### Smart Growth Self-Assessment for Rural Communities

### *Section IX: Provide Transportation Choices*

### *This tool is part of the Smart Growth Self-Assessment for Rural Communities, developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. EPA suggests that communities using this tool complete Section I: “Revitalize Village and Town Centers,” before filling out other sections. For more information and the tool’s other sections, see* *<https://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/smart-growth-self-assessment-rural-communities>.*

Compact and mixed-use town and village centers can encourage walking and bicycling, and they can be served more effectively by intercity public transportation and paratransit. Making it safer and easier for people to walk and bike also helps people stay healthy and allows older residents the ability to stay within their homes and neighborhoods. Walkable, accessible downtown areas also help local economic development, as people can more easily reach their daily needs without having to leave town. Communities can provide more transportation choices through the design of new development and by retrofitting existing transportation facilities.

| Goal: Provide Transportation Choices | Adopted? | Add or Improve? | Context [[1]](#footnote-1) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Making Areas Walkable, Bikeable, and Accessible to People with Disabilities and Mobility Challenges* |  |  |  |
| Is pedestrian-oriented site design required for new development and redevelopment?[[2]](#footnote-2),[[3]](#footnote-3),[[4]](#footnote-4),[[5]](#footnote-5) |  |  |  |
| Strategy 1: The installation of sidewalks is required when new development is constructed.[[6]](#footnote-6),[[7]](#footnote-7) *[Enter optional notes in gray boxes for all strategies]* |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 2: At least one entrance is required on the side of the building that faces the street, and public or private sidewalks connect to that entrance.[[8]](#footnote-8)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 3: Sidewalk paths are clear of obstructions such as utility poles or mailboxes, allowing minimum clearance in pedestrian-oriented areas in new developments.[[9]](#footnote-9),[[10]](#footnote-10)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 4: In pedestrian-oriented areas, maximum setbacks ensure that new buildings are close to sidewalks.[[11]](#footnote-11)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 5: Building façades have a minimum percentage of window space,[[12]](#footnote-12) such as clear glass on at least 50 percent of the façade between 3 and 8 feet above grade.[[13]](#footnote-13)  |[ ] [x]  1,2 |
| Strategy 6: Windows, doors, and murals are encouraged, on the sides of buildings that extend along sidewalks.[[14]](#footnote-14)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 7: Screen parking areas from sidewalks with landscaping or low walls.[[15]](#footnote-15)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 8: Require shared driveways for adjacent commercial properties.  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 9: Parking lots are behind buildings in pedestrian-oriented areas.  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 10: Apply designs that improve access for the disabled to sidewalks, crosswalks, and transit facilities when reconstruction or redevelopment takes place [[16]](#footnote-16)  |[ ] [ ]   |
| Strategy 11: Clear guidance indicates what entity is responsible for maintaining sidewalks.  |[ ] [ ]  1, 2 |
| Strategy 12: Allow and encourage a mix of uses in pedestrian-oriented areas.  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Do codes require bicycle parking?  |  |  |  |
| Strategy 13: Secure, public bicycle parking is required for new developments or redevelopments in village and town centers.[[17]](#footnote-17),[[18]](#footnote-18)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Do codes set parking requirements based on demand and community context?  |  |  |  |
| Strategy 14: Shared, off-site, or reduced parking for new development and rezoned uses is allowed in village and town centers.[[19]](#footnote-19),[[20]](#footnote-20)  |[ ] [ ]  1 |
| Strategy 15: Buildings can reduce the amount of parking they need to supply if they are close to public transit or have bicycle parking, nearby public parking, or on-street parking.[[21]](#footnote-21)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| *Making Street Connections Within New Developments and Redevelopments and to Adjacent Neighborhoods* |  |  |  |
| Do codes require or encourage adequate pedestrian connections?  |  |  |  |
