



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

---

## **Summary Report**

# **Context Sensitive Solutions Technical Assistance: Florida Department of Transportation**

July 31, 2017

---

---

October 2017

---

### **Notice**

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) in the interest of information exchange. The U.S. Government assumes no liability for the use of the information contained in this document.

The U.S. Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trademarks or manufacturers' names appear in this report only because they are considered essential to the objective of the document.

### **Quality Assurance Statement**

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) provides high-quality information to serve Government, industry, and the public in a manner that promotes public understanding. Standards and policies are used to ensure and maximize the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of its information. FHWA periodically reviews quality issues and adjusts its programs and processes to ensure continuous quality improvement.

**Technical Report Documentation Page**

<b>1. Report No.</b> FHWA-HEP-18-008	<b>2. Government Accession No.</b>	<b>3. Recipient's Catalog No.</b>	
<b>4. Title and Subtitle</b> <b>Final Summary Report</b>  <b>Context Sensitive Solutions Technical Assistance:</b> <b>Florida Department of Transportation</b>		<b>5. Report Date</b> October 2017	
		<b>6. Performing Organization Code</b>	
<b>7. Author(s)</b> Oana Leahu-Aluas, Gary Toth		<b>8. Performing Organization Report No.</b>	
<b>9. Performing Organization Name and Address</b> The Cadmus Group, Inc. 100 Fifth Avenue, Suite 100 Waltham, MA 02451		<b>10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)</b>	
		<b>11. Contract or Grant No.</b> DTFH61-11-D-00031, order no. 5007	
<b>12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address</b> U.S. Department of Transportation 1200 New Jersey Ave. SE Washington, D.C.		<b>13. Type of Report and Period Covered</b> Final Report	
		<b>14. Sponsoring Agency Code</b>	
<b>15. Supplementary Notes</b>			
<b>16. Abstract</b> <p>The Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) sponsors a Technical Assistance (TA) effort to support states in applying Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) to challenges they face in the transportation sector. Each state participating in the TA effort is invited to identify one issue to tackle using a CSS approach, with FHWA assistance. Participating states can also join a virtual peer exchange for sharing information and lessons learned. Each state and state agency faces unique issues, but the results and key findings of these CSS efforts can offer valuable insight to other states.</p> <p>FDOT requested the CSS TA to convene a discussion among FDOT District senior staff and develop an action plan that will provide them with the steps necessary to implement the Complete Streets Handbook with their Districts. The delivery of the TA was in the form of a four-hour meeting attended by FDOT District senior staff. The report documents the background, purpose, and key takeaways from the meeting. The report also provides a detailed summary of the meeting, including key points from presentations and the challenges and solutions the meeting attendees identified regarding Complete Streets implementation in Florida.</p>			
<b>17. Key Words</b> Complete Streets, Florida Department of Transportation, Context Sensitive Solutions, CSS, Context Identification		<b>18. Distribution Statement</b> No Restrictions	
<b>19. Security Classification (of this report)</b> Unclassified	<b>20. Security Classification (of this page)</b> Unclassified	<b>21. No. of Pages</b> 19	<b>22. Price</b> NA

## Table of Contents

Background .....	4
Purpose of the Technical Assistance.....	4
Key Takeaways .....	5
Meeting Agenda.....	6
Meeting Attendees .....	7
Meeting Summary.....	8
Welcome from FHWA and Introductions .....	8
Presentation on Complete Streets Best Practices from Other DOTs .....	9
Description of the FDOT Complete Streets Policy and Guidance.....	10
Challenges to Implementation Discussion .....	11
Strategies to Address Challenges .....	14
Prioritization of Strategies/Closing Discussion .....	16
Appendix .....	18
FHWA and FTA Recent Bicycle and Pedestrian Resources .....	18-19

## Background

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has been a leader in changing its business model to better serve its communities since the 1990s, beginning with the creation of its Livable Communities Initiative in 1996. FDOT then became a major partner, along with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and other State and local transportation organizations, in creating [Community Impact Assessment \(CIA\): A Quick Reference for Transportation](#). In 1997, FDOT created a strategic plan to implement CIA, followed by a continuing sequence of toolkits, handbooks, and training sessions on sociocultural effects and public involvement. FDOT also became a leader in the national Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) movement. In 2002, Florida became one of the first States to issue multimodal level of service guidance.

