a process with its stakeholders to revisit the needs behind some of the regional projects that are already in the statewide plan. The purpose would be to identify changes that could be made to the project scopes to make them more cost-effective while still accomplishing most of the identified objectives, such as operational improvements or transportation demand management strategies. These savings can then be redirected to fund other priorities. Several state DOTs have conducted this type of evaluation to achieve cost savings across their program. TDOT's approach below may provide a model.

Case Study: Revisiting the scope of projects already in the queue

Tennessee DOT created the Expedited Project Delivery (EPD) process to address decades of project backlog. As of 2012, TDOT had a backlog of more than 800 roadway projects in various phases of development, with total costs estimated at \$6.1 billion. Several projects had been in the TDOT work program for many years with little to no progress, mainly due to high estimated costs and lack of funding.

TDOT began by identifying projects that had been on the books for a long time and were not slated for funding in the near term. TDOT specified the intended outcomes of each project, and then staff looked for less expensive alternatives that accomplished the same or a substantially similar result. Some examples were reduced to 1/20th the cost of the original design while accomplishing 80-90 percent of the goal. For example, TDOT reevaluated an expansion project that proposed converting a 2-lane road into a 4-lane road. The cost was estimated at \$58 million. Instead, TDOT introduced curve warnings, school speed limit signs, stop signs, and other pavements and signage improvements at a cost of \$85,000. This improved the estimated level of service, while reducing costs by more than \$57 million.²⁵

²⁴ <http://www.virginiadot.org/projects/stars.asp>

²⁵ <https://www.greshamsmith.com/showcase/projects/showcase-7/tdot-expedited-proj-delivery>

4. Establish a process for making tradeoffs between different modal needs or objectives

NHDOT and its local partners make a number of tradeoffs during planning and project development: around prioritizing regional throughput versus local travel and economic development, prioritizing the needs of different roadway users, and balancing those needs with other considerations like maintenance costs. Some of these tradeoffs came up during discussions about the King Street Corridor case study. Having the tough but necessary conversations about these tradeoffs upfront is a challenge all state DOTs face. GICD recommends the following actions to support these discussions and decisions about tradeoffs for projects moving forward.

4a. Require a corridor visioning session between NHDOT and the local agency when projects are accepted into the state's Ten Year Plan

NHDOT should establish a specific point in its overall process to routinely have corridor visioning sessions with localities and discuss the role of the road in serving both regional and local trips, community goals, and what modal needs should be prioritized in the project. GICD suggests that this happen as a requirement when projects are added to the Ten Year Plan.

Determining what a road's role should be in serving local traffic versus regional trips is a major step in making modal tradeoff decisions. If a road's primary function within the context of the broader network is to serve shorter local trips, it may make sense to prioritize the needs of people walking and biking. However, a road that serves as a major regional connection might require more focus on higher-speed car travel and potentially transit.

As the state agency, NHDOT's traditional role is focused on serving regional and statewide throughput. Some NHDOT engineers likely default to using roadway design standards in line with this objective during project development. However, as participants noted during the workshop, designing roadways for regional throughput often presents a direct conflict to pedestrian and bicycle safety and access. This includes design decisions related to lane widths, travel speeds, frequency of pedestrian crossings, crossing distances, vehicle turning movements, and a host of additional considerations.

Therefore, it will be important for NHDOT and its local partners to make decisions upfront about what role the road *should* play within the surrounding community and region to provide a framework for guiding future design decisions during project development. The following steps will support this:

- Document a clear decision: NHDOT should institutionalize documentation of the outcomes of the visioning sessions, including specific determinations about the role of the corridor and which modal needs should be prioritized. This will set up a framework for decisions during scoping and design.
- Establish criteria to make a determination about through versus local trips: Having basic criteria in place will help make conversations with stakeholders easier and decisions about priorities more transparent and less controversial. Criteria could include evaluating the existence of nearby roads or highways that serve through or local traffic, the current land use context, future planned growth, current travel patterns, economic development benefits of promoting travel within the area versus through the area, and

other considerations to determine what the primary role of the road should be in relation to the community and surrounding transportation network.

- Provide guidance to communities on how to develop street typologies: NHDOT should consider offering guidance to communities on how to better define the function and design characteristics of their street network based on different roles a road can play in the community (ex. rural highway, main street, access road, etc.). This will help localities do some of the necessary visioning upfront before meeting with the state.

