Regional Livability Workshops

Appendix A: Meeting Summaries

Requested by

Federal Highway Administration

Prepared by

ICF International

August 29, 2011

Note
Two separate documents accompany this Appendix. First is the primary document "Regional Livability Workshops: Executive Summary Report". The second is Appendix B, a separate PDF of all workshop presentations. Information on accessing these documents is available at
http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/livability/.

Cover photos, top to bottom: Boston, Atlanta, and Denver workshops

Table of Contents

Two separate documents accompany this report. First is the primary document "Regional Livability Workshops: Executive Summary Report". The second is Appendix B, a separate PDF of all workshop presentations. Information on accessing these documents is available at http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/livability/.

This page intentionally left blank

Regional Livability Workshop Process and Results

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) began the workshop planning by dividing the country into five regions. A city and organization in each region was then identified to host the workshops. The regions, meeting dates, and host locations are listed below.

- **Southern region**— April 5, 2011: Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, and South Carolina. Co-hosted with the Atlanta Regional Commission at Loudermilk Center in Atlanta, Georgia.

- **Plains/Midwest region**— April 7, 2011: Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma. Co-hosted with the Mid-America Regional Council of Governments at their offices in Kansas City, Missouri.

- **Northeast/Mid-Atlantic region**— April 27, 2011: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and New York. Co-hosted with the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization at the John A. Volpe National Transportation Systems Center in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

- **Pacific region**— May 3, 2011: Washington, Oregon, Nevada, California, Hawaii, and Alaska. Co-hosted with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments at their offices in Sacramento, California

- **Mountain region**— May 5, 2011: Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico. Co-hosted with the Denver Regional Council of Governments at the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Region 8 Office in Denver, Colorado.

The meetings brought together regional leaders on livability from metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), transportation agencies, city governments, county governments, private developers, public developers, State departments of transportation (DOTs), nonprofit organizations, housing agencies, community developers, transit agencies, environmental and resource preservation, and others. To identify participants with relevant experience that could provide valuable input during the workshops, the following activities were conducted in order to develop a potential participant list:

Boston workshop discussions.

- *Reviewed prior project work in the area of livability in transportation to identify relevant best practice examples.* Using existing firsthand knowledge on best practices in the areas of livability, transportation planning, and projects that have worked to integrate these two ideas, potential participants were identified from a broad range of databases. Sources included prior livability research, prior corridor, streets, and planning projects, awards from the interagency partners and nonprofit groups, and other industry contacts. Additional efforts were made to identify and ensure participation from small town and rural practitioners, housing agencies, developers, and resource agencies, as well as areas outside of planning within State DOTs.

- *Regional representatives from the Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and FHWA identified regional leaders*. Based on existing knowledge of best practice examples in the areas of environmental and resource preservation, housing, and transportation, regional offices from EPA,

HUD, FTA, and FHWA were asked to contribute participant suggestions within their particular workshop region.

- *Combined consultant and Federal list to generate final invitation list.* Drawing from the suggested participants from the previous project work and research, and Federal regional office members, a list of initial invitees (40 to 50 people) was compiled for each region. This list considered geographic location (urban, suburban, and rural) and topic of expertise within a given focus area. The final list represented a balanced group of individuals who could speak readily to their organization and region's efforts regarding livability in transportation. If initial invitees were unable to attend, invitations were extended to alternates that did not receive an initial invitation.

Each meeting had between 27 and 30 participants, plus 13 to 20 Federal participants from FHWA, FTA, EPA, and HUD, and representatives from the Center for Disease Control (Atlanta), and National Park Service (Denver).

Prior to each meeting, participants received read-ahead materials including *The Role of FHWA Programs in Livability: State of the Practice Summary* paper, a workshop logistics packet, and a link to the FHWA/FTA *Livability in Transportation Guidebook*. These materials helped to prep participants for a hands-on working session, including limited presentations, large-group discussions, and small-group brainstorming and strategy development. During discussions, participants noted issues from the perspective of their agency, from their own perspective, and any relevant regional issues and/or successes. Below is the general agenda for each meeting.

7:30 – 8:00 am	Arrivals / Informal Networking

8:00-8:30 am	Welcome and Introductions
8:30-8:45 am	Setting the Stage for Livability
8:45-9:45 am	Identifying Challenges to Livability
9:45 am -12:00 pm	Overcoming Challenges
12:00-1:00 pm	Lunch (on your own)
1:00-3:00 pm	Regional Livability Planning Strategies
3:00-4:30 pm	Identifying Opportunities
4:30-5:00 pm	Closing and Next Steps

After each meeting, participant feedback was collected and their suggestions were shared with FHWA and incorporated into subsequent meetings whenever possible.

Complete summaries of each workshop are provided in subsequent sub-sections in order of their occurrence. Appendix B includes all workshop PowerPoint presentations in the same order.

Atlanta, Georgia Summary

Discussion Summary: During the Atlanta workshop, the discussion focused on the Federal government's role in helping to advance livability, along with regional/metropolitan planning organization issues. Key discussion points included:

- Challenges associated with interagency/inter-jurisdictional collaboration, zoning and land use changes, plan implementation, developing performance measures and demonstrating benefits, and transit project implementation.
- Solutions associated with educating the public, decisionmakers, and policymakers, increasing collaboration, and incorporating livability into project development.
- Regional livability plans, including how to coordinate these at the appropriate scale, whether to make separate livability plans or simply incorporate them into existing processes, and goal setting and measurement for livability plans.
- Opportunities with marketing and communications, such as alternative ways of describing livability, development of performance measures to sell the concept, and marketing "one pagers" on various components of livability.

As a result of this initial workshop, subsequent workshops focused on exploring these ideas more thoroughly. The meeting structure included a number of presentations on regional practices, as well as a significant amount of brainstorming, facilitated discussion, and idea sharing. A summary of activities and key outputs at each location follows.

Workshop Specifics:

Location:

Loudermilk Center
Ann Cramer Room
40 Courtland Street NE
Atlanta, GA 30303

Date / Time:

April 5, 2011 from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm

Atlanta workshop discussions.

Welcome and Introductions:

Shana Baker from FHWA's Office of Human Environment welcomed participants and provided a brief overview of the day's goals. Ms. Baker reiterated that FHWA is focused on livability as part of comprehensive planning efforts to generate a framework for transportation decisions that result in safer and more convenient transportation options.

Representatives from the regional HUD/DOT/EPA Interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities also gave opening remarks. *Steve Luxenberg, Director of Program Development at the FHWA Georgia Division Office,* highlighted the importance of partnership and breaking down traditional silos, as well as the benefits of supporting communities that offer a variety of transportation choices. *Tom Thomson, the Deputy Regional Administrator for FTA Region 4,* spoke on the funding opportunities available for supporting livable communities (e.g. urban circulator program, bus livability program, and TIGER I and II). Mr. Thomson also noted Region 4's current outreach efforts, which include an information toolkit on the Sustainable Communities Initiative. *Angie Billups, Project Officer for EPA Region 4*, spoke on the benefits of integrating environmental considerations into other efforts such as transportation and housing. Ms. Billups mentioned EPA is currently focusing on, such as land revitalization and re-use, green space

enhancement, water quality improvement, and brownfields redevelopment. Facilitators, managers from ICF International and Renaissance Planning Group, and all participants introduced themselves

Setting the Stage for Livability:
Harrison Rue from ICF International reviewed the purpose and outcomes of both the overall project and the day's workshop. As the majority of participants indicated they had read the background paper developed for this project, *The Role of FHWA Programs in Livability: State of the Practice Summary,* Mr. Rue provided a brief overview of the paper's content. This overview included a brief review of the Sustainable Communities Partnership and the livability principles, components included in the definition of "livability in transportation," benefits of incorporating livability, overall research findings, and a review of state of the practice examples from areas that have successfully incorporated livability into a variety of efforts.

Identifying Challenges to Livability:
A facilitated large group discussion was held and participants were asked to focus on the following three questions:

1. What are the big challenges to implementing transportation solutions that advance livable communities?
2. What is one solution that has worked for your agency?
3. How do the challenges and solutions differ in:
   a. Urban, suburban, and rural contexts?
   b. Local, regional, and State agencies?

Participants identified five main categories of challenges, as well as potential solutions that could be used to overcome some of these challenges:

Interagency/Inter-jurisdictional Collaboration
- Many barriers exist in trying to develop a true regional partnership where support for cross-regional project implementation is included. Oftentimes plans are developed with cross-regional input, but the projects contained in these plans are not ultimately implemented due to lack of support and funding priority.
- Local governments do not always support regional livability through project selection or land use changes. It is challenging to change "business as usual."
  o At both the State and local level, bicycle and pedestrian projects are often viewed as nonessential project components rather than as mandated aspects of comprehensive project development.
  o Complete streets projects do not often receive full funding. Instead, only essential road elements are funded and the livability concept behind the project is not fully implemented.
- There is a disconnect between engineering and planning., both in their respective discipline's perspectives and in communication between departments.
- Even with the recent partnership efforts at the Federal level, silos remain. This is particularly an issue when it comes to funding for livability projects, which cut across agency focus. Instead of being able to apply to one source, agencies must apply to numerous funding sources. Not all agencies, particularly at the local level, are able to devote the staff resources necessary to apply to the numerous funding sources required to receive full project funding. Funding does not necessarily reach projects that will provide the greatest community benefits. One of the greatest barriers to breaking down these silos results from the fact that organizations are primarily concerned by their own budget.
- There is often a disconnect between how roadway purpose and function is viewed by local planning agencies as compared to regional planning organizations. Oftentimes, local agencies

will plan with the livability principles and interagency partnership in mind while regional planning organizations will remain siloed in their efforts. By focusing on partnership opportunities between local agencies and regional organizations, livability projects could be advanced.

- Railroad companies are not willing to share control over rail line corridors. Many of these corridors either run directly through, or could be directly involved in, neighborhood redevelopment efforts. These corridors could be used to help improve access and provide avenues for alternative modes of transport.
- A significant roadblock facing project implementation includes a lack of communication between State DOT personnel assigned to a project and the local government staff member who has developed a project. This is particularly true for small projects. Part of this issue may stem from a lack of enthusiasm on the part of State DOT personnel to push these projects through, as they have not been as intimately involved in the project development as the local staff member. Some State DOT representatives expressed frustration with identifying appropriate staff contacts associated with and accountable for small projects.
- Local regulations can conflict with one another, particularly where planning and environmental regulations overlap.
- State politics can serve as a barrier to project implementation at the local and regional levels.
- Not enough attention and resources go toward improving the standard of living in communities that have not taken any steps toward being livable communities. Instead, much attention continues to be placed on those areas that have already begun to take steps in this direction.

Zoning and Land Use Changes
- Many areas primarily implement use-based zoning. Gaining staff approval and changing these regulations to allow for a new way of doing things (i.e. form-based), has been challenging.
  - One participant highlighted the resistance of his local Public Works Department to update design standards to meet livable streets criteria.
  - Particularly in urban environments, developing projects that meet the criteria imposed by land use separation, has been difficult.
- Form-based zoning is not well understood by many areas, and therefore is not being implemented.
- Simplifying smart growth concepts so that they can be implemented by any region—even those without a land use code, as concepts such as form-based codes can be difficult to implement.
- Land use planning efforts have not been successful in many areas.
  - Generating a State policy around land use planning could help remedy some of these negative outcomes.
  - One-way street directions have resulted in irreversible, negative consequences in a number of downtown areas.

Plan Implementation (including plan/project disconnect and incorporating livability into existing planning processes)
- While it is relatively easy to develop and compile plans, it is difficult to gain the necessary approval and funding from management to implement plans and their proposed projects.
  - Engineering standards often generates issues for receiving project approval.
  - For Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) projects in particular, there is often a narrow window of time between when a project is included in a plan, approval is received, and funding becomes available.
  - For complex partnership projects included within the TIP, there is a longer approval time, and more funding is generally required. A number of organizations noted that projects are often moved forward more quickly when using local funding rather than TIP funding.
- There is a disconnect between what is contained in a plan and what is ultimately implemented. The public often raises concerns about projects that were discussed and vetted at public meetings,

yet not ultimately implemented by the time the plan is adopted at the State level. There is a disconnect between the visioning process, the funding process, and the project design generated by engineers.

- There is a disconnect at many levels of government in understanding the relationship between plan development, the TIP, and project development. There is a perception that these efforts are unrelated, when in fact they are directly related. Amongst policymakers in particular, there is a greater focus on individual projects rather than interconnected networks. In some cases, planning is viewed as a detriment to economic development. Rectifying this misunderstanding presents a significant challenge.

- Sidewalks and bike lanes are often not considered at the early stages of developing the concept for a roadway improvement project because local comprehensive or transportation plans are frequently not consulted by the DOT engineers, and there is typically little information provided regarding bike/pedestrian facilities within roadway projects in the TIP. The need to add a sidewalk or bike lane may not arise until the first public meeting, which is typically not held until later in the process once the concept report and environmental document have been approved and preliminary plans are complete. To add a sidewalk or bike lane at this stage would require redesign of plans, resubmissions of environmental and ROW documents, and increased costs, potentially delaying the project a year. Therefore, DOTs resist making the changes, and bike/pedestrian elements are often left out of the project. Integrating sidewalk and bike lane construction into earlier phases of preliminary engineering phase is critical to providing complete streets.

- Current planning processes do not fully account for identifying a vision for corridor planning that incorporates the livability principles. This generates a process where livability components are not incorporated at any stage of the process, as by the time that project engineers become involved in the process, the focus is on technical road components.

- Individual landowners retain significant power over planning decisions. If a person does not want to sell their land to accommodate a project plan, the planning agency has no power to force their decision.

- Environmental justice issues can generate a "Not In My Backyard (NIMBY)" effect for livability projects. For example, constructing a high-speed rail line that will border existing personal property lines, or infill and density development within existing neighborhoods.

- Interstate roadways are becoming increasingly clogged, which has generated higher traffic levels on a number of US routes, many of which pass directly through local downtown areas. Higher congestion within small downtowns conflicts with livability principles.

- In a number of areas, regional planning organization (RPO) authority does not extend far. In some instances, RPOs are limited to safety project scope and implementation only.

- There is a lack of affordable housing in accessible locations. Housing tends to be more affordable beyond city centers where land is cheaper; however, these areas are also the least accessible.

- Concerns over liability, more so than safety, drive decisions.

- Difficulty implementing livability-type projects with federal funds: Local governments often have a lack of staff or lack expertise to implement a project using federal funds. The process is overly complicated, requires highly specialized consultants (not just for design, but for environmental process, ROW acquisition, project management) that it is not cost-effective to use federal funds for projects under $500,000 and yet local governments don't have the local funds to do it on their own. The federal and state DOT requirements seem unnecessarily cumbersome for small projects, taking 5-8 years on average) to implement a project that would take the local government 18 months-2 years. Because of slow project implementation, the "livability" momentum built up during the planning process is lost, the public develops a cynical view of government, and from a more tangible standpoint, these delays can tie up millions of dollars in the TIP year after year when projects are not authorized, preventing new "livability" projects from being funded.