In 2011, Smart Growth America released a report called [Dangerous by Design](#), which ranked States by how hazardous walking was in each State. Florida ranked among the most hazardous States and became determined to change how it approached its road design. This led FDOT to redefine its entire bicycle and pedestrian program, and in the process FDOT added a bicycle and pedestrian specialist in each of its seven Districts. FDOT also developed a statewide strategic safety plan for walking and bicycling, and began training its planners and engineers on walk- and bike-friendly road design.

To support these efforts, FDOT created several cutting-edge design policies and guidance. In 2011, FDOT revised the [Florida Greenbook](#)—which contained road design guidelines for cities and counties—to include an additional chapter specifically for context sensitive design of Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) communities. This chapter represented a fundamentally different approach than conventional transportation design and was expanded upon in a supplemental publication, the [Traditional Neighborhood Development Handbook](#).

Additionally, FDOT's [Roadway Design Bulletin 14-17](#), issued in late 2014, established eleven-foot travel lanes as the default for roadways with a divided section in or within a mile of an urban area. The bulletin also set seven feet buffered bicycle lanes as the standard for marked bike lanes. FDOT is also one of the few State DOTs that actively advises local communities on how to apply and implement road diets.

In September 2014, FDOT released its [Complete Streets Policy](#). FDOT incorporates CSS principles throughout its Complete Streets effort and strives to provide more context-sensitive roads by putting "the right street in the right place." In support of the policy, FDOT released its [Complete Streets Implementation Plan](#) in December 2015 and the external draft of both the [Complete Streets Handbook](#) and [FDOT Design Manual](#) in April 2017. Comments received on the *Handbook* informed FDOT's decision to move forward with the [FDOT Context Classification](#) guide, which was published in August 2017. The full *Handbook* however is a draft and not approved. The facilitated discussions held during the Technical Assistance were related to the draft *Handbook*, and it is referenced extensively throughout this report.

## Purpose of the Technical Assistance

FHWA is sponsoring a CSS technical assistance (TA) effort to support States in applying CSS to challenges they face in the transportation sector. Each State participating in the TA effort was invited to identify one issue to tackle using a CSS approach, with FHWA assistance. FHWA is also inviting States that have completed a CSS process to join a virtual peer exchange where they can share information and lessons learned. While each State and State agency faces unique challenges, the results and key findings of these CSS efforts can offer valuable insight to other States.

FDOT requested the CSS TA to convene a discussion among FDOT District senior staff and develop an action plan that will provide them with the steps necessary to better incorporate CSS while establishing context identification and implementing the *Complete Streets Handbook*. The delivery of the TA was in the form of a four-hour meeting attended by FDOT District senior staff. The purpose of the TA included the following:

- Update FDOT District staff on the latest developments of the *Complete Streets Handbook*;
- Provide FDOT with CSS and Complete Streets best practices from other DOTs;
- Facilitate discussions among District staff to identify challenges and corresponding solutions related to better incorporating CSS into the *Handbook*;
- Develop a prioritized action plan for District staff to use as they work to adopt the *Handbook* at the District level.

## Key Takeaways

Through a facilitation exercise, participants at the meeting came up with key challenges that they associated with FDOT's Complete Streets implementation effort. The challenges that emerged were then sorted into five categories:

- Implementation phasing;
- Funding;
- Managing expectations;
- Project delivery process – scoping; and
- Training/culture change.

FDOT District personnel expressed concern that an early release of the *Handbook* to the public might generate high expectations on the part of its customers for additional accommodations outside of the scope of programmed projects, putting pressure on an already tight capital program. The goal of the Complete Streets policy is to increase the balance of multimodal elements in FDOT projects. However, with limited resources and funding for implementation, there is uncertainty among District personnel regarding how to redistribute funds between: freight, commuting capacity-increase projects, fix-it-first infrastructure projects, as well as the newly emphasized Complete Streets elements. Furthermore, the *Handbook* adds a new process related to the determination of eight land-use context classifications. District personnel participants discussed challenges with the new process and ways to approach it successfully, in a manner that would not overburden existing staff resources and cause them to fall behind schedule on projects already in the capital program pipeline.

After discussing the challenges associated with Complete Streets implementation, participants brainstormed strategies to overcome these challenges. The top strategies that emerged were:

- Resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation (3R) projects already in the project pipeline should be grandfathered in.
- The priority project programming process (4P)—a project scoping process used by several of the Districts—would provide a useful tool for making the decisions on how and when to include Complete Streets components into FDOT projects. It was discussed that this approach could be expanded to all Districts during the planning and pre-programming phase.