| Strategy 16: Encourage street patterns with greater pedestrian connectivity by providing incentives for smaller blocks and more sidewalk coverage.[[22]](#footnote-22),[[23]](#footnote-23)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 17: Encourage or require pedestrian connections and bicycle paths between abutting cul-de-sacs and dead-end streets.436  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 18: New subdivisions require a minimum connectivity measure for streets, such as a connectivity index, block lengths, block acreage, or length of space between intersections.[[24]](#footnote-24),[[25]](#footnote-25),[[26]](#footnote-26)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Do codes require or encourage connections between new developments and adjacent neighborhoods? |  |  |  |
| Strategy 19: New subdivisions require multimodal connections to adjacent neighborhoods or developments.[[27]](#footnote-27),436  |[ ] [ ]  1,2,3 |
| Strategy 20: Dead-end street “stubs” are required to allow connections to future adjacent development.436  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 21: Access management strategies are required to connect adjacent non-residential developments along commercial corridors and to encourage shared driveways.[[28]](#footnote-28)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2,3 |
| *Build and Retrofit Streets for All Users*[[29]](#footnote-29),[[30]](#footnote-30),[[31]](#footnote-31) |  |  |  |
| Do engineering or street design guidelines encourage or require infrastructure to support walking on new and existing streets?  |  |  |  |
| Strategy 22: Adopt sidewalk design, grading, and construction standards.[[32]](#footnote-32)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2, 3 |
| Strategy 23: Require sidewalk design based on the street’s intended use and context (for example, wider sidewalks and planting strips might be required in an activity center).[[33]](#footnote-33)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2,3 |
| Strategy 24: Require minimum sidewalk setbacks from the curb or pavement edge when adjacent to a road with a greater than 35 mph posted speed, and not separated by street parking.[[34]](#footnote-34),[[35]](#footnote-35)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2,3 |
| Strategy 25: Require sidewalks on both sides of the streets in village and town centers.[[36]](#footnote-36),[[37]](#footnote-37)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 26: Require signalized intersections to include walk signals that give pedestrians adequate crossing time.[[38]](#footnote-38)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 27: Intersections use high-visibility crosswalk striping and street signs.[[39]](#footnote-39),[[40]](#footnote-40),[[41]](#footnote-41)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2,3 |
| Strategy 28: Allow unsignalized crossings with guidance on their location and design and signs to alert drivers.453,454,455  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 29: New or reconstructed bridges in cities and towns include sidewalks, as well as bicycle lanes and multimodal on/off ramps where appropriate.[[42]](#footnote-42)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 30: Permit on-street parking in pedestrian-oriented areas such as village and town centers.  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 31: Require traffic calming and context-sensitive street design for streets in downtowns, around schools, in residential neighborhoods, and in other pedestrian activity centers.[[43]](#footnote-43),[[44]](#footnote-44)  |[ ] [ ]  1 |
| Do engineering or street design guidelines encourage or require infrastructure to support biking on new and existing streets? |  |  |  |
| Strategy 32: New or reconstructed bridges include a wide shoulder or bicycle lane on both the bridge and on/off ramp.456  |[ ] [ ]  1,2,3 |
| Strategy 33: Bicycle facilities, such as dedicated lanes, share-the-lane markings, and/or signs are required on roads heavily used by bicycles and potential bike routes.[[45]](#footnote-45),420,421  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 34: Rural highways include shoulders that provide sufficient space for bicyclists and have “share the road” signs to alert drivers.[[46]](#footnote-46)  |[ ] [ ]  3 |
| Do engineering or street design guidelines encourage or require infrastructure to support transit use? |  |  |  |
| Strategy 35: Provide shelters at bus stops.[[47]](#footnote-47)  |[ ] [ ]  1 |
| Strategy 36: Locate transit stops near crosswalks.[[48]](#footnote-48)  |[ ] [ ]  1 |
| Strategy 37: Placement of a transit stops ensures pedestrian and bicycle safety by reducing interactions with high volume / high speed roads.461,462  |[ ] [ ]  1 |
| Are impact fees assessed to help pay for multimodal transportation improvements in existing town centers?  |  |  |  |
| Strategy 38: An impact fee program or parking district revenues allocate funds to pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure improvements.[[49]](#footnote-49)  |[ ] [ ]  1 |