Developing Performance Measures and Demonstrating Benefits
- Developing performance measures that reflect agency performance is challenging, as each agency measures "success" differently. In trying to develop a standard measurement system for a regional or partnership effort, agency needs can be in direct competition with the needs and desires of other agencies. As such, developing performance measures should be an iterative process, with some level of guidance provided at the Federal level.
- Develop comprehensive performance measures that account for multimodal travel. These performance measures could focus on connectivity, mode choice, and/or network choice. Ultimately, these performance measures should be used to develop a framework for evaluating projects as they relate to enhancing a multimodal network.
- Developing performance measures for roadways, particularly as it relates to capacity. There is a potential conflict between providing multimodal options and constraining the current roadway capacity.
- The positive health effects and economic benefits of livable communities need to be marketed more fully to better understand the variety of co-benefits that come from following livability principles. The World Health Organization developed an index to measure the economic benefits that result from increased activity. When this index was applied to regions within the US, areas that promoted walking and biking demonstrated the greatest economic benefits.
- While it is relatively easy to estimate and/or predict a project's dollar cost, defining value, particularly over the long-term, presents a significant challenge. Comparing benefits and costs of transportation projects that incorporate livability components is particularly difficult when the benefits cannot be estimated in terms comparable to that of the project cost.
- In rural Alabama, one of the biggest challenges over the past 15 years has been overcoming the mindset that concentrated commercial development will reduce business visibility and customer access. Many businesses stress the importance of having highway frontage for high visibility and two driveways for easy customer access.
- Road redesign projects that reserve one lane for walking and/or transit may be viewed negatively and perceived as money wasted on a design that incorporates an empty vehicle traffic lane. The public may react negatively to this as well.
- The traditional definition of "road functionality" is no longer relevant. Particularly as it relates to livability, the traditional definition does not capture multimodal use. In some areas, road functionality must also take into account heavy freight traffic as well as multimodal use. Ultimately, each locality should determine what "functionality" means locally and incorporate this understanding into future planning efforts.
- While the mindset of elected officials and general public (who may vote on transit funding) is that the roadway network is a free market product that is funded by the roadway users via the gas tax, there is a lack of understanding about the amount of local tax dollars that go into road building and maintenance. People think that transit is far more expensive to the taxpayer than roadways are.
- Many transportation models are not sensitive to land use or urban form influences on travel behavior, and do not account for bike/pedestrian trips.

Transit Project Implementation
- Transit project development presents a number of challenges related to inadequate funding, developing effective Transit-Oriented Development, and identifying the type of transit from which a community will benefit most effectively.
- There is a need for more public transportation service in rural areas.
- Transit faces many institutional challenges and barriers to implementation. These challenges are compounding as budgetary concerns grow, particularly given the high costs beyond transit project construction that are associated with transit maintenance.

- o In Georgia, money from a regional sales tax would go toward paying for transportation; however, identifying the percentage of money that would be dedicated toward transit as compared to other modes remains in question.
  - o When compared to the level of dedicated highway funding, transit funding is extremely low. There is significant inequality among mode funding. There is a misconception that roadways are a "free market" product paid by the users through their gas tax, and transit is wholly subsidized. There is a lack of understanding that most of the roadway network is paid for by local property tax money and it does not support itself, and there are greater environmental costs associated with our roadway network, which is also not covered by the gas tax. These views affect how transit is funded, in GA in particular when it comes to support for state funding and voting for the regional sales tax.
- Transit routes in the US often extend for significant mileage and are planned so that they accommodate riders and minimize the distance they are required to walk from their origin to their desired transit station. In Europe, transit routes are planned so that riders are required to walk to the nearest transit station. Transit has tried to become too convenient and the network is suffering as a result. Accommodating riders and route convenience is also present in the school bus system. Because of this route structure, and in addition to the fact that buses use a large portion of the available roadway, a paradigm shift should be considered for how school bus routes are operated.

A summary of the solutions that participants mentioned are listed below.
- *Education*
  - o Education and opportunity will play a role in encouraging people to support complete streets. This transformation to more walkable streets may occur by encouraging people to park on the street when traffic is high, or by making transportation options more accessible.
  - o Explore options for tools that local agencies could use during development, particularly in areas where land use does not support livability principles.
  - o Educate people about land use decisions and the benefits of proposed projects within the area. This may help to eliminate some of the potential barriers faced by landowners who are not willing to sell their land to accommodate project designs.
  - o To overcome the disconnect between planning and engineering, engineers should be trained and educated early on about livability and the principles behind it so that the value behind incorporating these livability components is fully understood by everyone involved in the project development process.
  - o By incorporating form-based zoning definitions and concepts into educational efforts related to planning, people will be able to contextualize and understand this process so that it will be incorporated into their future planning efforts.
- *Increased collaboration and partnership efforts.* States should collaborate with local governments to develop a working definition.
- *Project marketing.* By taking a retrofit approach to negatively perceived road design projects (e.g. "empty lane syndrome"), projects can be presented as network redesign and system enhancement projects as a way to generate increased public support.
- *Changes to the Planning Process.* To overcome potential barriers in the current planning processes where livability may not be incorporated adequately into projects, livability principles could be incorporated during the project development phase during discussions with the community of overall concept and measures of effectiveness.

Overcoming Challenges:
Three of the workshop participants presented on successful livability efforts within their organization, allowing all workshop participants to see and hear about successful livability examples in their region.

Jane Hayse from the Atlanta Regional Commission presented on metro Atlanta's long-range plan, Plan 2040. Emphasizing the livability framework on which the plan is based, the associated work plan for project and program implementation, and the associated funding. In particular, Ms. Hayse focused on program implementation for the Livable Centers Initiative (LCI), which ties land use plan implementation to transportation project funding *Mary Blumberg from the Atlanta Regional Commission* presented on the agency's efforts to accommodate its aging population through the Lifelong Communities effort. Much of this effort is focused on providing accessible transportation and housing options, expanding access to services, and encouraging healthy lifestyles. *Amanda Thompson from the City of Decatur, GA* discussed how her city used the LCI grant funding that it was awarded in 2002 to improve the city and access to its transit station. Using its existing town center and by focusing on building community, the city redeveloped its surface parking lots and added housing units, retail businesses, and restaurants. The redevelopment efforts have attracted new businesses and generated job opportunities. *Norm Steinman from the City of Charlotte, NC* presented on the City's efforts to incorporate the Centers, Corridors, and Wedges concept into their planning efforts. The City used this approach to plan a transit system based on available funding resources, develop urban street design guidelines that will promote complete streets, develop thoroughfares, evaluate bicycle and pedestrian Level of Service using a new method they are developing locally, accommodate growth, evaluate preferred block length, and survey the community to gain input on preferred projects.

Participants were divided into five groups for an hour-long small group discussion. As there were a significant number of Federal participants at the workshop, half of the Federal representatives were asked to form a group together. The Federal group was asked to examine challenges and solutions, and answer the questions below from a Federal perspective. Those Federal representatives that did not participate in this Federal-only group chose another participant-majority group to join. Participants and other Federal representatives in the participant-majority groups were asked to consider examples where they had overcome a project challenge and use that experience to answer the following questions:

- What are effective strategies for overcoming challenges?
- When overcoming these challenges, what was important for you to succeed?
- What, if anything, did the Partnership do to facilitate that success?
- How have you measured the success of your efforts?
- What helped you to align or integrate different funding and agency priorities?
- What kinds of public and interagency process worked?
- Do these approaches change in urban, suburban, and rural contexts?

Each group provided a quick summary of their discussion.

Group 1
- Develop partnerships between stakeholder agencies. These partnerships should be based on the physical and geographic environment rather than jurisdictional boundaries.
- Work to gain buy-in from non-traditional constituents.
- Reach out to technical staff members, as they are extensively involved in project implementation details. Without practitioner-level support, livability efforts may not be effectively integrated into the detailed project components.
- Invest resources in data interpretation, as this information can be used to communicate with the public and demonstrate the importance of livability.
- Develop performance measures that account for, and integrate, livability considerations.
- Develop an image bank of pictures that show what is meant by "livability." This bank could be used by planners and educators to help communicate what is meant by livability and garner support from the public for livability projects.

- Use social media to "sell" the idea of livability. Social media can be an effective tool for reaching out to the public and helping them identify with livability projects.
- To speed up project delivery and fund a broader range of project types involves the MPO "swapping" federal transportation funds with local funds. For example, an MPO could give a toll authority $10 million to spend on interstate improvements and the toll authority would give the MPO $10 million in toll revenue, which are unencumbered local dollars and can be spent on small livability projects, TOD development related projects, or other costs that normally would not be reimbursable under federal guidelines. The greatest benefit of doing this exchange is that a typical sidewalk project could be built in 18 months to 2 years, as opposed to 5-8 years as can be typical with federal funds. A number of MPOs were cited as currently using this practice (San Francisco, Portland, and Dallas-Fort Worth).

Group 2
- Invest in education efforts, such as organizing bus tours of various communities that have successfully implemented livability so that planners and members of the public alike can see what is meant by the term.
- Develop educational materials that the public can understand.
- Invest resources in coalition building so that planners are not the only group advocating for livability. By gathering support from other communities such as business and public health, the public will receive a more unified message and they will be able to more easily associate livability with a variety of co-benefits.
- Revise environmental standards so that they maintain the same level of environmental quality, but accommodate increased flexibility.
- Consider revising the current definition of "State" and "interstate" roads, as traditional definitions do not accommodate the variety of contexts within which these roads operate (i.e. on the edge versus directly through the center of a community and the surrounding land use).
- Make a conscious effort to keep politics out of the decision-making process. Planning is focused on developing places with a long-term focus while politics change frequently and focus on the short-term.
- Develop relationships with those at the policymaking and decisionmaking levels, as the people within these levels maintain control over funding allocation.

Group 3
- Leverage public/private partnerships, such as Common Interest Developments, funding swaps with other local governments and agencies (transit included), and nonprofit partnerships.
- Federal requirements surrounding Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) funds could be revised to eliminate the time limits placed on these funds so that they roll over even if an approved program is not authorized in that current year.
- To overcome challenges, a greater focus should be placed on using the processes that are already in place.
- Livability policies and mandates often already exist; however, they are not utilized effectively. This is particularly true as it relates to bicycle/pedestrian projects.
- MPOs should be encouraged to provide more leadership and technical assistance to local governments during project implementation.
- The Federal project development process should be streamlined.
- Place greater attention and support on those projects that will generate lasting benefits rather than those that are ready and funded at the present time. In doing so, quality projects will be supported and implemented.
- The conformity process should be adapted to account for livability projects, as livability projects that slow traffic are often in direct conflict with conformity standards related to emissions.

- To help with local, regional, and State livability project implementation, the Federal government could provide additional assistance for rural areas looking to incorporate livability components.
- To assist with environmental regulations surrounding project development, categorical exclusions could be expanded and environmental projects should last for five, rather than seven years.

Group 4
- Align funding mechanisms, with a particular focus on utilizing existing mechanisms with overlapping purposes and/or goals.
- Develop tools to demonstrate the return on investment from and co-benefits of livability projects.
- Support grassroots forums to educate the public and elected officials about livability principles. These forums should aim to generate leadership at a grassroots level and develop community support for livability projects.
- Planning agencies should work to actively demonstrate their commitment to livability to the public. This could be an article, policy Statement, or guidance Statement
- Place a greater focus on transportation and land use integration as a way to promote livability.
- Merge comprehensive plans in order to streamline existing processes while accomplishing the same intended outcome.

Federal Observers/Group 5
- Target educational materials to distinguish between those topics pertinent to rural versus urban area.
- Develop standard terminology related to livability (i.e. incorporate the term "underserved").
- Invest resources in grassroots efforts.
- Focus on coalition building in order to develop new connections and break down informational silos.

Regional Livability Planning Strategies:

Two of the workshop participants presented on their organization's success in developing and implementing livability planning strategies at a regional level. *Tom Thomson from the Chatham County-Savannah MPO* presented on redevelopment efforts by the City of Savannah, GA to expand the 1770 Oglethorpe city plan centered on public squares while providing incentives for mixed use development. *Brian Leary from Atlanta Beltline, Inc.* discussed how they are using the 22-mile loop of railroad beltline land to create new park and trail development, brownfield redevelopment, light rail and streetcar transit construction, affordable housing development, a jobs training program, and local art sponsorship. Mr. Leary also presented on a separate effort, Atlantic Station. As a transportation control measure, the brownfield redevelopment project is a walkable area and demonstrates air quality improvement through reduced vehicle miles travelled. The project is currently 40% constructed and has already surpassed its original air quality measure goals.

Whit Blanton from Renaissance Planning Group presented on the concept of a "Regional Livability Plan," and the strategies that have proven most effective in supporting regional livability. In examining those areas that serve as best practice examples of regional livability, Mr. Blanton identified three common plan elements: (1) regional analysis, scenarios, and goal setting, which have been used to assess issues such as transportation choices, affordable housing availability, and also to develop performance measures so that planners could more effectively measure livability; (2) policies and plans that have been used to identify areas for implementation and opportunities for collaboration; and (3) programs, which have included educational elements to explain the connections between livability and existing community components, and avenues for exploring and developing collaborative efforts. As many of these elements

are present in existing planning requirements and processes, participants were asked to identify frameworks within these processes where regional livability planning efforts could operate. In addition to the plans mentioned in the presentation (long-range transportation plans, comprehensive plans, regional visioning efforts, regional environmental greenprints and watershed planning, and regional transit plans), participants mentioned economic development plans as a potential opportunity for integrating livability considerations.

During an information large-group discussion, participants discussed materials that would be most useful for them in their efforts to successfully implement regional livability, particularly as it would relate to communicating the importance of livability to decisionmakers and policymakers. These included the following:
- Educational materials to explain the importance of locating key centers where investments can be optimized.
- Taking steps to ensure that blueprint mapping includes greenprint mapping.
- Developing maps at the regional level of areas where investment should be targeted to achieve the greatest community benefit.
- Include the energy sector in partnership efforts to ensure a comprehensive approach to livable communities that incorporate energy efficient strategies.
- Develop guidance materials to assist local governments in identifying their role as it relates to livability and steps that can be taken to apply livability at the sub-regional level.
- Develop education materials on accommodating mixed-use along a corridor, particularly as it relates to long-term planning.

Participants broke into the same five groups for an hour-long small group discussion on the following questions:
- Do these Regional Livability Plan elements make sense?
  - Regional analysis, scenarios and goal setting
  - Policies and Plans
  - Programs
- Are there any overarching issues/principles/approaches missed?
- Can they apply to urban, suburban, & rural contexts?
- How would a regional livability plan fit with existing required plans?
- What processes & implementation strategies work?
- How can performance on livability goals in livability be measured and tracked?

Each group summarized their discussion, and the main points of each summary are listed below.

Group 1
- Gather data on natural environment, social environment (e.g. develop a community profile), and the existing transportation network. Incorporate the date findings into the plan.
- Consider constructing the plan around system-level policies and plans.
- Incorporate elements such as aging in place, health, accessibility, and transportation services.
- Implementation often happens at the local and neighborhood level—perhaps the regional scale is too large.
- Rural areas in particular have a unique framework within which their plans are operating. There are few best practice examples highlighted at this scale, yet small towns have largely retained their historical structures from the post-WWII era, and can use this to their advantage when considering livability projects.
- Explore public/private and/or corporate partnerships as funding sources for project implementation.

- Identify ways to market the idea of livability effectively. This may include education materials that could provide people with a toolbox of programs and/or projects helping in starting to incorporate livability into a plan.
- Consider development a "Matrix of Livability" that identifies the metrics associated with livability and helps people identify the relationship between these metrics and the agency's planning efforts.