- The *Handbook* should distinguish between capacity and non-capacity projects in prescribing the extent of implementation of Complete Street and context sensitive elements. For instance, non-capacity projects such as resurfacing have manageable scopes of work that are usually bundled with other street improvements for quick implementation. For these projects, anything more than reallocating space between the modes —e.g. narrowing lanes to fit in a bike lane—could fundamentally change the cost and scope to a degree that it would effectively kill the project. District staff recommended that in these instances, non-capacity projects be allowed to move ahead within the existing curb lines and the Complete Streets elements be considered in a new project for planning study and incorporation into the development program.
- The *Handbook* and public outreach should make it clear that, for 3R projects in the pipeline, the budget is already set, and there is no new FDOT funding for additional scope such as bulb-outs. If the local jurisdiction wishes to add elements beyond the scope of a 3R project, then it must provide the funds themselves. Participants discussed working with their respective Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to secure the funding, or having FDOT create a new multimodal project-scoping study to address the desired features.
- The current wording regarding public engagement in the *Handbook* inserts public engagement into each phase of a project, including 3R projects. This is challenging, particularly in light of the recommendation that 3R projects need to remain with a pre-set scope. Providing the public with a “pattern book” of Complete Streets and CSS features and then inviting them in for discussion on their transportation needs and priorities would be beneficial for both the community and FDOT. The *Handbook* can be used to educate the public and elected officials about the Complete Streets implementation process. Similarly, the *Handbook* could be used to discuss newly requested transportation features that may not fall within the scope of a 3R project, yet could more suitably be addressed during a 4P-like scoping process. The 4P process provides an opportunity for robust public engagement on “capacity” and multimodal focused projects.
- Participants communicated that more time is needed for project phasing beyond what is currently allotted in the *Handbook*. A primary cause for concern is the amount of time and resources needed to fully incorporate CSS principles when establishing the street context classifications. One proposed solution suggested removing the need to set classifications for 3R projects, or using relatively simple methods to distinguish context characteristics. While the *Handbook* does state on page 19 that “[i]n most cases, especially for [3R], safety, and traffic operations projects, primary measures are sufficient to understand and determine a roadway’s context classification,” workshop participants expressed the need for additional ongoing collaboration to fully incorporate the process of identifying and implementing the updated classifications.
- The *Handbook* should clarify the distinction between existing and future context classifications. This is most relevant for 3R projects.

## Meeting Agenda

The meeting was titled “Directors Meeting: Complete Streets Implementation Session,” and was held on Monday, July 31, 2017.



**Florida Department of Transportation  
 Directors Meeting: Complete Streets Implementation Session**

Burns Building Auditorium  
 605 Suwannee Street  
 Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Monday July 31, 2017  
 1:00 – 5:00 PM

1:00 to 1:15	<b>Welcome from FHWA and Introductions</b>
1:15 to 2:00	<b>Presentation on Complete Streets Best Practices from Other DOTs</b>
2:00 to 2:30	<b>Description of the FDOT Complete Streets Policy and Guidance</b> Presenter – DeWayne Carver, FDOT
2:30 to 3:15	<b>Challenges to Implementation Discussion</b>
3:15 to 3:30	<b>Break</b>
3:30 to 4:15	<b>Strategies to Address Challenges</b>
4:15 to 4:45	<b>Prioritization of Strategies</b>
4:45 to 5:00	<b>Closing Discussion</b>

## Meeting Attendees

The target audience for the meeting was FDOT Division Directors. Others from FDOT were also in attendance, along with a representative from FHWA Headquarters and subject matter expert facilitators.

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Oana	Leahu-Aluas	Senior Analyst	Cadmus
Brian	McKishnie	District 7 - Director of Operations	FDOT
Bill	Jones	District 7 - Director of Development	FDOT
Larry	Parks	District 2 - Director of Development	FDOT
Phil	Bishop	District 2 - Director of Operations	FDOT
Jason	Watts	Director, Office of Environmental Management	FDOT
Alan	Hyman	District 5 - Director of Operations	FDOT
Rick	Morrow	District 5 - Director of Development	FDOT