| Strategy 39: An impact fee program or parking district revenues allocate funds to transit infrastructure and service improvements.[[50]](#footnote-50),[[51]](#footnote-51)  |[ ] [ ]  1 |
| *Creating a Comfortable Environment for Walking and Biking* |  |  |  |
| Do codes require or encourage pedestrian- and bicyclist-oriented street lighting and signs?  |  |  |  |
| Strategy 40: Require pedestrian-oriented street lighting, with bases designed to reduce risk of injury to vehicle occupants and pedestrians, in village and town centers.[[52]](#footnote-52)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 41: Business signs hang perpendicular to sidewalks and streets so they can be seen more easily.  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 42: Scale commercial and wayfinding signs to the pedestrian environment.[[53]](#footnote-53)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2,3 |
| Do codes include requirements for street trees?  |  |  |  |
| Strategy 43: Specify appropriate locations for street trees, including surrounding development context and placement within the right of way.[[54]](#footnote-54)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 44: Require street tree planting to be appropriate type and size so that they have enough space to grow and not disturb the sidewalk.[[55]](#footnote-55)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 45: Designate minimum sizes for street tree planting areas.469  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| *Improving Transportation Choices Through Comprehensive Plans and Local Government Policies* |  |  |  |
| Do planning documents call for the integration of multimodal improvements in all infrastructure projects?  |  |  |  |
| Strategy 46: Require projects to consider pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure for inclusion in all road construction, reconstruction, or maintenance projects.420,421  |[ ] [ ]  1,2,3  |
| Strategy 47: Prepare a greenway trails plan in conjunction within transportation or parks and recreation plans.[[56]](#footnote-56),[[57]](#footnote-57)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2,3 |
| Strategy 48: Develop a pedestrian master plan to prioritize future investments.[[58]](#footnote-58),[[59]](#footnote-59)  |[ ] [ ]   |
| Strategy 49: Develop a bicycle master plan to prioritize future investments.[[60]](#footnote-60),[[61]](#footnote-61)  |[ ] [ ]   |
| Do planning documents identify priority areas for multimodal improvements?  |  |  |  |
| Strategy 50: Prioritize financing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure improvements in downtowns and activity centers, around transit stops, and in areas that connect activity centers.[[62]](#footnote-62),[[63]](#footnote-63)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2,3 |
| Strategy 51: Amenities such as lighting, route and system maps, benches, and landscaping are provided at transit stops.50,51  |[ ] [ ]  1 |
| Do planning documents make connections between land development and transportation?  |  |  |  |
| Strategy 52: Clearly prioritize development in areas already served by existing transportation infrastructure in policy documents.[[64]](#footnote-64)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2,3 |
| *Improving Transportation Choices Through Programs and Services* |  |  |  |
| Are sidewalk improvements allocated funding on a regular basis?  |  |  |  |
| Strategy 53: Sidewalk construction and maintenance programs identify and invest in areas in need of improvements on a regular basis. [[65]](#footnote-65)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 54: Perform an audit and create a follow-up program to rebuild older sidewalks and crosswalks to better meet the needs of disabled users.[[66]](#footnote-66),430  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 55: Perform an annual walkability audit for streets in town and village centers.[[67]](#footnote-67)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Are there walking and biking educational programs and incentives?  |  |  |  |
| Strategy 56: Offer cycling safety and operational education programs for children.[[68]](#footnote-68)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 57: Provide pedestrian safety campaigns for pedestrians and motorists.[[69]](#footnote-69)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 58: Encourage employers to provide incentives or accommodations for walking or bicycling to work including incentive payments and showers in office buildings for bike commuters.[[70]](#footnote-70),[[71]](#footnote-71)  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |
| Strategy 59: Establish, publish, and promote walking and biking routes in the community.  |[ ] [ ]  1,2,3 |
| Strategy 60: Adopt a program to work with businesses in town centers to update and improve their street.  |[ ] [ ]  1,2 |