Group 2
- Rather than developing a new planning requirement for a Regional Livability Plan, focus should be placed on incorporating livability into existing plans, as these often provide an adequate avenue for advancing livability.
- Resistance may be encountered by small jurisdictions that may not support the need for regional planning.
- Better integrate public participation into the planning process, particularly at the local level.
- Devote resources to public education, particularly as it relates to providing context for regional and local spending and project funding. If people understand the costs associated with road maintenance as compared to transit line construction and maintenance, they may be more inclined to support transit projects.
- Many effective performance measures have been developed. There are many opportunities to draw from when developing livability performance measures. For example, industry uses site selection indicators, whose purpose overlaps directly with livability interests.

Group 3
- Engage the business community in regional efforts. In particular, examine the opportunities for using improvement districts to leverage current efforts. By referring to the Comprehensive Plan as a "Regional Business Plan," the business community may be more inclined to become engaged.
- Develop informational materials explaining the existing planning processes to assist in efforts to identify current overlaps or partnership opportunities among current planning efforts.
  - These materials could also be used to identify areas where plans are duplicative and resources could be allocated more efficiently toward development of these planning elements. In particular, these overlaps could be used to support more effective and targeted community engagement efforts.
- Use purpose and need Statements to identify a variety of stakeholders in the beginning of the project development process who are connected to the project. These relationships could be further explored when developing performance measures, to help connect project performance with a wider variety of community partners.
- FHWA could develop a best practices guidebook, including examples of varying partnership opportunities and sponsorship examples at a variety of geographic levels.
- Streamline the funding process, as the current one is resource-intensive and prohibitive for project implementation.

Group 4
- Develop a manageable number of goals so that resources are used efficiently and those involved in the project development process can focus on a reasonable scope.
- Funding
  - Designate a funding source for livability projects. This funding source should also include guidance for those who apply.
  - Recognize the integrated nature of livability project focus by allowing funding flexibility.
- Identify parameters for what would be considered the "livability model."

- Provide implementation assistance for those communities interested in pursuing livability projects. For smaller communities in particular, organizations may lack the resources (both staff and financial) needed to begin implementing livability effectively. Assistance could include identifying experts who would serve as available resources for those areas.

Identifying Opportunities:

Harrison Rue reviewed some successful communication and outreach efforts to identify some of the options available for messaging and marketing the concept of livability. Successful communication and outreach efforts have included fact sheets, summary brochures, summary posters, Web 2.0, and social media. Considering these efforts, participants were asked to reflect on the following questions in a large-group setting:

- What messages resonate with you and other practitioners to embrace livability?
- What communications and marketing materials would be helpful to help make the case for livability?
- What tools do you need?
- What technical assistance do you need?
- Are there specific products needed in urban, suburban, and rural contexts?

A summary of the discussion is included below.

Marketing and Branding Tools
- Re-title the comprehensive plan as the business plan.
- Recognize the political context surrounding the term "livability" and consider options for re-titling the effort. In some political circles, "livability" has a negative connotation. Work to de-politicize the term and incorporate the word balance.
- Recognize the variety of names for which people refer to "livability" around the country.
- Invest in branding efforts to associate livability with the following:
  - Economic benefits (cost savings from not traveling as far)
  - Associate livability with core American ideals such as freedom, choice, prosperity, self-expression, privacy, individualism, mobility, and opportunity.
  - If the term "freedom" is marketed as being connected to livability, recognize that "freedom" has traditionally been associated with owning a car rather than walking to transit stations.
- Identify how the average American would identify with livability and sustainability and build on this idea. Everyone can define what is meant by "building a better community" or an "economically vibrant city." By translating livability into terms that associate with these ideas, people are more likely to associate with the term "livability" and support it.
  - Health and safety benefits are factors with which every citizen can identify and marketing efforts should connect livability with co-benefits in these areas. Livability should be framed as enabling "complete communities," which includes public safety and neighborhoods where people can live for a lifetime. One option is to refer to these communities as "8-80" communities—ones that offer benefits to children as well as older adults.
- Communities should be encouraged to identify their priorities and begin investing in those choices.
- Identify how livability relates to the priorities of one's leadership and use this to garner support. For example, the negative impacts of wasting time due to congestion are common across all areas and apply to all people. By framing livability as part of solutions to congestion, communities may be more inclined to invest in livability.

- The term livability may not even need to be used. If city and local governments deliver on projects from which the community can identify benefits, residents are more likely to support similar future project efforts.
- There may be a perception that livability harms economic investments. Planners need to focus on explaining how a regional vision that incorporates livability components will affect local businesses.
- Connect livability to climate change, particularly as it relates to residents making location choices in places that are practical for the long-term.
- There is a potential disconnect between how the visionary themes in plans are translated into practice and regulations, which can negatively affect public support.
- There may be an opportunity to associate the idea of "doing more with less" with livability; however, this term should be used carefully. In recognition of the fact that budgets are shrinking, there may be an opportunity to cast livability projects as more efficient. Project construction can involve multimodal improvements rather than focusing only on one mode.
- Make a conscious effort to make people, particularly local staff members, more comfortable with the idea of using multimodal options. Oftentimes people will argue against constructing bike lanes, as this service is viewed as only catering to a minority; however, if more people were aware of opportunities to travel using these lanes, support may become more widespread.
- A comprehensive image library would be extremely helpful to educate elected officials and board members, but also to help implement the "livable centers" charrettes work we are doing around the region. It would need to be organized by category with a top-notch search engine. It should be organized by region, by urban, suburban, rural/small town, old/traditional versus post-war and newer planned developments, everything from streetscapes, roads, parking, development types, public spaces, parks and open spaces, and not only include photos, but also some renderings, diagrams, and before and after shots.

Invest Resources in Developing Performance Measures
- Focus on the economic benefits (e.g. bottom line, time savings) associated with livability. Economic messages resonate with a wide variety of audiences and could be effective in promoting livability.
  - Elected leaders in particular focus on the economic message, and particularly how jobs and businesses have been generated or supported through livability projects.
- The Center for Neighborhood Technology's Housing + Transportation Affordability Index is a helpful resource that agencies could draw upon.

Identifying the Product
  - Develop a fact sheet showing examples of how agencies have used non-Federal spending for livability projects.
  - Develop a one-page fact sheet for decisionmakers showing examples of areas where jobs and businesses have been created through livability projects.
  - Develop educational materials to help agencies identify central livability elements that should be incorporated into all planning efforts.
  - Explore the option of coordinating planning, public involvement, and funding processes to ensure these efforts are coordinated and efficient.
    - For public meetings, this could involve combining requirements for various efforts to help conserve staff and financial resources.
    - For planning, overlap exists between current planning requirements and there is an opportunity to suffice multiple requirements by combining efforts. Where these requirements may be associated with different regulatory agencies, a certification process could be developed to ensure that organizations are pre-approved to combine requirements by the regulatory agencies in question.

Ultimately, all requirements should be framed as working toward one, unified goal of creating a livable region.

- For funding, the option of creating a more streamlined process should be considered. Currently, there are numerous sources of money, each of which has its own rules. Organizations waste a significant amount of staff and financial resources on learning these rules and applying for funding from multiple sources. By streamlining funding so that there are fewer sources of funding, organizations would benefit.

o Explore the concept of efficient transportation decision-making where varieties of stakeholders are brought to the table in the initial phases of the project development process to ensure the project is comprehensive.

o Consider using Connect CTY to connect with residents regarding local planning efforts and public messaging.

o Blogging can be an effective way to inform people about current efforts and collect public opinion.
- A targeted blog about livability specifically could be helpful, but should be lively and include examples of how livability has been incorporated into local level projects around the country.

o Customer surveys are effective tools for evaluating public response to projects—particularly ones that were controversial. Oftentimes with livability projects, those who were opposed to the project in the beginning are pleased with the outcome. Recording these testimonies and marketing them could be very effective in addressing negative perceptions in other areas.

o Utilize the mainstream media more effectively, as many people use this as their main source of information. In recognition of the fact that many journalists may not be familiar with the terminology associated with livability, planners can develop a resource for journalists that they can draw from when writing about livability. When journalists understand livability, they are better prepared to inform their readers.
- Invest resources in developing media kit that could include an image bank of high-resolution photographs, contacts for quotations, standard text, and terminology.

o Rather than waiting for the media to come to the planners for information, planners should be proactive and take a pre-written press release to the media. Project coverage can be expanded greatly by recruiting television and news stations to report on current efforts.
- Government channels are often a free option that planning agencies could use to show slides, videos, and other informational materials.

o Open a town forum online to allow people to post feedback on project ideas and general community goals. This may allow agencies to gather greater public feedback than would be collected through public meetings alone.
- Charlottesville, Virginia used a teleconferencing line for its school board meetings to allow people to call in and listen to meetings at their own convenience.
- The City of Decatur, Georgia has used a community forum as a way to keep residents informed about ongoing city activities. Community members are able to post comments on this forum as well, which helps inform the city about public opinion.

o Recognize that traditional communication methods may not resonate with persons of all languages. Consider targeting non-English speaking populations through alternative communication methods. For example, one organization successfully used a telenovela style video to communicate their drunk driving campaign.

o Develop a comprehensive list of successful outreach methods and make this available to governments at all levels.

- o Actively communicate with other industries. Consider media that is not focused on planners, such as construction journals, concrete journals, engineering journals, etc.
  - ▪ Also, consider setting up informational tables or booths at Continuing Education Credit classes for other industries. One organization set up an informational booth at a class for engineers as a way to gather input from a variety of industry personnel during a time that was convenient for them.
- o Develop a document that is marketed and written for engineers only. It can be very difficult to communicate livability to this industry and it would prove to be a helpful resource when planners are communicating with engineers.

Closing and Next Steps:

To finish the day, the facilitators and FHWA staff thanked participants and explained the next steps in the creation of the supporting guidance materials for organizations around the country that are interested in pursuing or advancing livability in transportation efforts in their community.

Evaluation Forms:

Most participants felt that they were well informed about the workshops. They generally agreed that the facilitators were knowledgeable on the topics, and that they presented the information in an organized manner. They felt that the workshop information discussed was useful, the format of the workshop was logical, and their participation was worthwhile. There was greater variability in the responses on how the workshop would help support FHWA's training and support, as participants were less sure on workshop goals. Some specific requests include:

- Sharing the workshop results with the participants (see next steps section).
- Clarify the workshop goals and the desired outcomes from their participation.
- Continue with the case study presentations as those were well received.
- Peer networking was useful, as the participants were multi-disciplinary.
- More guided facilitation during the breakout sessions.

As a result, several changes were made to the Kansas City meeting preparations, including more emphasis on the workshop goals and desired outcomes, added more case study presentations, and clarified the breakout sessions more clearly. Some of the sessions were also changed– shortened the breakouts, added additional smaller exercises, and provided more facilitator guidance –help make the workshop more stimulating. They also presented some results from the Atlanta meeting for response from the Kansas City participants.

Workshop Participants	
Amanda Thompson	City of Decatur, GA
Amy Goodwin	Atlanta Regional Commission
Angie Laurie	Central Atlanta Progress
Ashby Johnson	Houston-Galveston Area Council
Bob Cambric	South Florida Regional Planning Council
Brian Leary	Atlanta Beltline, Inc.
Byron Rushing	Georgia DOT
Catherine Ross	Georgia Tech Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development

Daniel Robinson	City of Suwanee, GA
Darrell Howard	Birmingham MPO
David Baird	Chattanooga-Hamilton County Regional Planning Agency
Dawn Landholm	East Alabama Regional Planning and Development Commission
Gina Mitteco	Houston-Galveston Area Council
Jane Hayse	Atlanta Regional Commission
Julie Hunkins	North Carolina DOT
Kaycee Mertz	Georgia DOT
Kris Krider	Kolbinsky Krider Design
Lauren Blackburn	Town of Davidson, NC
Lisa Riegel	State of North Carolina
Mark Kirstner	Piedmont Triad, Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Project
Mark Pleasant	South Carolina DOT
Mary Blumberg	Atlanta Regional Commission
Norm Steinman	City of Charlotte, NC
Paul Black	Land of Sky Regional Council
Pat Steed	Central Florida Regional Planning Council
Rick Bernhardt	Nashville-Davidson County
Robin Romeo	Louisiana Department of Transportation
September Barnes	Triangle J Council of Governments
Ted Tarantino	Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA)
Tom Thomson	Chatham County-Savannah MPO
Federal Participants	
Andrew Edwards	FHWA – Georgia Division Office
Andy Johns	FHWA – Ohio Division Office
Angie Billups	EPA
Ann-Marie Day	FHWA – Georgia Division Office
Candace Rutt	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Claiborne Barnwell	FHWA – Mississippi Division Office
Carlos Gonzales	FHWA
David Harris	FHWA – Alabama Division Office
Elizabeth Martin	FTA – Region 4
Emma Newsome	HUD – Field Policy and Management
James Setze	FHWA
Katherine Hebert	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Shana Baker	FHWA – Office of Human Environment

Steve Luxenberg	FHWA – Georgia Division Office
Tom Thomson	FTA – Region 4
Unwanna Dabney	FHWA – North Carolina Division Office
Yolanda Morris	FHWA – South Carolina Division Office
Consultant Team	
Elizabeth Wallis	ICF International
Harrison Rue	ICF International
Kathleen Rooney	ICF International
Whit Blanton	Renaissance Planning Group

Livability Examples Provided by Atlanta Participants

In order to draw on the vast experience and knowledge of the selected participants, participants were asked to send the facilitators relevant information on best practices related to livability within their communities prior to the workshop. This information, along with the information that regional representatives presented during the workshop, are listed below. This information serves as an informal collection of examples that could be used in future guidebook/primer efforts when discussing best practices and developing case studies.

■ Prowalk Seattle (2008), presentation on Decatur, GA Community Transportation Plan given at the PRoWalkProBike conference in 2008

■ "Decatur Bike Lane" (2011)—a two-page handout that shows how Decatur, GA created a Complete Street on West Ponce de Leon/Trinity Place

■ "2008 Annual Report," Decatur, GA sustainability-focused annual report

■ "2010 Annual Report," Decatur, GA annual report focused on their strategic planning process, which focuses on connecting operations, programs, built environment etc together to create a livable community

■ Decatur, GA "Community Transportation Plan," http://www.decaturga.com/index.aspx?page=422

■ Sustainable Communities Initiative, North Carolina http://www.onencnaturally.org/pages/SC_SustainableCommunities.html.

   o Two communities in NC were awarded Federal funding from the August 2010 grant cycle of the regional Sustainable Communities Planning grants:

     ▪ Land-of-Sky (Asheville area) http://coablog.ashevillenc.gov/2010/10/land-of-sky-regional-council-wins-1-6-million-sustainable-communities-grant/

     ▪ Triad (Greensboro/Winston-Salem area) www.triadsustainability.org

   o NC Sustainable Communities Task Force was established by the 2010 General Assembly to lead and support a sustainable communities initiative. The Task Force has developed a Community Practices Assessment to assess how well a community is implementing the identified principles.