First Name	Last Name	Title	Organization
Mike	Shannon	Turnpike Enterprise Headquarters - Director of Development	FDOT
Sharon	Harris	District 1 - Interim Director of Operations	FDOT
John	Kubler	District 1 - Director of Development	FDOT
Lora	Hollingsworth	Chief Safety Officer	FDOT
Trey	Tillander	Director, Traffic Operations	FDOT
Jim	Spalla	Director, Right of Way	FDOT
Paul	Hiers	Criteria Administrator	FDOT
Michael	Shepard	State Roadway Design Engineer	FDOT
John	Krause	Civil Integrated Management Officer	FDOT
Jim	Wood	Chief Planner	FDOT
Mike	Sprayberry	Sitting for Director, Office of Maintenance	FDOT
Tim	Lattner	Director, Office of Design	FDOT
Mary	O'Brien	State Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator	FDOT
Courtney	Drummond	Chief Engineer	FDOT
Lisa	Saliba	Director of Office of Work Program and Budget	FDOT
Jason	Peters	District 3 - Director of Operations	FDOT
Jared	Perdue	Director of Development	FDOT
Fleming	El-Amin	Community Planner	FHWA
Gary	Toth	Senior Director, Transportation Initiatives	Project for Public Spaces

## Meeting Summary

### Welcome from FHWA and Introductions

DeWayne Carver, FDOT, kicked off the meeting by welcoming everyone and letting all participants introduce themselves. He explained that FHWA had sponsored the meeting to engage FDOT Division Directors in FDOT's Complete Streets implementation efforts.

Fleming El-Amin of FHWA thanked the FHWA Florida Division for helping to make the meeting possible, and provided all participants with two handouts. He explained that one of the handouts offered information on FHWA's CSS website, including information on CSS as it relates to Complete Streets. The handout also provided a list of related program websites and contact information for FHWA personnel on the livability team. The other handout listed FHWA pedestrian and bicycle resources, including publications, guidance, and websites. Fleming explained that most of the resources were produced very recently and covered a wide range of topics relevant to CSS and Complete Streets.

Fleming indicated that Florida was the sixth State to receive technical assistance under the current FHWA CSS technical assistance effort. He also announced that FHWA was preparing to host virtual peer exchanges among the States that received TA and others, including one focused on Complete Streets on October 25.

## Presentation on Complete Streets Best Practices from Other DOTs

A national overview of Complete Streets and CSS practice, including examples of what other States were doing, was provided. Key items mentioned during the presentation included:

- Many DOTs are working to be more transparent with communities about their work.
- The Colorado DOT has recently compiled a guide, [Colorado Downtown Streets: A Tool for Communities, Planners, and Engineers](#), to set expectations for communities regarding the capabilities the DOT has. The guide lays out design metrics helpful for both the DOT and communities.
- The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet has teamed with the Kentucky Department for Public Health to provide bicycle and pedestrian planning support for communities.
- The Michigan DOT has released guidance on their process for conducting lane elimination reviews.
- Several States have set guidance to prevent DOTs from experiencing cost overruns on projects.
  - The Washington State DOT’s design manual explicitly states that the DOT seeks to engage with local stakeholders as part of their decision-making process.
  - Indiana DOT’s OpenRoads program—their version of Performance Based Practical Design—is an approach that “targets investment decisions to the roadway system as a whole, rather than seeking to accomplish individual project perfection in a single location.”<sup>1</sup> In its first year of implementation, it reduced the cost of capital projects from an initial \$200 million cost estimate to \$80 million.
  - The New Jersey DOT and Pennsylvania DOT together have developed the [Smart Transportation Guidebook](#), which lays out what the DOTs have been able to accomplish, what they have not been able to accomplish, and the communities’ responsibility. The guidebook also codifies the concept of diminishing returns as a design philosophy.



*Figure 1: Pennsylvania DOT used the Smart Transportation process to rescope the Route 202 bypass from a four-lane controlled access freeway with a 65-mph design speed to a two-lane multimodal parkway with a 35-mph design speed. Lower speeds allowed for bending the road to fit into the surrounding context as well as eliminating the need to clear cut wide swaths of adjacent woodland. The design also eliminated large overpasses and reduced the number of lanes. Thus, the rescoping led to dramatically fewer impacts, and at less than one-half of the original project cost. Source: Al Biehler, Former Secretary, Pennsylvania DOT*

---

<sup>1</sup> Indiana Department of Transportation. “Open Roads (Practical Design).” (website) Available online: <http://www.in.gov/indot/3261.htm>, last accessed August 16, 2017.

