Complete Streets Implementation Team
Implementation Phase: Meeting #2

February 5, 2020

Agenda

• Introduction
• Current design process and resources
• Public outreach
  – Current processes
  – Discussion about what constitutes successful, effective public outreach
• Introduction to project prioritization
• Next steps
DESIGN PROCESS AND RESOURCES

Current Resources
Design Manual

- Volume III covers most transportation-related elements
- Volume IV includes standard details
- Supplemental resources are used for design elements that are not addressed in the Design Manual

Supplemental Resources

- AASHTO “Green Book”
  - Foundation of US geometric design policy
  - Basis for much of the County’s Design Manual
Supplemental Resources

- AASHTO/FHWA: Numerous design resources in addition to the Green Book
- Other national guidelines and best practices
- MDOT SHA standards and guidelines
Design Manual Updates: General Direction

Guiding Principles

- Complete Streets are safe, comfortable, and convenient for people of all ages and abilities, whether they are walking, bicycling, riding transit, or driving
- Our goal is to ensure the Design Manual fully addresses all of these modes of travel
  - Street design based on national best practices
  - Street types based on both function and land use context (“typology”)
  - Trade-offs due to limited available right of way
  - Overlays for bike routes and scenic roadways
• Streets are currently designed based on their transportation function.

**Functional Classification**

Relationship of functionally Classified Systems in Serving Traffic Mobility and Land Access

Proportion of Service

- Mobility
- Arterials
- Collectors
- Land Access
- Locals
Howard County Highway Classification System

- Principal arterial highway (freeway)
- Intermediate arterial (multi-lane divided or undivided highway; limits type and number of access points from adjacent land uses)
- Minor arterial
- Major collector
- Minor collector
- Local road (includes access place and access street)
- Scenic roadway
Should street design be based on traditional functional classification?
Should street design be based on traditional functional classification?

- Complete Streets are designed based on the land use context **AND** on their transportation function.
Land Use Contexts

- Initial list under consideration
  - Mixed use
  - Higher-density residential
  - Lower-density residential
  - Commercial
  - Industrial
  - Rural
  - (plus overlays for special uses)
Future vs Existing Land Use

Future vs Existing Land Use
Future vs Existing Land Use

Sample Street Typology:
Prince George’s County
Prince George’s County

Only urban street types have been developed so far

- Mixed-Use Boulevard – 2, 3, or 4 lanes
- Neighborhood Connector
- Neighborhood Residential
- Industrial Road
- Shared Street
- Alley

This is just an example of a similar typology; Howard County will choose its own design criteria

Prince George’s County

Criteria for Urban Street Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Street Type</th>
<th>Minimum Number of Lanes</th>
<th>Minimum Number of Transit Lanes</th>
<th>Minimum Lane Width (ft)</th>
<th>Minimum Roadway (ft)</th>
<th>Minimum Median (ft)</th>
<th>Minimum Curb/Fence (ft)</th>
<th>On-Street Parking</th>
<th>Minimum Storm Drain</th>
<th>Other Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Boulevard (A) - 2 Lane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10’ (18’3” max width)</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Boulevard (A) - 3 Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10’ (18’3” max width)</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Boulevard (A) - 4 Lane</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10’ (18’3” max width)</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Boulevard (B) - 2 Lane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10’ (18’3” max width)</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Boulevard (B) - 3 Lane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10’ (18’3” max width)</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Boulevard (B) - 4 Lane</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10’ (18’3” max width)</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Connector (A)</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10’ (18’3” max width)</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Connector (B)</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10’ (18’3” max width)</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Connector (C)</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10’ (18’3” max width)</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Residential (A)</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10’ (18’3” max width)</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Residential (B)</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10’ (18’3” max width)</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Residential (C)</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10’ (18’3” max width)</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Street</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10’ (18’3” max width)</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alley</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10’ (18’3” max width)</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Streets in Regional Transit Districts and Local Centers
* Additional horizontal and vertical design components required to meet design standards, refer to AASHTO A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets.
** Figure is provided to illustrate alternative configurations intended to be applied as on-street parking zones in the standard details.
## Prince George’s County
(URBAN STREET TYPES ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Street Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Boulevard</td>
<td>• Buildings close to street&lt;br&gt;• Mix of land uses&lt;br&gt;• Medium to high density land use&lt;br&gt;• High volumes of vehicles and transit&lt;br&gt;• Medium to heavy ped/bike activity&lt;br&gt;• Reduced vehicular speeds</td>
<td>• 2-4 travel lanes&lt;br&gt;• Median&lt;br&gt;• Sidewalks &amp; bike facilities&lt;br&gt;• Street furniture &amp; enhanced lighting&lt;br&gt;• On-street parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Prince George’s County
(URBAN STREET TYPES ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Street Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Neighborhood Connector     | • Connect multiple neighborhoods  
                             | • Medium density land use; Buildings close to street  
                             | • May feature mixed land uses or mostly residential w/ occasional businesses  
                             | • Heavy pedestrian/bike activity; Provide continuous walking and bicycling routes  
                             | • Some are major bus routes; Slow speeds (20-25 mph) | • 2 travel lanes  
                             |                             | • Bike facilities, Sidewalks, Lighting  
                             |                             | • Enhanced street scape  
                             |                             | • In mixed use/retail areas, space for street furniture, outdoor events & dining  
                             |                             | • On-street parking |