■ Piedmont Triad Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Project – Process Design http://www.partnc.org/TriadSustainability.html

■ Piedmont Triad Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Project – Project Overview (February 2011) http://www.partnc.org/TriadSustainability.html

■ Atlanta Regional Commission, Plan2040 Vision http://www.atlantaregional.com/land-use/plan-2040

■ Atlanta Regional Commission, Livable Centers Initiative http://www.atlantaregional.com/land-use/livable-centers-initiative

■ Atlanta Regional Commission, Lifelong Communities, http://www.atlantaregional.com/aging-resources/lifelong-communities-llc

■ Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning, "Centers Corridors and Wedges," http://charmeck.org/city/charlotte/planning/AreaPlanning/CentersCorridorsWedges/Pages/Home.aspx

■ Charlotte Area Transit System, "2030 Transit Corridor System Plan," http://charmeck.org/city/charlotte/cats/planning/2030Plan/Pages/default.aspx

■ Charlotte Department of Transportation, "Transportation Action Plan," http://www.charmeck.org/city/charlotte/Transportation/PlansProjects/Pages/Transportation%20Action%20Plan.aspx

Livability Examples Provided by Atlanta Participants

- Charlotte Department of Transportation, "Urban Street Design Guidelines, http://www.charmeck.org/city/charlotte/Transportation/PlansProjects/Pages/Urban%20Street%20Design%20Guidelines.aspx

- Chatham-County Savannah MPO, "Unified Zoning Ordinance," http://www.unifiedzoning.org/

- Chatham-County Savannah MPO, "Tricentennial Plan," http://www.thempc.org/Planning/TricentennialPlan.htm

- Atlanta, BeltLine Project, http://www.beltline.org/

- Atlantic Station, http://www.atlanticstation.com/home.php

This page intentionally left blank

Kansas City, Missouri Summary

Discussion Summary: While this meeting was intended to focus on rural and tribal issues, because of the attendee mix, additional issues were addressed. Key discussion points included:

- Challenges associated with the disconnect between regional and local priorities, coordination of many funding streams, and demonstrating the benefits of livability projects.

- Solutions associated with prioritizing livability (or related attributes) in project selection, establishing metrics to quantify livability benefits, and branding or developing other communication strategies to talk about livability.

- Livability primer issues such as the need to appeal to a wide variety of audiences, connecting any new guidance to previous publications, and branding it in a way to appeal to interagency coordination and to those who may not be otherwise receptive to the term "livability."

- Opportunities for marketing and communications such as standard marketing materials and PowerPoints for planners to use and that have been vetted through focus groups.

Based on input from this workshop, continued work in subsequent workshops focused on developing these ideas more thoroughly. The meeting structure included a number of presentations on regional practices, as well as a significant amount of brainstorming, facilitated discussion, and idea sharing. A summary of activities and key outputs follows.

Workshop Specifics:

Location:

Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) office
600 Broadway Street
Boardroom in Suite 200
Kansas City, MO 64105

Date / Time:

April 7, 2011 from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm

Kansas City workshop discussions.

Welcome and Introductions:

Shana Baker from FHWA's Office of Human Environment welcomed participants and provided a brief overview of the day's goals. She reiterated that FHWA is focused on livability as part of comprehensive planning efforts to generate a framework for transportation decisions that result in safer and more convenient transportation options.

Representatives from the regional HUD/DOT/EPA Partnership for Sustainable Communities gave opening remarks as well. *Cindy Terwilliger, Deputy Regional Administrator for FTA Region 7,* highlighted her agency's collaboration in Jefferson City, Kansas, on a diesel reduction grant, and the interagency reviews of grant applications on nationwide basis. *Tracy Troutner, Transportation Planner for FHWA's Iowa Division,* commended an inner city project in Iowa that is also a brownfield redevelopment project for its good coordination efforts, particularly at Federal level. *Derrith Watchman-Moore, Regional Administrator from HUD Region 7,* emphasized the focus on the quality of life for children now and in the future within livability. *Matt Duran, Acting Deputy Assistant Regional Administrator for EPA Region 7,* recognized that collaborating closely with Federal entities is essential to supporting sustainable communities. He mentioned how sustainability is important because where and how you build a community has an impact on public health, highlighting EPA's Greening America's Capitols (including nearby Jefferson City) and their increased outreach to State and local partners.

Workshop facilitators, managers from ICF International and Renaissance Planning Group, and all participants introduced themselves.

Setting the Stage for Livability:
Harrison Rue from ICF International reviewed the purpose and outcomes of both the overall project and the day's workshop in particular. As the majority of participants indicated that they had not read the background paper developed for this project, *The Role of FHWA Programs in Livability: State of the Practice Summary,* Mr. Rue provided a comprehensive overview of the paper's content. This overview included a review of the Sustainable Communities Partnership and the associated principles, components included in the definition of "livability in transportation," benefits of incorporating livability, overall research findings, and a review of State of the practice examples from areas that have successfully incorporated livability into a variety of efforts.

Identifying Challenges to Livability:
During this large group discussion session, participants were asked to focus on the following three questions:

1. What are the big challenges to implementing transportation solutions that advance livable communities?
2. What is one solution that has worked for your agency?
3. How do the challenges and solutions differ in:
    a. Urban, suburban, and rural contexts?
    b. Local, regional, and State agencies?

Participants identified five main categories of challenges, as well as potential solutions that could be used to overcome some of these challenges. During the discussion, participant recommendations were listed on flip charts and posted around the room for participants to reference during discussion. From the Atlanta meeting discussions, greater emphasis was put on identifying priorities among the different challenges through a dot-voting exercise (see description at the end of the section) and expanding the discussion on success stories/practices from the participant's experiences. The categories below of the five identified challenges reflect the voting priorities from this exercise.

Interagency/Interdisciplinary Barriers
- Many transportation agencies, specifically State DOTs, view livability as a local concern. It is not necessarily incorporated into their design or projects.
- A disconnect exists between local authority and regional decisionmaking, especially when dealing with land use issues. If all localities assume strong growth, then the regional traffic projects are increased as well. It can be difficult to get everyone to transition from local to regional decisionmaking.
- Interdisciplinary projects are the anomaly, rather than the norm. It is not as common in practice as everyone would like.
- Local and regional processes have evolved to respond to Federal requirements and those processes now have their own self-imposed restriction. What are the changes we need to make to leverage the flexibility offered at the Federal level?
- Local and regional priorities start from different places and are different – the challenge is in reconciling or balancing them.
- Environmental justice is defined differently by EPA and FHWA, which challenges practitioners.
- Local governments may not enforce their own zoning and sidewalk ordinances in their own plan, which complicates achieving the regional vision.

Funding Priority Mismatch

- Particularly on the FHWA side, the funding programs are not very well established to support livability projects. Many funding program are not accessible for community-level projects that support/promote livability
  - With priorities—for example, livable community projects are competing with major bridge projects. DOTs are not hearing from communities that livable communities are higher priority than the bridge. Also big projects have been waiting to be built so they stay on the project list as higher priorities.
- Specifically with congestion mitigation and air quality (CMAQ) funding, the State gets CMAQ funding which they do not use for bicycle and pedestrian projects in urban areas that maintain their attainment. Those communities are being punished for doing their job well.
- Different agencies have different requirements at different points in time. They don't have pots of money that come out at the same time that are being used in a given State in a coordinated notice of funding availability (NOFA) so that you can target a local project for a true livable communities effort. Agencies have different implementing regulations and definitions. Even the basic time horizons for the programs are different and uncoordinated.

Making Livability Less Politically "Hot"
- Too few policymakers and elected officials at local level understand these concepts and their value to the community.
  - Shifting national priorities makes it difficult for local elected officials to grab on to the livability concept and this happens at all levels of government.
  - City staff will be on-board for building complete streets, but it is stuck when it gets to council members who will not vote for new zoning code. (Despite this concern, it was noted that more than six local governments in the Kansas City region have adopted complete streets policies in 2011)
- It can be difficult to insulate many projects from kinds of political changes mentioned here.

Demonstrating the Value of Multimodal Transportation (in a range of contexts)
- People do not value multimodal transportation systems, in both rural and urban regions, and all of the related benefits.
- It is difficult to evaluate multimodal transportation and its benefits
- Very common to have conflicts between State DOT and local project sponsor, especially when road in question is a State route but very important locally.
- Current scorekeeping practices do not recognize economics/pedestrian/health benefits of livability projects.
- It can be hard to implement many multimodal solutions in the existing right-of-ways.

Cost/benefit Analyses to Quantify the Benefits Related to Larger Community Goals
- With the cost of building the roadways, many communities are looking at short-term costs rather than long-term benefits.
- Economic benefits do not officially count in transportation decisionmaking. Most investments do not require cost benefits analysis.
- Sustainability measures and solutions are not included in transportation analyses.

Other Challenges
Design standards, manuals, and technical concerns:
- Real/perceived conflicts with design standards that engineers need to follow.
- Engineers tend to stick with the most conservative option even within flexible standards.
- Standards do not differentiate enough between different types of community contexts.
- Safety is still limited to automobile measures.

- Planners and engineers are always designing for more growth in 2030, but that is a value judgment and an assumption that may not be true.
- The goals for highway and transportation officials may not match what the communities and residents want. Many visions for community design in places are controlled by transportation engineers and they do not necessarily have the attitude that we are looking for.
- Current curriculum for traffic engineers in colleges does not include courses on traffic design and courses on how traffic affects businesses.

Scale:
- The environmental scale of the decisions may be different from the transportation scale of decisionmaking.
- Hard to know how to reconfigure a mile grid structure to a smaller scale, are the tools missing?

The impacts of changing demographics: Designing and collaborating across sectors for an aging population is not well accounted for.

Sprawl is still a viable choice: Opportunity to sprawl out in these communities still exists.

A summary of the solutions that participants mentioned are listed below. As many of these solutions are broadly applicable to a variety of challenges, they are not grouped into discrete categories.
- Provide design standards that engineers can/will follow
    - Re-title those documents to help frame it differently in people's minds.
    - Create tools that show them how to use/embrace the flexibility the standards give them.
- Add a way to account for other benefits in the transportation project selection process, such as for economic, pedestrian, environmental/sustainability, health outcomes, etc.
- Redefine success for State highway officials so that they can feel good about accomplishing the livability goals. Create more training and training opportunities for transportation decisionmakers, specifically on street design. Community design in many places is controlled by transportation engineers.
- Expand safety statistics to include other users, such as creating a Level of Service (LOS) measure for other modes.
- Do not design for an "always growth in cars in 2030 traffic" scenario and be clear about assumptions and goals behind planning.
- Make livability a State DOT concern.
- Promote interdisciplinary teams.
- Change the curriculum for traffic engineers in colleges so that they include some review courses on traffic design and courses on how traffic affects businesses.
- Educate and train policymakers/elected officials at local level so they understand these concepts.
- Promote partnerships between governmental and aging institutions—medical centers – to prepare for future demographic and lifestyle changes/trends (aging, obesity).
- Changes/reevaluate the noise and vibration standards in highway and roadway considerations
- Identify a path to coordinate the time horizons for different Federal planning requirements
- Create a way to "pick a planning process" and just follow one agency's public process for a plan, but meet the requirements of all other planning statues in other processes.

Following this discussion, participants received four dot stickers, which they used to vote for the challenges they thought were the most significant. No limit was placed on this voting process, and participants were allowed to use one or all four dots on any one particular challenge, depending on the significance they placed on it. As mentioned above, the categorization of the five identified challenges reflect the voting priorities from this exercise.

Overcoming Challenges:
Four of the workshop participants presented on successful livability efforts in the region, allowing all workshop participants to see and hear about successful livability examples in their region. *Tom Gerend from the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC)* spoke about their Transportation Outlook 2040 as a

foundation for public discussion around regional goals, aiming to understand how transportation can be used to leverage us collectively to respond to all of these challenges together. *Dean Katerndahl from MARC* spoke about their green impact zone initiative, which was a way to concentrate resources in one specific neighborhood area to make a substantial impact – by addressing all those social problems/dimensions simultaneously, the investment could have a bigger impact. *Scott Bernstein from the Center for Neighborhood Technology* talked about their housing and transportation affordability tool, which analyzes the financial/economic benefits of location efficiency. *Janet Attarian from Chicago DOT* discussed their streetscape and sustainable design program policies, which use sustainability as a driver for their work. She also emphasized that performance measure ground livability and sustainability to ensure that what is built is performing in the way you said it would, helping to move the practice forward. Afterwards, there was a panel discussion, focusing on the key elements of their success:

- Having the leadership of mayor who supported these initiatives and having key people in the departments. Chicago has a green team—one person from each department – and they meet monthly and has been instrumental in breaking cross-agency barriers and creating cross-agency relationships.
- Shifting from project orientation to a way of life - getting people to think about this as something that would be done every day.
- Playing the role of translator/ambassador between different parties' counts a lot. Translating these concepts to a set of maps/calculators/websites has tremendously helped with people and their understanding. Organizing people into a user group so they know they are not alone.
- Solidifying project goals up front, which provides a foundation for future work and purpose – supports the collective vision and message. As a result, regional partnerships have largely contributed to success in securing Federal partnerships.
- Strong and committed community engagement. The Green Zone is their project and does not fit into any Federal program funding scheme, but that engagement and commitment is essential to place-based approach. Partnerships and persistence have also been key.
- Using local funding, rather than Federal monies. Currently, Federal monies are very difficult to use for these projects in Chicago.

Following this roundtable discussion, participants divided themselves into five groups with a mix of State, regional, local, and Federal representatives. During this hour-long discussion, participants were asked to consider examples where they had overcome a project challenge and use that experience to answer the following questions:

- What effective strategies have helped you to overcome challenges?
  - What was important for you to succeed?
  - What, if anything, did the Partnership do to facilitate success?
  - How have you measured the success of your efforts?
- What helped you to align or integrated different funding and agency priorities?
- What kinds of public and interagency process worked?

Each group provided a quick summary of their discussion.

Funding Priority Mismatch
- Improving the interagency alignment between Federal funding agencies would be helpful.
- There is a lack of available funding for livability-focused programs, as they do not often qualify for application to many funding sources. For those sources where livability programs do qualify, the application process is often very competitive.
- Unlike other programs where reliable funding sources have been around for an extended period of time, livability programs do not have a dedicated, reliable funding source. Existing funding processes should be reexamined to identify if efforts could be combined so that funding requirements are revised to offer increased opportunities for pursuing livability projects.

- Local decisions and higher-level State and Federal decisions often do not follow similar timelines, which can generate a disconnect between the decision-making process. Often, by the time local decisions are made, higher-level decisions have already been made.
- Developing a "livability standard" could help compare projects across Federal agency disciplines.
- Coordinating regional efforts can help align funding resources to accomplish a common objective. Supporting interregional communication can also keep regions informed on activities being undertaken elsewhere.
- Federal and State policies are not always aligned.
- Develop educational materials on the rules surrounding funding and flexibilities that may already exist. Flexibilities are present, but are not well known.
- An outcome-based approach to project funding would help prioritize effective projects as they relate to regional goals.
  - The HUD Sustainable Communities grant uses a performance-based approach and may serve as a good example.
- Funding programs should recognize the quick timescale involved in project development. Oftentimes, by the time a project receives approval and funding, the solution is no longer relevant, as the community has already changed.

Making Livability "Apolitical"
- Developing effective performance measures such as different kinds of data, calculators, and/or tools can help people quantify project/activity impacts.
- Incorporating robust public engagement processes can assist in identifying local priorities, needs, and visions into project.
- Institutionalizing effective processes at every level can help maintain good decisionmaking even across leadership change. For example, Janet Attarian's presentation on the role that Green Committee involvement played in project success involved partnership efforts between EPA, HUD, and DOT. Staff members had buy-in and had therefore invested in project implementation and success.
- Developing design standards can be adopted into standard practice and readily followed.
- Integrating State, local, and Federal processes can help unify efforts.
- Use information sharing among individuals and organizations to develop relationships and advance projects effectively.
- Gain support from a leadership level, which can provide resources and support.