- Some DOTs are looking toward multiple performance metrics beyond just level of service.
  - The PennDOT Connects program makes it policy that building communities, economic vitality, and health issues are important factors in addition to level of service.
  - Colorado DOT's *Downtown Streets* guide states that "great streets are more than infrastructure...unfortunately many transportation facilities built in recent decades are singularly focused on moving cars from place to place."<sup>2</sup>
  - New York State's Greenlites program sets up a matrix of broad performance metrics for community, environmental, sustainability, and transportation metrics.
  - In 2014, FHWA sponsored a webinar on quality of life performance measures and Level of Service (LOS), which highlighted the need for practitioners to consider multiple performance metrics and LOS goals that consider all road users, support livable communities, and help achieve CSS.
- Several State DOTs have enacted policies to ensure that community and environmental metrics are fully considered during transportation decision making, while also setting clear expectations and benchmarks for local communities to meet. For instance, some States require communities to carefully consider land-use planning regulations to ensure local destinations do not become overly congested due to excessive auto-oriented land uses that significantly impact capacity on regional thoroughfares and State highways.
- The Florida DOT has been a national leader on Complete Streets, as exemplified by the release of statewide lane elimination guidance and reducing default lane widths in urban areas.
- FDOT's *Complete Streets Handbook* expands upon the five functional classification contexts provided by the National Cooperative Highway Research Program publication, [An Expanded Functional Classification System for Highways and Street](#), and defines eight contexts: natural, rural, rural town, suburban residential, suburban commercial, urban general, urban center, and urban core.
- It is important that State DOTs continue to work with local communities to prioritize projects and discuss funding constraints in order to maximize benefits.

## Description of the FDOT Complete Streets Policy and Guidance

DeWayne Carver, FDOT, provided an overview of Complete Streets policy implementation at the meeting. Key items mentioned during the presentation included:

- In the *Dangerous by Design* report released by Smart Growth America in 2011, Florida communities were listed as the highest in terms of pedestrian and bicycle fatalities, prompting FDOT's Secretary to take action.
- Florida pursued the "4Es" of road safety: education, engineering, enforcement, and emergency services. In addition to these efforts, FDOT developed a Complete Streets policy adopted in 2014. In addition to safety, the policy promoted quality of life and economic development. The policy also highlighted the desire to serve the transportation needs of all users, including cyclists, freight handlers, motorists, pedestrians, and transit riders.
- Many local communities within Florida adopted Complete Streets standards, but they often clashed with FDOT standards, requiring District engineers to request exceptions and variations.

---

<sup>2</sup> Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Colorado Department of Local Affairs, and Colorado Department of Transportation. (2016). *Colorado Downtown Streets: A Tool for Communities, Planners, and Engineers*. Available online: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-vz6H4k4SE5Qk9vSGRIQII5dnM/view>, last accessed August 16, 2017.

- FDOT collaborated with Smart Growth America to develop the *Complete Streets Implementation Plan*, completed December 2015. The plan described how to enact the Complete Streets policy step by step and provided a common vision for FDOT. The plan also helped FDOT understand that Complete Streets is a process, not a product.
- The *Complete Streets Implementation Plan* identified 12 documents that required updating (currently underway by FDOT). As part of the implementation process, FDOT engaged with representatives from its Districts, MPOs, regional planning councils, and the private sector.
- The *Complete Streets Handbook* was developed as a starting point to the process of updating FDOT documentation. The *Handbook* introduced FDOT’s newly defined context classifications, but it was neither a design manual nor a “best practices” guide. The *Handbook* presented the roles of FDOT and local governments regarding Complete Streets implementation.
- Overall, FDOT’s Complete Streets efforts do not imply or result in new funding, so projects will continue to be programmed and funded as they were previously. The difference is that the projects will now include context classifications.
- The eight context classifications FDOT developed expand upon the categories of urban and rural and help determine design criteria, including appropriate design speed.
- FDOT is updating its *Design Manual*, which incorporates context sensitive design criteria. The *Manual* will indicate how context classification influences design criteria. One significant change included in the revised *Manual* will be that certain context classifications will have greater flexibility in allowable design speed ranges.
- The revised *Manual* increases flexibility in design. Certain elements that previously were not allowed at higher design speeds can now be accommodated and local partners have an opportunity to become involved in this process.
- Criteria changes in the revised *Manual* include reduced lane and median widths (that will not require design exceptions), and increased border and sidewalk widths.
- Each FDOT District has a Complete Streets coordinator and implementation continues through meetings and regular communications.
- The District Offices have taken different approaches to defining context classifications including: defining them project-by-project; defining them through proactive corridor/town planning; and defining all contexts within their District all at once.