1. Self-assessment topics and recommendations apply to one or more of the following scales: 1 – large town/small city (population of approximately 10,000 or greater); 2 - village/small town (population typically under 10,000) 3 – rural (very low density places, working lands, and natural areas outside of towns, villages, and cities). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Georgia DOT Pedestrian & Streetscape Guide: Toolkit 10 – Site Design for Pedestrians (<http://www.bikewalk.org/pdfs/sopgeorgia_ped_streetscape_guide.pdf>). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Kirkland, Washington Design Guidelines for Pedestrian-Oriented Business Districts ([http://www.kirklandwa.gov/Assets/Planning/Planning+PDFs/Design+Guidelines.pdf](http://www.kirklandwa.gov/Assets/Planning/Planning%2BPDFs/Design%2BGuidelines.pdf)). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Green Valley Institute. Design Guidelines: Village and Gateway Districts, Town of Coventry (<http://www.greenvalleyinstitute.org/planning_design.htm>). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Westminster, Colorado Design Guidelines for Traditional Mixed Use Neighborhood Developments (<http://www.ci.westminster.co.us/CityGovernment/CommunityDevelopment/PlanningDivision/RegulationsandDesignGuidelines.aspx>). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Smart Growth America. Complete Streets: Local Policy Workbook (<http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/complete-streets/changing-policy>). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Change Lab Solutions. Creating Complete Streets (<http://changelabsolutions.org/publications/laws-resolutions-cs>). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Fort Worth, Texas Zoning Ordinance: Urban Design/Form Based Districts (<http://fortworthtexas.gov/zoning/>). [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. In general, sidewalks need to be at least six feet wide for two people to pass comfortably. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Carrboro, North Carolina Town Code: Streets and Sidewalks (<http://www.ci.carrboro.nc.us/139/Carrboro-Town-Code>). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Ideally the maximum setback is 20 feet. The ideal sidewalk zone is 10 to 15 feet in “main street” areas, to include tree planting and furniture zone at the back of curb. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Commerce, Michigan Zoning Ordinance: Building Form and Composition ([http://www.commercetwp.com/sites/default/files/zoning/Article%2027%20-%20Form%20&%20Composition.pdf](http://www.commercetwp.com/sites/default/files/zoning/Article%2027%20-%20Form%20%26%20Composition.pdf)). [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Avoiding large stretches of windowless walls is important to creating sidewalks that feel safe and inviting. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. When blank wall space is present, use murals or other façade improvements to create interest. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Park Ridge, Illinois Landscaping and Screening Ordinance (<http://www.parkridge.us/assets/1/Documents/Section_13_Landscaping_and_Screening.pdf>). [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Boulder, Colorado Transportation Master Plan (<https://bouldercolorado.gov/transportation/tmp>). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Bicycle racks will ideally have a minimum of three spaces in a given location. Larger developments or parking decks will have somewhere between one per 20 vehicle spaces and one per 50 vehicle spaces. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Victoria Transport Policy Institute. Bicycle Parking (<http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm85.htm>). [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Madison, Mississippi Shared Parking Ordinance (<http://www.madisonthecity.com/communitydevelopment/planninganddevelopment.html>). [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Shared parking fact sheet (<https://alexandriava.gov/uploadedFiles/planning/info/SharedParkingFactSheet.pdf>). [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Cheyenne, Wyoming Unified Development Code – Article 6 Design Regulations (<http://www.cheyennecity.org/index.aspx?nid=1824>). [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Kentucky Transportation Cabinet. Street Connectivity Model Ordinance (<http://transportation.ky.gov/congestion-toolbox/pages/connectivity.aspx>). [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Add Street-Connectivity Minimums into Subdivision Ordinances (<http://walksteps.org/tactics/add-street-connectivity-minimums-into-subdivision-ordinances/>). [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Network connectivity can be measured either through a connectivity index represented by link-to-node ratio for new development. For example, VTPI identifies ratios of 1.4 and greater as desirable for improved walkability (<http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm116.htm>). Alternatively, some communities have required minimum spacing standards intersections, where the average intersection for local streets cannot average greater than 300 to 400 feet. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Litman, Todd. “Evaluating Accessibility for Transportation Planning.” (<http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm84.htm>). [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Cheyenne, Wyoming Unified Development Code – Article 4 Subdivision Regulations (<http://www.cheyennecity.org/index.aspx?nid=1824>). [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Victoria Transport Policy Institute. Roadway Connectivity (<http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm116.htm>). [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. FHWA. Access Management. Access management techniques, such as shared driveways and inter-parcel connections, are particularly important along linear commercial corridors, both for safety and preserving roadway function (<http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/access_mgmt/what_is_accsmgmt.htm>). [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. This section pertains primarily to street construction or reconstruction rather than requirements for site development. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Smart Growth America. Overview of the National Complete Streets Coalition (<http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/complete-streets>). [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Florida Department of Transportation Quality/Level of Service Handbook (<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/systems/programs/sm/los/>). [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. FHWA Designing Sidewalks and Trails for Access (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/publications/sidewalk2/contents.cfm>). [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Institute of Transportation Engineers and Congress for the New Urbanism. “Designing Walkable Urban Thoroughfares: A Context Sensitive Approach.” (<http://www.ite.org/css/>). Table 6.4 offers Design Parameters for Walkable Urban Thoroughfares based on place type. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Kane County, Illinois Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (<http://kdot.countyofkane.org/Publications/Forms/AllItems.aspx>). [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Durham, North Carolina DurhamWalks Pedestrian Plan: Standards and Guidelines (<http://www.bikewalkdurham.org/BPAC_pedplan.html>). [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Kirkland, Washington Design Guidelines for Pedestrian-Oriented Business Districts ([http://www.kirklandwa.gov/Assets/Planning/Planning+PDFs/Design+Guidelines.pdf](http://www.kirklandwa.gov/Assets/Planning/Planning%2BPDFs/Design%2BGuidelines.pdf)). [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Cookeville, Tennessee Sidewalk Requirements (<http://www.cookeville-tn.gov/planning/zoning-code/>). [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Tucson, Arizona Traffic Signal Design Manual (<http://www.tucsonaz.gov/tdot/traffic-engineering-division>). [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Boulder, Colorado Pedestrian Crossing Treatments website (<https://bouldercolorado.gov/transportation/pedestrian-crossing-treatments>). [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Massachusetts Highway Department. Traffic Safety Toolbox Series: Crosswalks (<http://www.mhd.state.ma.us/safetytoolbox/>). [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. North Central Section Institute of Transportation Engineers. Guidance for the Installation of Pedestrian Crossing Facilities (<http://www.nc-ite.org/images/files/Crosswalk-Guidelines-w-appendices_021909.pdf>). [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Oregon DOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines (<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/BIKEPED/Pages/planproc.aspx>). [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Iowa State University Institute for Transportation. Evaluation of Gateway and Low-Cost Traffic Calming Treatments for Major Routes in Small, Rural Communities (<http://www.ctre.iastate.edu/research/detail.cfm?projectID=-226410767>). [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. Moraga, California Traffic Calming Guide (<http://www.moraga.ca.us/Default.aspx?PageID=6957156&A=SearchResult&SearchID=11070014&ObjectID=6957156&ObjectType=1>). [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide (<http://nacto.org/cities-for-cycling/design-guide/>). [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. Valley Transportation Authority. Bicycle Technical Guidelines: Bikeways on Major Roads (<http://www.vta.org/projects-and-programs/planning/bikes-bicycle-technical-guidelines-btg>). [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. Pima