Demonstrating the Value of Multimodal Transportation
- Demonstrating the value of providing multimodal transportation options would help overcome one of the significant barriers to project implementation and funding. Many decisionmakers may be happy with the current system and therefore unmotivated to devote resources for improvements.
- The cost of multimodal system construction and maintenance does not necessarily reflect the true cost of the transportation system.
- Identifying funding opportunities for multimodal transportation improvements is difficult, as many of these opportunities are stand-alone and do not offer financial incentives.
- Resource investment in education and communication could help residents understand what is meant by a "livable community" and the technical tools involved in creating such a community. The average decisionmaker and resident may not understand what is needed to achieve some of the goals associated with livability. For example, if a community is interested in generating affordable transportation options, these tools could lay out the steps involved in doing so.

Cost/benefit Tools for Quantifying the Broader Benefits of Livability for Communities
- Anecdotes have captured that communities based on the livability principles enjoy the following benefits: increased real estate values; reduced living costs; job creation and higher job availability; lower congestion and increased travel speeds; increased job accessibility; health improvements; increased road safety; natural resource improvements; and reduced operating costs for businesses and homes. Capturing these benefits into materials that people understand and are accessible can help generate support for livability projects.
- Develop educational materials on transportation costs—both owning a car and purchasing a home that is not accessible to multimodal options. One of the challenges facing support for livable communities is that people do not understand the full costs associated with owning a car as compared to using or supporting multimodal transportation options. Currently, we do not place value on multimodal accessibility. People may be inclined to make different housing choices if they were aware of the transportation choices associated with moving to an inaccessible versus an accessible location.

Interagency Barriers
- Goals often differ from the bottom up or top down, as well as across an organization. For example, the goals, strategies, and mission Statements of State, local, and Federal organizations within the same focus area, differ widely.
- Recognize that each community will choose to set its own priorities and should have the freedom to do so. For example, Cedar Rapids is dedicating 20% of its funding to trails and pedestrian improvements; however, not every community will choose to do the same.
- Strategies for addressing interagency barriers include:
  o Identifying differences can serve as an initial first step in working to bridge efforts toward a unified goal. Specifically, determining where tradeoffs exist between pursuing one goal over another can help ensure one agency's goals are not compromised.
  o Improving communication and coordination between agencies.
  o FHWA should identify a clear mission as it relates to livability so that practitioners have a clear framework with which to operate and plan.
  o Strengthening partnerships at the State level.
  o Work on usable definitions for "sustainability" and "livability."
  o Bring a variety of stakeholders to the table so that everyone understands the vision and goals of planning efforts.
  o Within a region, identify those common goals and agendas and use these to develop a workable plan.
  o Focus on bringing about change at the core.

Regional Livability Planning Strategies:

Four of the workshop participants presented on their organization's success in developing and implementing livability planning strategies at a regional level. *Jay Hoekstra from the Grand Valley Metro Council* discussed his organization's regional planning process, which uses scenario planning and 10-12 development options. They used a visioning process and asked people to place their population in areas around the region. There was remarkable consensus about where growth should go—into central urban area and the least should go into the agricultural and natural areas. *Ruth Ann Wedel from Greensburg Greentown* discussed how her town has used sustainability as a planning and development principle after 80% of the town was destroyed in a tornado. Their initiative is incentive and education based, and has been very successful. *Stephen Hardy from BNIM* discussed his firm's work with the Pine Ridge Indian reservation in southwest South Dakota. One challenge has been to identify who should be in charge of planning and how it is organized; they have also been focusing on using technology in new ways, experimenting with place-based text messaging and different crowd source regional tools to get feedback from people. *Kerstin Carr from Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC)* discussed their

lifelong communities' initiative, which links complete streets and healthy communities. Afterwards, there was a panel discussion, focusing on the key elements of their success:

- Having a central concept/vision of ecotourism with education and using it to get buy-in from the community and from other supportive agencies outside the community. Finding a way to rebuild successfully in a different way than New Orleans after Katrina.
- Listening was very important for MORPC to understand their concerns and working with them to understand the importance of lifelong communities. The process needs to be very inclusive of a variety of interests.
- Fitting the regional plan into some established process and using it as a basis for consensus and showing people alternative ways of development. The form-based code is working and they are being established in different places.
- Think about the plan and its implementation as you go.
- Make the case to rural communities that the same kinds of things that cities are doing pays off in rural areas.
- Linking the initiative back to heritage and conserving natural resources.
- If you can add in new jobs, which is a big win in a small community. In Pine Ridge, the need to maintain that infrastructure is an important consideration for local economy. We may never be able to call those rural areas urban, but we can rally them to be ready to face their challenges.
- A housing study in Grand Valley was effective in helping to convince developers and making them feel more assured and comfortable.
- Developers will start making the case for us very soon. At least locally, these benefits are starting to be recognized and celebrated.

Kate Ange from Renaissance Planning Group provided an overview of strategies and planning efforts that have proven most effective in supporting regional livability within a variety of geographic scales. Ms. Ange examined those focus areas that offer opportunities for implementing livability at a regional scale, and where best practice examples have proven effective: integrated planning processes, including interagency coordination; technical analysis and goal-setting, including translating values and quantifying benefits; plans, policies, and projects, including tapping into flexible funding sources; and program support and outreach such as making livability apolitical and better articulating multimodal benefits. Ms. Ange reviewed that many of these elements are present in existing planning requirements and processes, including long-range transportation plans, comprehensive plans, regional visioning efforts, regional environmental greenprints and watershed planning, regional transit plans, and economic development plans.

Participants broke into five groups with a mix of State, regional, local, and Federal representatives, for an hour-long small group discussion on the following questions:

- Do these key focus areas make sense?
  - Integrated planning process
  - Technical analysis, scenarios, and goal setting
  - Policies, plans, and projects
  - Implementation, program, and outreach
- For the FHWA primer on livability planning, what new information is needed?

Each group summarized their discussion, and the main points of each summary are listed below.

Group 1
- Identify the intended guidebook audience. This audience should include program implementers and those who can implement the guidebook ideas.
- The products will likely face barriers to widespread publicity, as it requires agency staff members to become innovators. These people may face consequences for supporting these efforts.

- Recognize that the audience members may be in a variety of project development and/or implementation stages; therefore, this product may be viewed as out of sync with current efforts. Include information on integrating the product content into efforts at a variety of development phases.
- Consider co-branding with the other sustainable partnership agencies as a way to inform and remind people that the product and the ideas it supports, are supported from a variety of topic areas.
- Include information on involving a broad audience, particularly as it relates to local planning agencies. In order for the ideas to succeed, local agencies and residents must be able to see themselves as part of the local livability efforts.
- Take stock of the existing guidance that FHWA has already created and ensure that the new guidance is connected to these resources. Make sure that the existing guidance can be updated with the new rhetoric and context.
- Ensure that the product distinguishes between inventorying existing practices and generating new practices. Consider that it may be helpful to use current information to generate a clearinghouse of livability planning practices.
- Make the product's content real for the people implementing it by identifying how people's jobs are connected to it.
- Consider that livability may not be the right branding. Evidence shows that it is a politicized term that people define in a variety of ways. The final product should include a subtitle explaining what is meant by livability and as a way to encourage a wider audience to use the product.

Group 2
- FHWA Product
  o Prior to developing the livability primer, the audience needs to be more clearly identified. Currently, the intended audience seems to cover a broad spectrum, which does not allow for targeted information sharing.
  o The primer should focus on making this a collaborative effort between agencies. For example, collaborating with FTA would allow information to reach a transit audience (e.g. transit operators), as these people would likely contact FTA for information before going to FHWA. If the product is only developed by FHWA, the product may only have the opportunity to reach a narrow audience.
  o Consider using a format different from a guidebook to communicate.
  o The final product should include assistance from FHWA, particularly to assist in interpreting the information. This assistance would also provide an opportunity to be engaged directly with the audience.
  o Include guidance on effectively communicating priorities to decisionmakers to generate support and interest in one's efforts.
  o Frame the discussion to portray livability as something that is implemented quickly and easily.
  o Focus on performance measures related to livability. Frame performance measures as a positive and helpful practice. Consider developing an overview of performance measures currently being used around the country so that people have a database to choose from.
  o Provide an overview of FHWA's authority and current limits.
- Focus Areas
  o Recognize that MPOs are increasingly becoming more involved in planning efforts.
  o Allow for increased funding flexibility in tailoring projects to a community need rather than requiring organizations to tailor a project to fit funding opportunities.

Group 3
- Consider using a word other than "livability," as this term may be viewed unfavorably by politicians. Many of the concepts discussed would be captured under the phrase "integrated planning," which is not politically charged.

- The intended audience should include decisionmakers at all levels (local, regional, State, and Federal).
- If a regional plan does become a mandated requirement, FHWA should consider coordinating current planning requirements so that one plan is required for and developed by each area, rather than each agency.
- Consider developing two versions—a short one for politicians and a longer version for practitioners that includes best practice examples of livability project implementation, associated benefits (economic, environmental, etc.), and an overview of tools that could be used to help implement livability.
- Prior to developing guidance materials, ensure that there is a commitment from the Federal level down to the field level for the product content and ideas. Aligning the focus and processes at all of these levels will allow for coordinated direction and support to the implementing agencies.
- Invest in marketing to better educate people on why integrated planning is beneficial.

Group 4
- The guidance materials should make a conscious effort to be nonpartisan.
- FHWA could provide an overview on the steps involved in building consensus and the potential issues that may arise.
- Identify and discuss the benefits that arise from implementing livability projects.
- Discuss the importance of placemaking in generating public support. When people can see what has been done in other places, it can inspire them to become more involved in the project development process. Metrics can also be helpful in assisting people with project evaluation.
- Recognize the challenges involved in project delivery and implementation.
- New guidance should provide helpful tips on discussing livability with State DOT staff members.
  - Provide tools that local governments can rely on when working to justify livability efforts for State approval.
  - FHWA needs to be more involved in the livability project approval discussions between local governments and State DOTs. Federal representatives may be at the table during discussions, but they are often not vocal and do not ask questions that would help lead to State approval for livability efforts. By acknowledging policy and funding support for livability projects at the Federal level, State DOTs would likely be more inclined to support local livability efforts.

Group 5
- Stronger efforts should be made toward reviewing existing project funding across agencies to increase awareness about integration opportunities.
- Current planning requirements and processes should be reevaluated to identify opportunities for integration. The regional level may serve as an ideal opportunity for integrating planning efforts. If so, the local MPO would be the most likely agency to head this effort; however, issues would arise in areas without an MPO.
- Incorporate requirements for data gathering or research on existing tools into current planning requirements as a way to encourage agencies to investigate existing resources.
- Encourage and/or require a multidisciplinary team to be involved throughout the planning process. This could involve representatives from environmental, housing, and/or transit organizations.
- As there is a lack of useful and up-to-date data in rural areas, the Federal government should provide funding for data collection that is targeted toward these areas.
- Encourage people to develop and invest in livability projects by giving preferential treatment or financial incentives toward projects that follow certain livability guidelines.

Identifying Opportunities:

Harrison Rue reviewed some successful communication and outreach efforts to identify some of the options available for messaging and marketing the concept of livability. Successful communication and outreach efforts have included fact sheets, summary brochures, summary posters, Web 2.0, and social media. Considering these efforts, participants were asked to reflect on the following questions in a large-group setting:

- What messages resonate with you and other practitioners to understand and help explain livability?
- What communications and marketing materials would help you to make the case for livability?
- What tools do you need?
- What technical assistance do you need?
- Are there specific products needed in urban, suburban, and rural contexts?

A summary of the discussion is included below.

Messaging
- Is livability the right word? Maybe there needs to be a redefinition of comprehensive planning to incorporate livability principles? How does this relate to integrated planning? People are having problems with different definitions. Across the country, there is not a single brand name that works. It may be helpful to get the touchstones we are thinking about: prosperous, equitable, and healthy, which makes it more tangible.
- How to convey a sense of urgency to planning—livability does not quite carry the resonance that it encompasses. Is there a way to include a challenge for the readers using these materials to make people think of it as exciting?

Strategies
- Helping people identify the right person to talk to
- Communicate activities in real-time—do not wait for a standard timeframe for providing updates to decisionmakers and the public alike.
- If there is a process for a region where everyone understands the goals and you have the data to back it up, if those goals are regionally identified, do all stakeholders need to be at the table every time?
- What is the role of everyone involved in this effort? Reflect the reasons behind this is a new experiment and tie everyone to livability efforts so that they know how they fit in
- Having an early action agenda—testing out things early on – which are very popular in planning and for people in State DOTs.

FHWA-specific Technical Tools and Training
- Case studies really help.
- PPT that could be downloaded and shared. U.S. Green Building Council has their standard PPT and people use it everywhere. If there were something comparable, it would be helpful.
- Library of video material
- Forum for people to share ideas
- Peer exchanges to help the reluctant learner— they might benefit more from face to face interactions with some of their peers to discuss some of these issues.
- Have a very specific focused groups—does this help you do your job? Testing the resources out with the people who need them.
- Ideo firm (San Francisco) developed a methods manual with 60 cards of different methods in a box – literally a toolbox. Then people have a full menu of possible strategies and methods to achieve certain ends and can pick the ones they think work best.

- Developing an interagency network of people who understand these efforts and using social media tools to foster communication about developments in the area

Closing and Next Steps: To finish the day, the facilitators and FHWA thanked participants and explained the next steps in the creation of the supporting guidance materials for organizations around the country that are interested in pursuing or advancing livability in transportation efforts in their community.

Evaluation Forms & Changes for Next Meeting:

In general, workshop participants provided reviewed the workshop favorably. The initial session on "Identifying Challenges to Livability" worked well when divided into two separate discussions—challenges and solutions. Participants responded well to keeping the discussions separate rather than using the combined format from the Atlanta workshop. Small group discussions worked well when groups consisted of around eight people, and facilitators should work to ensure that future workshops maintain small groups of this size. Suggested changes to the format included separating the challenges and solutions discussion more firmly providing more closure to the first discussion session on "Identifying Challenges to Livability."

For the Boston workshop, FHWA conducted additional outreach to ensure greater representation from State DOT and housing agency representatives, as well as rural communities. In response to participant requests for receiving a more detailed agenda up-front, an agenda was provided with more information on the discussion topic areas and questions. A more detailed discussion and greater emphasis on the State and State DOT role in regional livability work will be highlighted. The Boston and other subsequent workshops will continue to build off the challenges mentioned in the Atlanta and Kansas City workshops.

Workshop Participants	
Amy Seeboth	Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission
Dean Katerndahl	MARC
Dianne Dessauer	Indian Nations COG
Greg Youell	Metropolitan Area Planning Agency
James Joerke	Johnson County, Kansas
Janet Attarian	Chicago DOT
Jay Hoekstra	Grand Valley Metro Council
Jeff Hirt	MARC
Kerstin Carr	Mid-Ohio RPC
Lee Ann Kell	Missouri DOT
Maggie Martino	Tri-County Regional Planning Commission
Mercy Davison	Town of Normal, IL
Mike Beezhold	Camp Dresser McKee, Inc.
Mike Brienzo	City of Lincoln, NE
Randy Entz	City of Oklahoma City, Planning Department
Richard Jarrold	Kansas City Area Transportation Authority
Robert Byers	Hennepin County, MN
Ron Achelpohl	MARC
Ruth Ann Wedel	Greensburg Greentown
Scott Bernstein	Center for Neighborhood Technology
Stephanie Watts	Kansas DOT
Stephen Hardy	BNIM Architects
Steve Rhoades	Patti Banks Associates
Terry Kohlbuss	Tri-County Regional Planning Commission
Tim Griffin	St. Paul Riverfront Corporation
Tom Gerend	MARC
Tom Jacobs	MARC
Federal Participants	
Amanda Halstead	EPA
Cindy Terwilliger	FTA
Derrith Watchman-Moore	HUD –Region 7
James Thorne	FHWA – Resource Center Planning Team
John Donovan	FHWA – Illinois Division Office
Justin Luther	FHWA – Nebraska Division Office
Laurie Bedlington	HUD
Mark Bechtel	FTA

Matt Duran	EPA
Michael Latuszek	FHWA – Missouri Division Office
Paula Schwach	FTA
Tracy Troutner	FHWA – Iowa Division Office
Shana Baker	FHWA – Office of Human Environment
Consultant Team	
Elizabeth Wallis	ICF International
Harrison Rue	ICF International
Kate Ange	Renaissance Planning Group
Kathleen Rooney	ICF International

Livability Examples Provided by Kansas City Participants

In order to draw on the vast experience and knowledge of the selected participants, participants were asked to send the facilitators relevant information on best practices related to livability within their communities prior to the workshop. This information, along with the information that regional representatives presented during the workshop, are listed below. This information serves as an informal collection of examples that could be used in future guidebook/primer efforts when discussing best practices and developing case studies.