## Challenges to Implementation Discussion

Participants were divided into four breakout groups and given instructions to come up with any challenges they associated with FDOT’s Complete Streets implementation plan. Participants first had to rapid-fire list any challenges, and those are listed below from each group.

*Table 1: Challenges to Complete Streets Implementation*

Group 1	Group 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff to do context classifications</li> <li>• Maintain project schedules</li> <li>• Local input</li> <li>• Cost impacts to planning budget</li> <li>• Cost impacts to individual projects</li> <li>• 3R targets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff – Who? How Many?</li> <li>• Funding – non-capacity program</li> <li>• Coordination with L/A (limited access) or high-capacity roads</li> <li>• Managing local expectations</li> <li>• Decision making/managing expectations (ability to say no)</li> </ul>

Group 1	Group 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local visions of corridors versus current use</li> <li>• Freight versus bike/pedestrian</li> <li>• Long term maintenance commitment</li> <li>• Politics – high turnover in local governments</li> <li>• Training for staff</li> <li>• Statewide consistency</li> <li>• Realistic timeframe for implementation</li> <li>• Buy-in – internal and external</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff training, buy-in/role</li> <li>• Not done in silo – coordination with technology</li> <li>• Future land use</li> <li>• Future technology – automated vehicles/connected vehicles?</li> <li>• Is it about just bikes? Pedestrians? Or mobility?</li> <li>• Property owner engagement</li> <li>• Not silver bullet</li> </ul>

Group 3	Group 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding</li> <li>• Right-of-way challenges</li> <li>• Classification determination/local agreement</li> <li>• Design speed?</li> <li>• Escalation matrix</li> <li>• Resurfacing – scoping</li> <li>• People/organizations involved/city/county</li> <li>• Bike lanes versus parking</li> <li>• Metropolitan planning organization/county priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Picking the context – Where do you draw the lines? Future conditions? How included? Minimum length of a segment?</li> <li>• Local government expectations – what level of engagement is expected?</li> <li>• Perception of Complete Streets</li> <li>• Maintenance questions</li> <li>• Doing the context classification with existing resources</li> <li>• How does context classification affect project development and environment (PD&amp;E)?</li> <li>• Culture change in FDOT – silos</li> <li>• How do we balance the function/purpose of the roadway?</li> <li>• Revisiting the status/role of level of service</li> </ul>

Once each group came up with their list of challenges, they discussed them and wrote down their top ideas, rephrasing as necessary. All breakout groups then came back together as one big group and posted their challenges on the wall, categorized them, and discussed. Clarifying notes are provided as needed.

*Table 2: Categorized Complete Streets Implementation Challenges*

Category	Challenges
Implementation Phasing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does context classification affect/relate to PD&amp;E  <i>[Clarification: The Districts noted that once a project</i></li> </ul>

Category	Challenges
Implementation Phasing	<p><i>enters PD&amp;E, if they have to do context classifications it would break the schedule and budget.]</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doing context classification within existing resources  <i>[Clarification: Where do Districts get the staff or consultant funding for this new layer of work?]</i></li> <li>• Maintain project schedules</li> <li>• Context class determination</li> <li>• Realistic time frame for implementation</li> <li>• The effort to obtain local input</li> <li>• How to staff context classification</li> <li>• Cost impact to projects</li> <li>• Planning and budget impact for eight classifications</li> <li>• County/MPO requests don't match priorities (MPOs set priorities then later ask FDOT to do something not in the original list)</li> <li>• Statewide consistency for classifications and funding</li> </ul>
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional right-of-way (R/W) needs (when to draw the line if completing a street requires new R/W)  <i>[Clarification: The concern was that often a community could ask for a feature that cannot be accommodated without buying new R/W.]</i></li> <li>• Managing local expectations</li> <li>• Decision-making matrix: How do you say no?</li> <li>• Funding: who pays?</li> <li>• 3R targets -&gt; funding shortfall</li> <li>• Funding non-capacity infrastructure (RRR, Bridge Replacement)</li> </ul>
Managing expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long term maintenance commitment – locals  <i>[Clarification: The concern was that FDOT should not be responsible for maintaining everything that is built as part of a project, for instance decorative lighting or perhaps a short walking connector to a local facility.]</i></li> <li>• Local government expectations – what level of engagement is expected</li> <li>• Future land use – if FDOT agrees to complete a street based on future land use changes, how does FDOT ensure the locals do what they say</li> <li>• Local visions of the corridor versus current use (Dreams versus reality)</li> <li>• Politics – High turnover in local elected officials results in changing visions</li> </ul>