---

### Prince George’s County
(URBAN STREET TYPES ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Street Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Neighborhood Residential   | • Provide immediate access to single-family and multi-family residences  
                             | • Focus on pedestrian safety, space for children to play, and well defined bicycling and walking paths  
                             | • Slow speeds | • 2 travel lanes  
                             |                             | • Sidewalks  
                             |                             | • Street trees  
                             |                             | • Lighting |
### Prince George’s County (URBAN STREET TYPES ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Street Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Street</td>
<td>• Serve industrial areas&lt;br&gt;• Carry moderate to high volumes of trucks of all sizes&lt;br&gt;• Fewer bicyclists and pedestrians, but often they must pass through</td>
<td>• 2 Travel lanes&lt;br&gt;• Adequate street width and turning radii to accommodate trucks&lt;br&gt;• Lighting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

![Industrial Street Diagram](image)

### Prince George’s County (URBAN STREET TYPES ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Street Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared Street</td>
<td>• Multiple land uses&lt;br&gt;• Single grade or surface shared by all modes&lt;br&gt;• Extremely low speeds</td>
<td>• Unique paving&lt;br&gt;• Street furniture&lt;br&gt;• Lighting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

![Shared Street Image](image)

![Shared Street Diagram](image)
### Prince George’s County
(URBAN STREET TYPES ONLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Street Type*</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Design Speed</th>
<th>Total # of Travel Lanes</th>
<th>Minimum Lane Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alley</td>
<td>Extremely low speeds</td>
<td>One travel lane</td>
<td>10 mph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Another Example:**
**Downtown Columbia Street Classifications**

- Also an urban context
- Pedestrian-oriented, mixed use community design
- “Streets will vary from the current standards in the Howard County Design Manual.”
- Boulevard
  - Multi-lane highway with median
  - No parking
- Parkway
  - Four lanes with median
  - Parking on both sides
  - Buildings on both sides
  - Promenade on one side
Potential Howard County Typology (SUBJECT TO CHANGE)

- Land use classification
  - Mixed use
  - Higher-density residential
  - Lower-density residential
  - Commercial
  - Industrial
  - Rural

- Transportation classification
  - Intermediate Arterial
  - Minor Arterial
  - Collector
  - Local
  - Overlays for Bike Howard routes and scenic roadways

When trade-offs are needed, design features for people traveling by various modes are prioritized according to land use context and transportation classification.

Potential Howard County Typology (SUBJECT TO CHANGE)

- How this compares with the current Highway Classification System:
  - Principal Arterials are generally State maintained and are not addressed by the Complete Streets policy
  - Two types of Collectors are combined into one
  - Scenic Roadways are addressed as an overlay

- Overlays for special categories
  - Bike routes
  - Scenic routes
### Potential Howard County Typology (SUBJECT TO CHANGE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSPORTATION CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>LAND USE CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use</td>
<td>Mixed-use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-density residential</td>
<td>Higher-density residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-density residential</td>
<td>Lower-density residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (everything outside PSA)</td>
<td>Rural (everything outside PSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate arterial</td>
<td>Intermediate arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor arterial</td>
<td>Minor arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public outreach process

- Office of Transportation
- Department of Public Works (DPW)
- Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ)

Office of Transportation

**Type of Project**

- Annual BikeHoward and Complete Streets Open House
- Community meetings for planning projects (generally 3 meetings):
  - Concept or pre concept
  - Mid stage of design
  - Final design
- Community meetings for bike lane additions through resurfacing
  - Usually at existing HOA or Village Board meeting
- Annual priority letter to the State
- Tabling at health fairs and other community events
Office of Transportation