- 3-Lane Roadway Conversions PowerPoint Slideshow (file sent by Robert Byers), Hennepin County, MN
- Complete Streets, Hennepin County, MN
  - Task force link:
    http://www.hennepin.us/portal/site/HennepinUS/menuitem.b1ab75471750e40fa01dfb47ccf06498/?vgnextoid=da46ca8e841cc210VgnVCM1000000b124689RCRD
  - Complete Streets Policy link:
    http://www.hennepin.us/files/HennepinUS/Housing%20Community%20Works%20and%20Transit/Community%20Development/Active%20Living/Complete%20Streets%20Policy%20Bd%20approved%207142009.pdf
- Active Living, Hennepin County, MN
  - Website link:
    http://www.hennepin.us/portal/site/HennepinUS/menuitem.b1ab75471750e40fa01dfb47ccf06498/?vgnextoid=e32d838b5a8e3210VgnVCM20000048114689RCRD
- Bicycle Planning, Hennepin County, MN
  - Bike planning link:
    http://www.hennepin.us/portal/site/HennepinUS/menuitem.b1ab75471750e40fa01dfb47ccf06498/?vgnextoid=d7c1f17e531a4210VgnVCM10000049114689RCRD
  - Bicycle Transportation Plan link:
    http://www.hennepin.us/portal/site/HennepinUS/menuitem.b1ab75471750e40fa01dfb47ccf06498/?vgnextoid=9b5228656b1a4210VgnVCM10000049114689RCRD
- Transportation Planning, Hennepin County, MN
  - 2030 Hennepin County Transportation Systems Plan (HC-TSP) website:
    http://www.hennepin.us/portal/site/HennepinUS/menuitem.b1ab75471750e40fa01dfb47ccf06498/?vgnextoid=57fa353ea19c4210VgnVCM10000049114689RCRD
  - 2030 HC-TSP PowerPoint Slideshow (file sent by Robert Byers)
- Complete Streets Policy and Toolkit, Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission
  - www.morpc.org/completestreets
  - Outreach efforts to local communities to discuss lifelong communities and the role of Complete Streets in these efforts.
  - Transportation Research Board 2011 Presentation, #654
  - Short video in progress focusing on demonstrating a sense of urgency around livability for local decisionmakers in Central Ohio.
- Oglala Lakota Plan project of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota,
  http://www.oglalalakotaplan.org/whats-this-all-about/
- Uptown Normal, IL Renewal, http://www.normal.org/Uptown/History.asp
- Normal, IL Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (adopted 2010), http://www.normal.org/Files/BikePedPlan.pdf
- Metropolitan Area Planning Agency, PowerPoint presentation on "Livability Initiatives in Omaha" (presentation provided by Greg Youell)
- Capitol Region Council of Governments, Sustainable Capitol region webpage:
  http://www.crcog.org/community_dev/sustainable-dev.html
- Capitol Region Council of Governments, Publications of interest:, first three documents listed on page,
  http://www.crcog.org/community_dev/SustainableCommunitiesPublications.htm
- Mid-America Regional Council, Kansas City Long-Range Transportation Plan "Transportation Outlook 2040,"
  http://www.marc.org/2040/
- Mid-America Regional Council, Green Impact Zone of Missouri, http://www.greenimpactzone.org/
- Center for Neighborhood Technology, Housing and Transportation Affordability Index, http://htaindex.cnt.org/
- Center for Neighborhood Technology, Abogo (a tool that lets you discover how transportation impacts the affordability and sustainability of where you live), http://abogo.cnt.org/
- Chicago Department of Transportation, Cermak Road-Blue Island Avenue Sustainable Streetscape,
  http://www.cityofchicago.org/city/en/depts/cdot/provdrs/streetscapes/svcs/current_projects.html

Livability Examples Provided by Kansas City Participants

- Chicago Department of Transportation, Benito Juarez High School Water Features, general information available at http://www.cityofchicago.org/city/en/depts/cdot/provdrs/streetscapes.html
- Chicago Department of Transportation, "Streetscape Design Guidelines," http://www.cityofchicago.org/content/dam/city/depts/cdot/Streetscape_Design_Guidelines.pdf
- Grand Valley Metropolitan Council, Sub-Regional Planning Efforts, http://www.gvmc.org/landuse/subregionalplan.shtml
- Grand Valley Metropolitan Council, Form-Based Code, http://www.gvmc.org/landuse/formbasedcode.shtml
- Grand Valley Metropolitan Council, INDEX Planning Software Project, http://www.gvmc.org/landuse/planning_projects.shtml
- Greensburg Greentown, http://www.greensburggreentown.org/
- Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission, Complete Streets Policy, http://www.morpc.org/transportation/complete_streets/completeStreets.asp

Boston, Massachusetts Summary

Discussion Summary: The Boston workshop discussion emphasized the role that State departments of transportation (DOTs) play in advancing livability, especially in rural communities. Key discussion points included:

- Challenges such as transportation agencies that are focused exclusively on transportation, the backlog of capacity projects that are still programmed but no longer needed, and the perception of livability projects as "luxury."

- Solutions such as incorporating economic development into livability planning, improving community engagement strategies, and quantifying the benefits of livability projects

- Primer attributes such as making the primer web-based or including dynamic visualization materials that are engaging and assist in outreach. Participants were also interested in having the primer include co-benefits.

- Additional livability resources needed, including language to help people in each region explain livability, design guidelines to assist in project design, and coordinated funding programs.

Based on input from this workshop, continued work in subsequent workshops focused on developing these ideas more thoroughly. The meeting structure included a number of presentations on regional practices, as well as a significant amount of brainstorming, facilitated discussion, and idea sharing. A summary of activities and key outputs follows.

Workshop Specifics:

Location:

John A. Volpe National Transportation Systems Center
55 Broadway Street
Management Information Center, 12th Floor
Cambridge, MA 02142

Date / Time:

April 27, 2011 from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm

Boston workshop discussions.

Welcome and Introductions:

Lucy Garliauskas from FHWA's Office of Human Environment welcomed participants and provided a brief overview of FHWA's current livability efforts, including working to define the concept and its meaning in relation to making informed transportation decisions. For FHWA, focusing on defining livability within FHWA provides an opportunity to advance projects that are multimodal and leverage nontraditional sponsors and partnerships.

Representatives from the Sustainability Partnership agencies provided additional opening remarks. *Pam Stephenson, FHWA Massachusetts Division Administrator,* highlighted that while it is difficult to define livability, it is a concept that people can identify when they see it. She also discussed Massachusetts DOT's new highway design manual, which focuses on an integrated, multimodal approach, incorporating context sensitive design, and providing a clear project development process. *Mary Beth Mello, FTA Region 1 Administrator,* provided an overview of New England's partnership efforts, which include technical assistance, a conscious effort to synergize activities, and filtering livability and sustainability down to the State and local levels so that these concepts become a part of everyday operations. *Ernie Zupancic, the Faith-Based Liaison for HUD's Manchester, New Hampshire Field Office,* stressed that the

agency has a renewed focus on urban development, which is emphasized through their sustainability community initiative grants. These grants are supporting efforts toward creating livable communities around the country. *Carl Dierker, Regional Counsel for EPA Region 1,* highlighted the current efforts of the New England Sustainability Partnership, which include developing a manual for implementing livability at the community level and developing livability performance measures through a current working group effort. Workshop facilitators, managers from ICF International and Renaissance Planning Group, and all participants introduced themselves.

Setting the Stage for Livability:
Harrison Rue from ICF International reviewed the purpose and outcomes of both the overall project and the day's workshop in particular. As the majority of participants indicated that they had read the background paper developed for this project, *The Role of FHWA Programs in Livability: State of the Practice Summary,* Mr. Rue provided a brief overview of the paper's content. This overview included a review of the Sustainable Communities Partnership and the associated principles, components included in the definition of "livability in transportation," benefits of incorporating livability, overall research findings, and a review of state of the practice examples from areas that have successfully incorporated livability into a variety of efforts.

Identifying Challenges to Livability:
During this large group discussion session, participants were asked to focus on the following three questions:

1. What are the big challenges to implementing transportation solutions that advance livable communities?
2. What is one solution that has worked for your agency?
3. How do the challenges and solutions differ in:
    a. Urban, suburban, and rural contexts?
    b. Local, regional, and State agencies?

Participants identified five main categories of challenges, as well as potential solutions that could be used to overcome some of these challenges. During the discussion, participant recommendations were listed on flip charts and posted around the room for participants to reference during discussion. Using a dot voting exercise, the five below reflect the priorities from the participants.

Interagency Collaboration
- There is often a focus within agencies with transportation as their core business. There is a culture of agency blinders where employees do not bring their whole community awareness into their job.
- Stove piping still exists within funding sources and programs. For example, within a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis, land use alternatives are not considered as an option to solve transportation issues. NEPA solutions are restricted to either build or no build.
- Organizations often work in silos, and it can be difficult to get decisionmakers to support integrated solutions. In fact, organizations could benefit by recognizing that transportation can be used to further other community benefits such as public health. Often times, decisionmakers in highway agencies and MPOs do not think livability is worth funding. Rather, they use a traditional way of looking at roads for capacity and project support.
- We often neglect to ask ourselves the "why." This is often due to lack of consensus and guiding vision. The result is a fragmented decisionmaking process where projects are approached on an individual, rather than collective, basis. This can turn into a political process as a result. Projects end up being divorced from the ultimate intended outcome.
- Reaching out to economic organizations and/or utility companies can be an important step in gaining support and identifying a unified, guiding approach for project implementation.

Municipalities often face issues in getting to the point where project implementation can begin and cities and States should consider coordination efforts up-front in the decisionmaking process.

- It is important to gain support from laborers and contract unions, as they are often integrally involved in project implementation.
- Agencies are not making connections at a regional level as to those goals that could be supported by a variety of agencies.
- MPO fragmentation presents a number of barriers. Within some States, there is a very high number of MPOs; however, this does not always mean that local projects are elevated to the TIP.
- Make a conscious effort to collaborate with non-traditional partners such as economic development corporations, Federal Emergency Management Association (FEMA), EPA, and HUD. By taking a broader approach to collaborative solution development, we may be able to identify effective, integrated decisions.
- Engage local funding partners such as local banks.
- Federal agencies should make a concerted effort to communicate with non-traditional partners and break down silos. This can help to reduce many of the issues faced by inconsistent messaging at the Federal level. Flexibility and ease of implementation should be the basis for these collaborative efforts. This consistent messaging and support should be communicated clearly and simply to States, MPOs, and localities.
- Broadening one's constituency base can be effective in gaining new support.

Funding
- There is a lack of funding for livability-specific projects. This is true for transportation in general, as many States are unsure as to how transportation projects will be funded in the future. The uncertainty of SAFETEA-LU and gas tax revenues contributes significantly to these issues.
- With the challenge grant, communities were able to choose their own approach to implementing solutions for the first time. Oftentimes, communities will know what solution would work best and how to implement it, but this does not always fit within the box prescribed by the government funding regulations. There is often a disconnect between the funding that is offered and what communities need. There is a need to integrate more flexibility into funding opportunities, as communities often know what they want and the Federal and State governments need to provide support for these solutions more effectively.
- Transportation funding is often already programmed for highway projects that are not helpful and that may even be harmful to livable transportation. For example, there are lists of projects that have already been assigned millions of dollars for road widening that may not even be needed. These legacy projects were often developed during a time when suburban expansion was desired; however, we are now seeing the long-term effectives of these projects and they are not aligned with current livability goals. It is often difficult to change the direction of these projects and re-assign this funding somewhere else.
- In a time when budgets are tight and money is not available to address basic system needs, it becomes difficult to justify spending additional money on medians and other "add-ons." Many livability components are perceived as nonessential. For example, many areas are facing older bridges. Fixing these bridges is not a choice, but rather a necessity. Once these projects are funded, there is often little to no funding remaining for other projects, let alone livability projects.
- Livability projects lack a funding stream.
- It is important to develop a broad awareness for other types of revenue generation schemes such as value capture. Enticing private development to these areas could be an effective funding solution.
- Livability projects are often turned into projects that are larger than necessary due to the extensive review and requirements surrounding the use of Federal transportation funding. Many smaller livability projects (under $500,000) could be made but are not due to extensive review requirements.

- Livability is often discussed as a luxury.
- Funding becomes increasingly competitive when livability projects are compared directly against highway interchange projects. Decisionmakers view it as politically risky to support livability project funding. Providing mechanisms to make it easier on decisionmakers to select those livability projects would help.
- Incorporate life cycle considerations into the decisionmaking process. This could include a cost-benefit analysis or a before/after analysis.
  - Accounting for the benefits of low-cost projects, particularly those that incorporate livability elements, can be an effective tool in gaining support from decisionmakers.

Marketing Livability and Overcoming Negative Public Perceptions
- Connect livability to community visions and economic development goals and/or as part of a local economic strategy.
- Livability projects are often smaller in scale, and smaller projects do not have the political appeal of the larger projects.
- States can do a better job of sending a positive public message about supporting livability efforts. The media is an effective tool for informing people about State priorities on a consistent basis.
- Road diets are often perceived as unsafe. It is important to educate people on the effectiveness and positive benefits of these, and other livability strategies.
- As with the public, policymakers are often hesitant to support big changes in process that livability brings.
- Many dense areas do not allow for mixed use through their zoning regulations. This is often the result of a local aversion to increasing density.
- There is a need for education and advocacy in a broader sense. While many advances have been made, it is still a challenge to gain support for livability.
- Many people view transit in a negative light, as a transportation mode for those who are desperate for a transportation option. Sometimes this means people will wait until an alternate transportation mode becomes available, and they will ultimately not reach the services they need. Changing this stigma toward using transit in non-metropolitan areas requires a targeted communication campaign about these services.
- A balanced approach toward solutions is needed. Often, a long-term view is sacrificed because of the need to address the immediacy of a problem. Taking a two-pronged approach allows for balanced solutions that move away from the either/or approach that is often used currently.
- Both FTA and FHWA face a challenge in communicating to the public the importance of operating in a sustainable fashion. Making every day operating decisions, both for how capital is invested and how decisions are approached to meet customer needs, should focus on sustainability.
- Urban education in public schools is a significant driver for where people decide to live. People often decide to move out of denser, metropolitan areas because of poor schooling options. Attending to this problem can help encourage people to move back into urban areas.
- Visioning is critical in gaining public support. It is important to create visions that are not subjective or vague, as words and visions have different meanings to each individual. Turning these words into specific ideas that people can orient around when making short-term decisions can be an effective tool when gathering project support.
- Guidance for visioning efforts is needed.
- Many municipalities do not support livability efforts and there is a need to overcome this barrier.
- Messaging and marketing are effective tools in working to revise a legacy project.
- Develop a message people can connect with.