Category	Challenges
Project Delivery Process – Scoping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do we balance the function/purpose of the roadway...e.g. Strategic Intermodal System (SIS), level of service (LOS) <i>[Clarification: Since road space is finite, often times, there is not enough space to layer in a bike lane, for instance, without reallocating space from other uses (e.g. take out a lane from through traffic)]</i></li> <li>• MPO: Realizing SIS needs in addition to Complete Streets</li> <li>• Bike lanes versus on-street parking</li> <li>• Design/target speeds</li> <li>• Funding non-capital</li> </ul>
Training/Culture change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Culture change in FDOT – silos <i>[Clarification: The structure of FDOT, in which units are specialized to match production needs, sometimes insulates staff in certain units from understanding the big picture.]</i></li> <li>• Training for staff and consultants (need to get training at all levels)</li> <li>• Staff: who, how many?</li> <li>• Staff training (internal buy-in, understanding roles)</li> </ul>

### Strategies to Address Challenges

The participants were once again divided into the original four breakout groups and each assigned one of the first four categories listed above. The training/culture change category was not assigned to a breakout group but was instead provided to DeWayne so he could brainstorm solutions from the FDOT Headquarters perspective. The strategies developed by each of the groups are shown below. Clarifying notes are provided as needed.

*Table 3: Strategies to Address Complete Streets Implementation Challenges*

Group 1: Managing Expectations	Group 2: Project Delivery Process – Scoping
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4P – Priority project programming process → helps manage expectations</li> <li>• Timeframes for data collection/ground truth (input by partners)</li> <li>• Timeframe for implementation (input by partners)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity – process works, no impacts, MPO prioritize <i>[Clarification: implementing the Handbook for capacity increase projects where the MPO has matched scope requests to the budget, will not impact project delivery.]</i></li> </ul>

Group 1: Managing Expectations	Group 2: Project Delivery Process – Scoping
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance would be helpful, a checklist (input by partners)</li> <li>• Coordination with locals</li> <li>• Transition timeframe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-capacity – FDOT owns currently, we prioritize – no input, context requires input <i>[Clarification: Historically, FDOT has “owned” the process for non-capacity 3R projects, meaning that the scope and budget are relatively cut and dry and FDOT has not shared a lot of the decision-making with stakeholders.]</i></li> <li>• Funding not on five year</li> <li>• State funds – not on priority, but data-driven, not recurring, always changing</li> <li>• Some problems not complete street friendly: 3R, bridge</li> <li>• Safety – only what data-driven, highway safety improvement program (HSIP) funds</li> <li>• LAP (local agency program) projects – federal funds</li> <li>• TA (transportation alternatives) funds – TPO (transportation planning organization) priority</li> <li>• Trail funds</li> </ul>

Group 3: Funding	Group 4: Implementation Phasing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better clarification that additional funding will be <u>local</u>/federal, MPO</li> <li>• 3R projects would need local funding during scoping process – <u>commitment</u></li> <li>• Reallocation of 3R dollars (excess 3R)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More time to phase-in <i>[Clarification: More time is needed particularly for projects requiring primary or secondary context classification measures].</i></li> <li>• Enhanced education for all</li> <li>• Clarify only context during planning for projects <i>[Clarification: Impacts on project schedules and budgets will accrue as the need to do context classifications are retroactively applied to projects in or past PD&amp;E.]</i></li> <li>• Clarify current and future classification</li> </ul>



## Prioritization of Strategies/Closing Discussion

At the conclusion of the workshop, each breakout group was asked to report out on one of their proposed strategies to overcome the challenges discussed earlier. The highlights of the reporting out are indicated below. In addition to the strategies, an action item emerged out of the discussion for DeWayne to investigate the wording on local engagement in the flow charts of the *Handbook* to ensure that it is clear. Additionally, District Directors agreed that they should meet more regularly to discuss progress on implementing the *Complete Streets Handbook*. Clarifying notes are provided as needed.