Outreach formats:
- Posting on project webpage
- Social media (OOT Facebook and Twitter)
- Email list (Constant Contact)
- Posting on County events calendar and OOT calendar
- County press release
- Boards and Commissions
  - Multimodal Transportation Board
  - Central Maryland Transportation and Mobility Commission
  - Bicycle Advisory Group
  - Transit and Pedestrian Advisory Group
- Outreach to Village Boards or HOAs
- Outreach through Council Members
- Outreach through advocacy groups

Department of Public Works

Public outreach for capital projects
- Based on Howard County Code sec. 18.211
- All bridge, road construction or reconstruction
- Public hearings at preliminary and final design phase
Department of Public Works

Preliminary phase public hearing
- Posting notices four weeks before the meeting at the site of the project. The notice includes purpose of meeting, project number, date and place and time of public meeting
- Posted on Howard County web site four weeks prior to meeting
- Written notice by first-class mail at least four weeks before the meeting to all adjacent property owners

Department of Public Works

Final phase public hearing
- Posting notices minimum two weeks before the meeting at the site of the project. The notice includes purpose of meeting, project number, date and place and time of public meeting
- Posted on Howard County web site minimum weeks prior to meeting
- Written notice by first-class mail at least two weeks before the meeting to all attendees at the preliminary design meeting and citizens who have sent written comments to the Department of Public Works on the project
DPZ: Site Development Plan

DPZ: Minor Subdivision
DPZ: Major Subdivision

Public outreach – your thoughts

- In your opinion, what is working well now?
- What types of outreach improvements would be beneficial?
- How do we measure the effectiveness of public outreach?
PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

Project prioritization

PROCESS DIAGRAM (FIRST DRAFT)
# Project Prioritization (First Draft)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure (from complete streets policy)</th>
<th>Project Selection Criteria</th>
<th>Points (100)</th>
<th>Project Prioritization Criteria</th>
<th>Points (100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety/Health: Number and location of fatalities by road type and mode of travel, and by age and gender as data are available</td>
<td>Project addresses demonstrated transportation safety issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project addresses demonstrated transportation safety issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddy: Percentage of new roadway projects or roadway projects in priority communities</td>
<td>Project is in a priority community as defined by Ch policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/Place: Connections to important destinations, including schools, libraries, parks, community centers, village centers, social service centers, significant health care facilities, and government centers</td>
<td>Project area includes important destinations including schools, libraries, parks, community centers, village centers, social service centers, significant health care facilities, and government centers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project provides connections to important destinations, including schools, libraries, parks, community centers, village centers, social service centers, significant health care facilities, and government centers (points per destination connected)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/Economy: Connections to employment centers</td>
<td>Project area includes employment center</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project provides connections to employment centers (points per employment center connected)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING PERFORMANCE MEASURE</td>
<td>Project feasibility study viewed outside funding (federal, state, and/or private) to reduce cost to County taxpayers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project construction leverages non-county funds (federal, state, and/or private) to reduce cost to County taxpayers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: Miles of sidewalk, trail, and bicycle infrastructure installed or repaired</td>
<td>Project increases the miles of sidewalk, trail, and bicycle infrastructure available</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project installs or repairs sidewalk, trail, and bicycle infrastructure (points per mile of infrastructure)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: Number of curb ramps installed or repaired</td>
<td>Project addresses pedestrian accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project installs or repairs curb ramps (points per curb ramp)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: Number of crosswalks installed or repaired</td>
<td>Project provides access to crosswalks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project installs or repairs crosswalks (points per crosswalk)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: Number of transit stops with sidewalk access installed or repaired</td>
<td>Project area includes transit stops</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project constructs transit stop with sidewalk access installed or repaired (points per stop)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: Percentage of transit stops with marked crosswalks within 150 feet</td>
<td>Project completes part of transit stop with sidewalk access installed or repaired (points per stop)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project completes part of transit stop within 150 feet of a transit stop (points per crosswalk)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: Percent of bike network that is short term network completed</td>
<td>Project completes part of bike network that is short term network completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project completes part of bike network that is short term network completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: Percent of Walk Howard network completed</td>
<td>Project completes part of Walk Howard network</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project completes part of Walk Howard network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: Percent of the population with direct access to a low-stress bike network</td>
<td>Project completes part of low-stress bike network</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project completes part of low-stress bike network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access: Percent of the population with direct access to a low-stress bike network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## NEXT STEPS
Next steps

• Next meeting
  – Wednesday, March 4, 3:00 pm

• Action items from this meeting