County, Arizona DOT Transit Guidelines for Roadway Design and Construction (<http://webcms.pima.gov/UserFiles/Servers/Server_6/File/Government/Transportation/Roadway%20Design/Transit%20Guidelines.pdf>). [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. American Public Transportation Association. Bus Stop Design and Placement Security Considerations (<http://www.apta.com/resources/standards/Documents/APTA-SS-SIS-RP-008-10.pdf>). [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. Bellingham, Washington Transportation Impact Fees (<http://www.cob.org/services/planning/transportation/transportation-impact-fees.aspx>). [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. Teton County, Wyoming Transit Impact Fee Study (<http://www.tetonwyo.org/plan/docs/SpecialReports/TransitImpactFeeStudy.pdf>). [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. Municipal Research and Services Center. Impact Fees (<http://mrsc.org/Home/Explore-Topics/Planning/Land-Use-Administration/Impact-Fees.aspx>). [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. Medford, Oregon Street Lighting and Pedestrian-Scale Street Lighting Requirements (<http://www.ci.medford.or.us/CodePrint.asp?CodeID=3927>). [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. Rochester, New York Center City Tourist – Visitor Circulation and Pedestrian Wayfinding Study (<http://www.cityofrochester.gov/article.aspx?id=8589948735>). [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. Orange, California Master Street Tree Master Plan (<http://www.cityoforange.org/depts/publicworks/street_tree_information.asp>). [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. Burlington, Vermont Street Design Guidelines (<http://www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPW/Transportation-Plan>). [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. Wisconsin DOT Rural Bicycle Planning Guide (<http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/projects/bike.htm>). [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. Scott County, Minnesota Rural Regional Trail Development & Design Guidelines (<http://www.co.scott.mn.us/PropertyGISLand/2030CompPlan/DetailedAreaPlanStudy/Pages/DAPRuralTrailAnalysis.aspx>). [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Conduct a sidewalk inventory to assess areas lacking sufficient sidewalks, and focus investment in sidewalks in these areas. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. Lee’s Summit, Missouri Public Sidewalk Inventory Analysis Report (<http://cityofls.net/Public-Works/Street-Programs-and-Maintenance/Sidewalk-Maintenance.aspx>). [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. Conduct a bicycle facilities inventory to assess areas lacking sufficient bicycle facilities, and focus investment in bicycle facilities in these areas. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. Penfield, New York Bicycle Facilities Master Plan (<http://www.penfield.org/index.php?pr=Plans_and_Studies>). [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. Boulder, Colorado Multimodal Corridor Prioritization (<https://bouldercolorado.gov/transportation/multimodal-corridors-prioritization>). [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. Wheat Ridge, Colorado Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (<http://www.ci.wheatridge.co.us/1204/Bicycle-Pedestrian-Master-Plan>). [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. Carroll County, Maryland Rural Villages: Boundaries & Villages Designated as Priority Funding Areas (<http://ccgovernment.carr.org/ccg/compplan/ruralvillage/>). [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. Naperville, Illinois 2015 Sidewalk Removal and Replacement Program (<http://www.naperville.il.us/sidewalkreplace.aspx>). [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. United States Access Board. Public Rights of Way (<http://www.access-board.gov/prowac>). [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center. Audits (<http://www.pedbikeinfo.org/planning/tools_audits.cfm>). [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. Bicycle Coalition of Maine. Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Education Program (<http://www.bikemaine.org/safety-education/bike-ped-safety-education>). [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. North Carolina Department of Transportation. Watch For Me NC, statewide pedestrian and bicycle safety campaign (<http://www.watchformenc.org/>). [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
70. Pima Association of Governments (Arizona) Travel Reduction Program (<http://www.pagnet.org/Programs/TransportationPlanning/TravelReductionProgram/tabid/220/Default.aspx>). [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. US DOT Commuter Choice Primer (<http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/jpodocs/repts_pr/13669.html>). [↑](#footnote-ref-71)