*Table 4: Priority Strategies to Address Complete Streets Implementation Challenges*

Challenge	Priority Strategies
Managing Expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3R projects already in the system should be grandfathered in prior to <i>Handbook</i> adoption.</li> <li>• Following the 4P process helps manage expectations. <i>[Clarification: The 4P process is a scope development process used by two of the seven FDOT Districts to establish project features, budget and schedule, <u>prior</u> to the project being programmed.]</i></li> </ul>
Project Delivery Process – Scoping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the <i>Handbook</i>, a distinction should be made between capacity and non-capacity projects, regarding how to apply the <i>Handbook's</i> strategies.</li> <li>• Complete streets mesh well with capacity projects. However, FDOT owns non-capacity projects, which are based on design criteria and public engagement is not incorporated into every step of these projects.</li> <li>• The concept of “no new funding” needs to be reinforced in the <i>Handbook</i>. <i>[Clarification: For 3R projects, the public needs to understand that these are on a fixed budget with a tight schedule and that only Complete Streets elements that can be accommodated within the original budget can be implemented.]</i></li> <li>• More time needs to be allotted for phasing in.</li> </ul>
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <i>Handbook</i> should clarify that funding for anything that adds to the 3R project scope needs to come from the local community, the federal government, or MPOs.</li> </ul>

Challenge	Priority Strategies
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The local funding commitment needs to come during scoping. <i>[Clarification: Once the project scope is set, it is entered into the Capital Program, which is a public document. The budget and schedule for that project needs to be established <u>prior</u> to being programmed to avoid politically troublesome budget reallocations or schedule delays from one project to another.]</i></li> </ul>
Implementation Phasing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Handbook</i> should clarify the role of existing and future context classifications. <i>[Clarification: Determining future land-use classifications is a complicated process relying on speculative growth and development projections and should be limited to major FDOT projects.]</i></li> </ul>

## Appendix

### Recent FHWA and FTA Bicycle and Pedestrian Resources

#### Publications

*Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks*

[www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/publications/small\\_towns/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/publications/small_towns/)

*Incorporating Qualitative Data in the Planning Process: Improving Project Delivery and Outcomes*

[www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/publications/qualitative\\_data/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/publications/qualitative_data/)

*Strategic Agenda for Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation*

[www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/publications/strategic\\_agenda/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/publications/strategic_agenda/)

*Achieving Multimodal Networks: Applying Design Flexibility and Reducing Conflicts*

[www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/publications/multimodal\\_networks/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/publications/multimodal_networks/)

*Guidebook for Developing Pedestrian and Bicycle Performance Measures*

[www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/publications/performance\\_measures\\_guidebook/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/publications/performance_measures_guidebook/)

*Incorporating On-Road Bicycle Networks into Resurfacing Projects*

[www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/publications/resurfacing/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/publications/resurfacing/)

*Bike Network Mapping Idea Book*

[www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/publications/bikemap\\_book/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/publications/bikemap_book/)

*Separated Bike Lane Planning and Design Guide*

[www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/publications/separated\\_bikelane\\_pdg/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/publications/separated_bikelane_pdg/)

*Coding Nonmotorized Station Location Information in the 2016 Traffic Monitoring Guide Format*

[www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/publications/tmg\\_coding/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/publications/tmg_coding/)

*Bicycle Facilities and the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*

[www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/guidance/mutcd/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/mutcd/)

*Pursuing Equity in Pedestrian and Bicycle Planning*

[www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/resources/equity\\_paper/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/resources/equity_paper/)

*FTA Manual on Pedestrian and Bicycle Connections to Transit*

[www.transit.dot.gov/research-innovation/manual-pedestrian-and-bicycle-connections-transit](http://www.transit.dot.gov/research-innovation/manual-pedestrian-and-bicycle-connections-transit)

*Coming Soon! Accessible Shared Streets: Notable Practices and Considerations for Accommodating Pedestrians with Vision Disabilities*

[www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian)

## **Guidance**

FHWA Guidance: Bicycle and Pedestrian Provisions of Federal Transportation Legislation

[https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/guidance/guidance\\_2015.cfm](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/guidance_2015.cfm)

Memorandum: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Design Flexibility

[https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/guidance/design\\_flexibility.cfm](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/design_flexibility.cfm)

Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel: A Recommended Approach

[https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/guidance/design.cfm](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/design.cfm)

## **Websites**

FHWA Bicycle and Pedestrian Program

[https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/)

FHWA Context Sensitive Solutions and Complete Streets

<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/css/benefits/completestreet.cfm>

FHWA Safe Routes to School

[https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/safe\\_routes\\_to\\_school/](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/safe_routes_to_school/)

Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center

<http://www.pedbikeinfo.org/>