Developing Design Standards and Performance Measures for Implementing Livability
- The capacity standards for roads are not realistic.

- The concepts of livability and complete streets are context sensitive, difficult to define, and do not follow a standard formula for implementation. For people interested in implementing these efforts, there is a more fluid approach in place. Decisionmakers can be supportive of the concept, but uncomfortable with this process, as it is very different from the traditional, step-by-step process. Educating decisionmakers on this process to help them understand it better can be helpful in gathering support.
- It is important to translate the large concept of livability into specific actions to help clarify what it entails so that an agency can tie measurable results to project decisions when asked to justify their actions.
- Many performance measures are auto-centric and congestion-oriented. Performance measures need to be much broader. Federal partners could help with this effort by developing a standard, unified approach.
    - Better assess the benefits and impacts of livability on generating revenue and job options in order to demonstrate how smart growth is good for business.
    - Tie livability performance measures to location efficiency (i.e. proximity to affordable housing, access to food from local farms).
- Federal agencies have received pushback for trying to provide prescriptive solutions for community decisions related to livability. As a result, Federal agencies are now approaching livability support as a bottom-up approach where providing local level choice and responding to the local vision is the main priority. Federal agencies are focusing on providing resources to help communities plan the places they want. This could prove to be an effective tool at the local level as well.
- For those DOTs where asset management and a state of good repair is the main focus, it is difficult to demonstrate the value of livability, particularly when asked to demonstrate the specific benefits per dollar spent.
- Incorporate equity considerations into the decisionmaking process.
- Develop a new analytical framework for assessing how communities can successfully implement livability.
- Analyze the impacts of single model systems to demonstrate the benefits that are generated by investing in multimodal systems.
- Require triple bottom line analysis for planning and projects.

Implementing Livability in Rural Areas
- Rural transit in general is a challenge. It is difficult to identify how to make sparsely populated areas more livable for the people, as the solution cannot employ a traditional transit model. Particularly for those residents who are aging and losing their ability to drive, the need to provide access to services to meet their basis needs is a growing challenge.
- Coordinating regional efforts in rural areas can be difficult. Some rural areas serve as a job hub where people drive into town for work, but live somewhere else. Residents of these towns often feel as if they are supporting the business community and therefore it is difficult to get their buy-in for livability solutions that operate at a regional level, across jurisdictions.
- Many rural areas gave up the inter-town bus and rail service they had 100 years ago for highways and an automobile-driven transportation system. Thus, they no longer have the infrastructure to support non-automotive travel. Solutions should focus on looking at how these rural multimodal systems operated in the past and the steps that can be taken to regenerate this system.
- In rural communities, the State highway has jurisdiction over the local streets and thus has primacy over those decisions.

Other Challenges: Economic development impacts, project timing, over-reliance on models, climate change, zoning, training, and overcome legacy projects

- There seems to be an unwritten understanding that all roadway projects have an effect on economic development. Underlying many transportation decisions is this idea that it is important for our economic development to have a healthy road system; however, we do not have this type of understanding for other infrastructures.
- The timing of transportation projects is not in sync with economic cycles and the local decisionmaking schedule. Thus, it can take up to ten years for a major project to be approved for implementation. There is a need to better align these processes.
- Decisionmakers can be over-reliant on models. They rely on data that are often nuanced; however, we rely on these model outputs when making decisions.
  - These models are often not sensitive to compact development.
- Climate change does not often enter into the decisionmaking discussion; however, the resulting impacts could wreak havoc with the decisions that we are making and the construction that we are undertaking.
- Many cities face zoning issues as a barrier to implementing livability.
- Incorporate livability criteria into job descriptions so that there will be a greater focus on training for expertise with livability strategy implementation.
- One group developed a "6-step process for overcoming legacy projects" which included:
  - Assess projects against new livability criteria
  - Utilize these criteria to assess project alternatives
  - Develop a message. Document the drawbacks and benefits.
  - Secure a respected champion.
  - Focus on education and outreach to help broaden the constituency.
  - Advocate for formal consideration in official decisionmaking criteria.

A summary of the solutions that participants mentioned are listed below. As many of these solutions are broadly applicable to a variety of challenges, they are not grouped into discrete categories.
- New road construction may not be the best solution to a challenge.
- All State DOTs should strive to adopt walkable street design guidelines, particularly for urban thoroughfares. This is especially necessary for main streets in small rural towns.
- Higher-level efforts should support ground-level efforts. Use the grassroots level community goals as a guide to developing new initiatives rather than the budget.
- Recognize that livable projects are not always small efforts and can include large projects, too. Livability projects can be regional, inter-regional, etc. By informing people about the regional processes in place, organizations can be aware of other processes and their associated limitations to come together and make informed decisions.
  - An informed decision-making process is particularly helpful because we have an aging system and preservation is still an important concern. By taking advantage of other processes, we can be creative and flexible in developing solutions.
- Encourage planners to broaden the discussion and not limit themselves to "business as usual."
- Develop a housing plan and an economic development plan to guide project decision-making across the State. Mirror the process that exists for a unified land use plan and transportation plan that informs decisions in the State. These plans should be developed at the Statewide level and be completely integrated with the land use and transportation plans.
- Incorporate public health into performance measures.
- When making decisions, keep in mind that they should be community-driven. Solutions should be responsive to the preferences indicated by the community. Community desires can be gathered by using a step-by-step process to collect input on how to implement livability at the local level.
- When engaging a community, take a partnership approach to all solutions and identify the role of FHWA, HUD, and EPA. Solutions cannot be looked at as an either/or approach, but rather should be examined from the perspective of what is best for the partnership.

Following this discussion, participants received four dot stickers, which they used to vote for the challenges they thought were the most significant. No limit was placed on this voting process, and participants were allowed to use one or all four dots on any one particular challenge, depending on the significance they placed on it. As mentioned above, the categorization of the five identified challenges reflect the voting priorities from this exercise.

Overcoming Challenges:
Four of the workshop participants presented on successful livability efforts in the region, allowing all workshop participants to see and hear about successful livability examples in their region. *Ned Codd from Massachusetts DOT(MassDOT)* provided a brief overview of the recent transportation reform and reorganization that created MassDOT and discussed the department's recent livability and sustainability initiative, GreenDOT, which operates under a triple bottom line framework. *Cathy Kuzsman from New York State DOT* reviewed the variety of livability initiatives they have undertaken and supported, including a Safe Seniors Pilot Program, GreenLITES in planning, the Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act, and a pedestrian and bicycle policy. Public meeting attendees have been supportive of these efforts. *David Kooris from the Regional Plan Association* provided an overview of his organization's efforts as they relate to using roads as an effective tool for improving the range of available services, and thereby shaping livable communities. Mr. Kooris noted that the space in between buildings is one of the greatest public assets, and how this space is used can determine whether it serves as a community benefit or detriment. *Rollin Stanley from the Maryland National Capital Parks and Planning Commission* discussed the financial benefits that come from adopting a smart growth approach. These benefits can be generated by creating a "growth print" to consider environmentally sensitive areas and agricultural areas when pursuing new development, or from thinking differently about how we build schools and taking a multi-story rather than a single-story approach. Afterwards, there was a panel discussion, focusing on the key elements of their success:

- Developing projects that did not create any new funding sources, but rather were integrated into the way that organizations do business.
- Using effective opportunities to grab the bully pulpit and get senior leadership team members to promote efforts.
- In Massachusetts, the State law for global solutions act, which requires GHG emissions analysis, generated an opportunity to take a holistic look at sustainability and livability by connecting these efforts with GHG reductions. MassDOT also enjoyed strong leadership support from the secretary.
- Meaningful public participation is very effective—particularly when it is framed as a conversation about the future of the region rather than discussion on an individual project.
- Education and training is very important in ensuring the public understands what is being proposed. When people fully understand the measures that would be implemented, they are more likely to support them. In New York, for example, when the recent Smart Growth Infrastructure Policy Act was first introduced, there was significant pushback, as many people were unsure what the policy entailed.
- Focus on one benefit of livability and build on that to generate support for future projects. Right now, many people are concerned with the economy. By showing information about how livability can be used to improve the economy, support for livability strategies can be generated.
- To gather funding for livability strategy implementation, the State of Maryland floated bonds to support a local TIP. MODOT assisted with funding efforts by helping localities float bonds to avoid limits on debt capacity.
- Building schools more efficiently can offer a number of benefits. Rutgers University has developed numbers for each State on how condominiums and apartments within walking distance of schools perform better in terms of more schoolchildren within walking distance, as opposed to comparable rural areas.
- Demonstrate the tax benefits of density.

Following this roundtable discussion, participants divided themselves into five groups with a mix of State, regional, local, and Federal representatives. Each group was asked to focus on one of the top six challenges, as voted on by the participants during the dot-voting process:

1. Incorporate economic development
2. Need models, tools, and measures to demonstrate multimodal impacts/benefits
3. See livability/maintenance/fix-it-first as 'mission critical,' not just 'nice'
4. Reframe the Federal role as 'in support of' community planning and goals
5. Communicate and quantify the benefits of livability projects
6. Reassess large legacy/pipeline projects to incorporate livability elements

During this hour-long discussion, participants were asked to focus on one of the challenge areas and answer the questions below. In doing so, participants were asked to consider examples where they had overcome a project challenge in a relevant topic area and use that experience to assist in answering the questions.

- What effective strategies have helped you to overcome challenges?
  - What was important for you to succeed?
  - How have you measured the success of your efforts?
- What helped you to align or integrated different funding and agency priorities?
- What kinds of public and interagency process worked?
- What, if anything, did the Partnership do to facilitate success?

Each group provided a quick summary of their discussion.

Incorporate economic development into livability planning projects
- Better assess the benefits, impacts of different scenarios, and options so that we can understand why livability is important for economic development.
- The business community has not traditionally been involved in the planning dialogue, and they need to be brought into the discussion.
- There is a need to demonstrate benefits and build confidence in livability strategies.
- Towns and municipalities often view their initiatives as in direct competition with one another. Overcoming this issue can help build regional collaboration rather than competition.
- Municipalities, local governments, and counties should invest their money in local banks rather than national banks as a way to invest in their local communities.
- Develop performance measures that can demonstrate economic developments benefits generated by livability.
- Recognize that one size does not fit all, and that that local economic development needs vary widely.
- Better quantify the jobs that are created by implementing livability strategies. Look at the type and quality of jobs from the perspective of what is important to the local community. Sell this as part of the project.
- Move away from State agency silos and into more collaborative efforts where agencies are working together toward a common purpose. Collaboration is seen as improving governmental efficiency, and can generate increased public support.
- Consider how the Federal partnership can help with economic development. Consider how long-term (e.g. 5 year) housing development plans may help guide efforts in other areas.
- Equity should be considered when making investment decisions, particularly between urban, suburban, and rural areas.

Need models, tools, and measures to demonstrate multimodal impacts/benefits
- There is currently an over-reliance on models/tools/approaches that cannot effectively demonstrate the impacts and/or benefits of multimodal mobility.

- We lack effective models/tools/measures to demonstrate the impacts and benefits of livability.
- State DOTs are very focused on investing money effectively within a particular focus area. Livability is not one of these recognized focus areas. Building a livability management system could help overcome some of these investment barriers.
- Look at lifecycle cost analyses when making investments. Comparing life cycle analyses between livability investments and traditional investments can help to generate project support.
- The traditional process for developing projects is biased toward large highway investments. There is a need for a better way of accounting for the benefits of low-cost projects so that they gain increased support.
- When demonstrating livability benefits, look at the per person benefit that will be derived per dollar investment made. The benefits of implementing livability strategies are significant as compared to major road widening projects.
- There is a need to move from auto-centric to more multimodal performance measures. These measures should account for local efficiency as well.
- If a problem is not defined as a livability problem in the beginning, a livability solution will not result. By identifying automobile-focused problems, an automobile-focused solution is likely to result.
- Many of people's daily trips go unaccounted for because they are part of their daily routine; however, many of these are undertaken using a livable environment. More effectively capturing and documenting the modes that people use when making these trips will provide a better understanding of how and when people use various system infrastructures.

See livability/maintenance/fix-it-first as 'mission critical,' not just 'nice'
- When the focus is on maintenance only, other interests are shut out from the process. On the other end of the spectrum, given the backlog in system preservation needs, maintenance is a necessity and cannot be cut out of the process altogether. We need to identify how we can make our agendas align.
- Integrating the maintenance imperative can be a helpful strategy for elevating the importance of livability. Integrating system preservation concerns with the livability agenda to make those projects more livable. In order to do this, it is important to have meaningful public involvement from a variety of stakeholders, particularly in the early stages of project phasing.
- Having good metrics to demonstrate the importance of livability is valuable. This is often a challenge, as livability is a subjective topic to evaluate.
- Education plays an important role in communication efforts with the public and among stakeholders. Additionally, it is key in efforts to integrate the system preservation and livability agendas.
- In communicating this idea, it is important to recognize the tradeoffs but also focus on how to move forward toward the goals in each area.

Reframe the Federal role as 'in support of' community planning and goals
- Move beyond bureaucracy and toward support for interagency partnership efforts. This includes breaking down silos among Federal agencies, particularly around the concept of livability.
- Regional level implementation and coordination can provide a good example for how project implementation can be approached effectively.
- Focus on coordination efforts amongst and within Federal agencies.
- Using a clear and simple message is effective for communicating with communities.
- Translate planning and goal ideas into projects with some flexibility.
- Do not rely on bureaucracy to move the project process along.
- Identify the problem that you are trying to solve and use a partnership to identify a solution.

Communicate and quantify the benefits of livability projects

- Identify up front who is the main audience for these messages. These messages are often needed for communication from the bottom up and from the top down.
  - The public is also a very important audience for gaining support for livability projects. Without support from a variety of stakeholders, particularly the public, efforts lack a backbone. Visualization can be very effective in communicating with the public and demonstrating what is meant by livable communities.
  - For decisionmakers, using technical documents and language can be more effective. These documents should articulate the benefits—even the nontraditional ones that are not normally measured. Although some of the nontraditional measures are hard to measure in an objective way, they can be used to communicate more readily.
- Emphasize the triple bottom line—economy, environment, equity—because this concept captures all of the measures that fall into livability and could be an effective way to present the benefits. Public health and safety can also be incorporated into this.
- If livability is applied to all public investments, it could help in building partnerships at other levels that mirror current Federal level efforts.
- Rising gas prices offer an opportunity to cause our communities and regions to look at things differently. Particularly, more attention will be focused on looking at the impact of single mode systems. This attention can be used to help increase attention on the need for more investments in livability.
- Better communication is needed between the Federal level to the State DOTs, particularly for design guides. A standard design guide should be used in all 50 States.
- Defining job descriptions/training course needs could be used to fill the practitioner gap so that livability efforts begin to be implemented on both the State and regional levels.

Reassess large legacy/pipeline projects to incorporate livability elements
- Assess projects against new criteria based on livability standards. These criteria should be clear in order to provide a way to evaluate projects and compare them effectively.
- Generate an opportunity to take projects in the existing pipeline and re-review them.
- Develop and utilize livability criteria to assess project alternatives. The option to simply say "no" should not be allowed. Rather, a solution should be required. To do this, developing messages and documenting the drawbacks and benefits of various approaches would be effective. These criteria and the importance of this new approach should be communicated to the public and leaders.
- Secure a respected champion. Ultimately, getting political buy-in will allow for a change of course.
- Focus on education and outreach as a way to broaden the constituency base. While older projects tended to focus on one single purpose, the new approach moves away from that and is focused on looking at multi-purpose projects. By broadening the constituency, a wider variety of nontraditional groups can be engaged and serve as a source for project support.
- Have the new process formally adopted. Following the new process, ensure that realigned projects meet the new criteria for livability.