Case Study: Guidance on context classifications

As part of its Complete Streets Implementation, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) recently adopted eight context classifications to guide road design decisions. Under this new system, planners and engineers will consider existing and future characteristics such as land uses, building configuration, and street connectivity to ensure that roads are designed for the right vehicle speeds, road users, and trip types. FDOT's guidance offers performance measures and indicators for FDOT decision-makers to use in determining the land use context of a project (such as urban core, suburban residential, suburban commercial, or rural small town) and identifying travel demand for different modes.²⁶

Case Study: Rural corridor typology guidance

Sussex County, NY adopted a Complete Streets policy and created an implementation plan that establishes a number of "corridor types" and provides guidance on which types of Complete Streets improvements are best suited to each, from road diets and narrowing of lanes to roundabouts. Sussex County is relatively rural and its corridor types may provide a good model for many New Hampshire communities.²⁷

4b. Integrate modal tradeoff discussions with stakeholders into project development procedures at several milestones

Decisions about how to weigh and prioritize the needs of different modes should be made early and should flow from the decision about the role of a corridor in serving local versus regional trips. NHDOT should explicitly integrate these stakeholder conversations about tradeoffs into its existing project development flowchart. They should happen during planning and scoping, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) stage for projects to which it applies, and likely several times throughout design at an increasingly granular scale as the project progresses. For example, during planning and scoping, these conversations can focus on which types of users should be prioritized based on current travel patterns, demand, and surrounding land uses. The conversations during design will be narrower, focusing on making tradeoffs between specific design elements or cross-sections to maximize safety and comfort for the priority modes within limited right-of-way.

²⁶ See: <http://www.flcompletestreets.com/files/FDOT-context-classification.pdf>

²⁷ See page 10 for Sussex County's corridor types:
<http://www.sussex.nj.us/documents/planning/transportation/sussex-completestreetsplan.pdf>

5. Expand community engagement practices

Participants in the workshop raised a need to reach more stakeholders through the engagement conducted by NHDOT and its partners, noting the limitations of traditional public meetings. Workshop participants brainstormed a number of strategies to expand community engagement, including social media and other platforms like YouTube. While this will likely help, it will only address certain demographics of stakeholders.

GICD suggests a multi-faceted approach to reach stakeholders that are not traditionally involved in transportation decision-making, including some combination of the following strategies.

Make it clear how the outcomes of the engagement will be used moving forward: Other state DOTs have found that community residents who tend to be active around these issues can face engagement fatigue from participating in a number of meetings if they do not appear to produce immediate outcomes or change how decisions are made. This can be especially frustrating when residents have taken time off of work or overcome other hurdles to attend workshops and forums, only to feel that their voices have not been heard. Articulating clearly how feedback from community members will feed directly into future projects or policy decisions and providing concrete next steps may encourage better attendance.

Offer multiple ways to provide feedback: NHDOT and its partner agencies can collect broader input by providing multiple ways for residents to provide feedback on a topic, such as online or phone surveys in addition to in-person events.

Meet people where they already are (i.e., traveling roadshows): Rather than hosting separate workshops and events, NHDOT and localities should attend existing standing neighborhood meetings, school functions, or community events. This can provide an opportunity to collect feedback from a broader group of residents that would not attend separate events.

Engage the community to help plan public meetings, workshops, and events, not just attend them: Doing so can make a big difference in ensuring that engagement is responsive to specific community needs. It might also show members of the community that they will get value from participating in the sessions.

Do ribbon cuttings and community events for smaller projects: Traditionally, transportation agencies only hold ribbon cuttings and events for major capital projects. Something similar to mark smaller projects and pilot projects can be a great engagement strategy. It can build excitement around broader initiatives while conveying to residents that NHDOT is accomplishing the things it has promised to accomplish.

Holding meetings and events at different times of day: This can help reach a range of community members with different work schedules and needs. While decision-makers and stakeholders from NHDOT and the localities can attend public meetings through their jobs, some community residents would need to take the day off of work to do so.

Provide childcare and food during public meetings and events: This may make it easier for community members to participate in sessions they might not otherwise be able to attend because of the costs or logistical hurdles of finding childcare.

Hire trusted community leaders to act as liaisons: Some residents will be more comfortable engaging with a community leader whom they know and trust. Hiring liaisons to support engagement efforts can cultivate longer-term relationships with residents that might otherwise be hesitant to engage.

Relevant resources

Safer Streets, Stronger Economies —A report that shows the return on investment for complete streets improvements

<https://smartgrowthamerica.org/resources/evaluating-complete-streets-projects-a-guide-for-practitioners/>

Evaluating Complete Streets Projects—A guide that suggests Complete Streets performance measures for different goals from safety to public health and provides case studies for each.

<https://smartgrowthamerica.org/resources/evaluating-complete-streets-projects-a-guide-for-practitioners-2/>

Complete Streets Policy Development – The National Complete Streets Coalition’s guidance on developing Complete Streets policies tailored to local context.

<https://smartgrowthamerica.org/program/national-complete-streets-coalition/policy-development/>

Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks – A guide to implementing Complete Streets in Small Towns and Rural Communities from the Federal Highway Administration.

https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/publications/small_towns/fhwahep17024_lg.pdf