Regional Livability Planning Strategies:

Four of the workshop participants presented on their organization's success in developing and implementing livability planning strategies at a regional level. *Chris O'Neill from the Capital District Transportation Commission (CDTC)* discussed the MPO's Regional Transportation Plan, New Visions, which focuses on developing a quality region by incorporating livability principles. An important component of this effort involved meaningful dialogue with the public, which allowed decisionmakers to make informed, supported decisions, as well as qualitative performance measures that are used to evaluate the community quality of life and support the decisionmaking process. *Amy Rainone from Rhode Island Housing* discussed their "KeepSpace" initiative, which is focused on overcoming the silo effect and encouraging conversations between representatives from the various issue areas. Ms. Rainone also discussed the organization's recent EPA technical assistance award, which is being used to identify financial resources that can be used to support projects that embrace livability criteria. *Dorathy Martel from the Eastern Maine Development Corporation* discussed two ongoing efforts: the Penobscot Valley Community Greenprint effort and the Mobilize Maine effort. The Greenprint project focuses on developing a regional vision for pursuing environmental and economic opportunities that will allow for a balance between rural areas and a vibrant economy, while Mobilize Maine is focused on supporting communities coming together to look at economic development and quality of life considerations when making decisions. *Gary Toth from the Project for Public Spaces* discussed the value of corridor studies in addressing some of the issues that tend to arise during the traditional project decisionmaking process. In particular, the process generates opportunities to leverage new strategies and funding sources, to create a bridge between planning and design, and to incorporate new stakeholders into the process so that the outcome is a well-informed solution. Afterwards, there was a panel discussion, focusing on the key elements of their success:

- Meaningful public dialogue is very effective. Linkage programs can be an effective way to achieve structured, meaningful, public participation.
  - Building trust with the customer is a valuable component of public engagement. In many communities, this lack of trust comes from decades of a poor relationship with the DOT.
- There must be commitment and involvement from all State agencies around the table. Having everyone committed to the same vision and participating in the public engagement process is important.
- Identify what works and build on it. By continuing to focus on what is wrong, it is not possible to identify solutions and begin to solve problems.
- For many of the corridor studies discussed, they enjoyed success in part because a number of highly visible improvements were made in the very beginning so that people could view progress and they felt like the project was moving forward.
- In Rhode Island, the Economic Development Corporation has been helpful in responding to the need for workforce housing. Conversations are now underway with community residents to discuss how to better provide affordable housing options and create the kinds of communities that incorporate the community visions and goals.

Kate Ange from Renaissance Planning Group discussed the initial concepts for the FHWA primer on implementing livability, in which FHWA was moving away from the idea of developing a regional livability model plan and more toward a primer or guidebook discussing how to implement these strategies and make it successful, and how best to put existing plans and processes together to start integrating livability efforts. The draft sections of the primer include integrated planning processes; technical analysis and goal setting; plans, policies, and projects; and programs, support and outreach.

The discussion on the primer was split into two separate 30-minute discussions – the first focused on the elements of the primer and the second on the marketing and general tools needed for the primer. Participants broke into six different groups with a mix of State, regional, local, and Federal representatives. The first discussion focused on the following questions:

- FHWA 'primer' on livability planning and implementation…what new information is needed?

- o Is there a consensus on key regional planning process steps?
  - ▪ Integrated planning process
  - ▪ Technical analysis, scenarios and goal setting
  - ▪ Policies, plans, and projects
  - ▪ Implementation, programs, and outreach
- o What new guidance is needed to help practitioners with implementation?

Harrison Rue reviewed some successful communication and outreach efforts to identify some of the options available for messaging and marketing the concept of livability. Successful communication and outreach efforts have included fact sheets, summary brochures, summary posters, Web 2.0, and social media. Considering these efforts, participants were asked to reflect on the following questions in a large-group setting:

- ▪ What format/type of products should any new guidance take?
- ▪ What messages resonate with different groups to understand and help explain livability?
- ▪ What communications and marketing materials would help you to make the case for livability?
- ▪ What tools and technical assistance do you need?

Each group summarized their two separate discussions, and the main points of each summary are listed below.

Group 1
- • Without funding for projects, the importance of identifying effective processes and planning strategies is diminished. Therefore, before the primer topics can be addressed effectively, one must first identify who has money and what they are spending it on.
  - o One solution to finding funding sources may be to attempt to retrofit livability planning ideals to fit existing projects. For example, ARRA projects represent a missed opportunity to build livability into those projects.
  - o CDCs could serve as a funding source. They are active in many areas and tend to support livability ideas. For example, a CDC put livability funds into the Fairmount project in Boston through a TOD effort.
- • It is important to look at the process from the bottom up instead of the top down.
- • Communication plays a vital role. In going out to the community and speaking with them, the idea should be to buy-in to the residents' vision rather than trying to get them to buy in to the agency's plan.
- • Work toward positive outcomes.
- • Provide tools to help visualize density.
- • Identify the role of livability as it relates to demographic shifts.
- • Provide assistance for developing indicators.

Group 2
- • The communication format should use web-based and social media, as they are effective.
- • Identify a champion who has personal knowledge or is from the local area.
- • Be present at stakeholder meetings in order to engage with the public directly.
- • Engage people personally.
- • The message should be tailored to a specific audience. There should be specific items that reflect a variety of interests and knowledge bases. Within messaging efforts, make sure semantics are consistent across all Federal agencies, especially among all partnership agencies.
- • Marketing efforts should use a lot of pictures and dynamic visualization to help convey messages. When people are able to see an idea, they are better able to understand it. Additionally, it is helpful when these materials use tangible, real-life examples to convey an idea.
  - o One-pagers on a particular item are very effective. By being able to walk into any meeting and have one page of information summarizing key livability connections and

benefits, it is helpful in gathering support. For municipalities in particular, they are focused on economic changes, so being able to show economic benefits is key.

- For tools and technical assistance, trainings and workshops are helpful, particularly when they are recorded and available at people's convenience. Peer-to-peer workshops in particular are helpful, as this allows people to meet physically with another organization and hear firsthand what was successful.
- It is helpful to provide a list of best practices and public involvement strategies that worked well in a variety of contexts. In addition to providing a list of things that worked well, it is also helpful to provide a list of things that one should definitely avoid. Having information on challenges people have faced and lessons learned is very valuable for other organizations engaging in similar activities.
- For the step involving "integrating planning processes," the following items are important:
  - Define when and the degree to which stakeholders should be involved in supporting livability efforts. Consider involving representatives from organizations involved in economic development, utilities, health, and civic services to address environmental justice concerns.
  - More guidance is needed on technical analysis for economics and travel markets. Many organizations face challenges in finding data to analyze alternatives. When this data is available, travel demand models are often outdated, making the outcomes less useful.
  - Guidance on indicators for data and tools would help to quantify benefits at system-wide levels. In particular, ranges rather than absolutes would be helpful when analyzing effects at a system level and when comparing projects against one another. It is difficult to come to one single number; having a confidence level would be much more useful.
- For the step involving "policies, plans, and projects," it would be helpful to have language in plans or ordinances that targets municipalities.
  - Synchronizing planning efforts with economic development aspects would be effective.
  - Developing a matrix would be useful for identifying those policies and plans that would be effective for States looking to incorporate livability.
- For the step involving "implementation, programs, and outreach," the following items would be helpful:
  - Develop a communication summary.
  - Coordinate communication efforts across and within agencies. Ensure that the Federal division office, the State, and local entities are all speaking the same language.
  - Identify specific tactics that local entities could use to increase funding access. For example, some projects may be ideal for Public Private Partnership opportunities.
  - Consider livability as an approach to what we already do and "business as usual" rather than as an entirely new concept. Many livability elements have been around for a while.
  - Separate spin from reality.
  - Keep working to find ways to bridge the gap between planning and project development.

Group 3
- To assist with the regional planning process, information on the following elements should be incorporated:
  - Consider adding a new step at the end for evaluation. Evaluating performance measures and measuring the success of the planning process overall provides closure on the planning process loop. It is helpful to go back and look at the process to evaluate its success and identify areas where revisions may need to be made.
  - Focus on public input and provide guidance on new tools and techniques available for enhancing this process. The primer should include guidance on how to effectively seek out those portions of the public that are not traditionally reached.
  - In an effort to move toward an integrated planning process, provide a framework for auditing existing planning documents. This may include doing a gap analysis and finding

integration opportunities among existing planning requirements. It could also involve developing Federal regulations that allow singular, integrated documents that fulfill considerations related to housing, transportation, and economics.
- o Include real case studies that show real world lessons learned—both positive and negative. Include contact information along with these examples so that people can reach out to someone with questions.
- o Include an index of resources on funding and/or training opportunities, as well as other resources planners can tap into when pursuing livability projects.
- The product that is ultimately developed should include the following:
  - o Use new communication technologies in addition to traditional printed materials when communicating with constituents. Webinars are an effective communication tool.
  - o Provide useful terminology to discuss livability. When discussing livability, focus on the promotion of choice (e.g. choosing where to live, how to get to work). Move away from the planning jargon and into something that people can actually understand. Translate the jargon into laymen's terms.
  - o Discuss the co-benefits of livability such as health benefits and the cost-effectiveness. Cost in particular is an element on which municipal governments will focus.
  - o Frame livability as a pause in existing planning processes and a continuation of the way planning has always been done rather than as a brand new approach. Promote the idea that livability is more efficient, cost effective, and can work within existing processes.

Group 4
- Recognize that the target audience changes depending on the circumstance and who one is ultimately trying to reach (e.g. public versus decisionmakers). The one audience that will likely be prevalent for the primer will be the regional DOT.
  - o The primer's messaging should recognize this. For the public in particular, livability may be couched in nostalgia for an older audience (e.g. the way things were) as compared to a younger audience, where the emphasis may be on providing connections to desired destinations.
- The primer should come out under the banner of all three agencies involved in the partnership, as this emphasizes the true project goal of breaking down silos. Just having FHWA author the primer does not send the right message.
  - o Regardless of the primer authors, the principles and criteria included in the document should be consistent with what is promoted across all three agency programs.
- The primer should incorporate visual messaging so that people can see examples of what is discussed in the document.
- Include messaging on fiscal and economic concerns, as this is an important concern for a variety of audiences.
- The primer should be widely promoted. Consider using a media campaign or an ad campaign. One idea for ad campaign is to mimic the one about "this is your brain on drugs" and do "this is you on sprawl" instead.
- Provide information on accessible tools that people can use to start conversations about livability. Many people are concerned with messaging and how to talk about this concept with other audiences. Tools that generate statistics and numbers would be helpful. Help people learn how to recreate these tools within their own jurisdiction.
- Identify strategies for engaging people at the very local levels on a regular basis to get buy-in on project ideas and ultimate visions. Due to anti-NIMBYism sentiments, it is important to have a constant reemphasis on participation.
- The primer should not only discuss the idea of a regional planning framework, but also the variety of ways in which plans could be implemented within this framework once they have been developed.

Group 5
- Clearly identify the primer's target audience. As the primer will be used by a wide audience, there is concern that it will only include broad information at a high level that would ultimately not be very valuable. To overcome this, the primer should include specific examples. These examples could be presented as a best practice matrix where users could look up specific strategies by concept area, and then further select a strategy based on geographic area in order to gain insight on how different strategies would work under different environments.
    - o In general, the main audience will be the people to whom the idea of livability is being sold.
- The primer should include links to existing resources so that users can see what has already been done, rather than investing in a duplicate product.
- Include information and guidance on specific tools that can measure the outputs of livability initiatives.
- Emphasize that the primer's content is voluntary.
- The discussion should recognize that planning processes vary by region.
- The primer should be in a web-based format where people can download the document rather than receive it as a printed material.
    - o Include online discussion groups where people can ask questions on the content and people with similar experience could respond with suggestions based on lessons learned.
    - o Include web-based applications such as visualization tools that site users could use to see what their community would look like if they implemented some of the strategies discussed in the document. This could include something like Google Earth where users could see what the strategy looks like when it is implemented on the ground or a modeling tool that simulates what a community would look like if residents choose to continue current trends as compared to beginning to implement livability-type strategies right away.
    - o Include a database of livability projects. Communities could upload details on a particular project and other communities could then access this information.
    - o Include graphics that clearly demonstrate the benefits of livability so that all audiences can understand these messages.
- The main messages that should be emphasized are public health, safety, the environment, and saving money. The discussion on the economics of scale and resource efficiencies would resonate with the public sector. The business community would likely focus on the environmental benefits generated by supporting livability, as they are concerned with presenting an environmentally friendly image.
- In generating tools and technical assistance to support implementing livability, the focus should be on reaching those who are difficult to engage and/or resist engagement. These people may be within implementing agencies, or among the public.
- Identify new technologies that are being used in communities. For example, concrete sidewalks may not be sustainable because concrete is not a sustainable or environmentally friendly product.

Group 6
- Include rural considerations in the discussion and identify strategies for communicating livability in these areas. Some rural communities may view livability as something that requires changing lifestyles and moving to an urban area, or one with transit options, when this is not the case. It is difficult to identify what livability means in rural areas, as much of this information has not been synthesized. The profession needs to take a new look at what livability means in a rural context.
- Practitioners face a challenge with public burnout, as there are numerous planning processes in place, which all require public meetings. Requiring another set of meetings to discuss regional livability is not necessarily a good plan. Instead, the focus should be on how to take those existing processes and reshape them to address new needs.

- Emphasize that the primer should be used to assess realistic options that foster a change toward quality of life.
- Recognize the importance of having regional and district offices engaged with local communities and State DOTs early on in the project decisionmaking process so that livability can be considered and incorporated up front, before decisions are solidified.
- The product should be developed to connect directly with customers through every communication format possible. Rather than limiting resources to one format (e.g. a website), use print materials as well. Consider mailing materials to traditional adversaries as well as traditional supporters. FTA has been effective in widespread messaging and this could serve as an effective model.

Identifying Opportunities:

Briefly, *Harrison Rue* summarized the previous workshop feedback about the different audiences for the final materials and the list of possible elements in the toolbox that FHWA will subsequently be creating. The potential audiences are FHWA division offices, MPOs, DOTs, local governments, Federal agencies, policymakers/ decisionmakers, general interested public. The draft toolbox concepts are in the table below.

Confirmed	Floating/Potential
Livability research paper	FAQs & fact sheets - Hypothetical situations/projects - Benefits - Multiple audience – public policy
Workshop synthesis	Brochures/roadshow materials
Livability primer	Online clearinghouse
PowerPoint template	Stock PowerPoint
Success story technical memorandum	More dynamic website
Livability in Transportation Guidebook	Image video gallery
FHWA livability website resources	

Participants were asked to comment on the elements that would be most important to include, and those products that are a high priority for development. A summary of the large group discussion in response to this information is included below.

Funding
- There is a lack of money for transportation because we have not been building livable projects and thereby elevating the concept's importance. There is a strong need to build public support for doing things a different way. One option includes beginning to build livable projects and their success will generate more public support. If the public can see examples of a better way of doing things, they are likely to support funding for similar projects.
- Funding options should be re-organized around livability. With livability as the basis for project objectives and goals, a variety of funding sources could be leveraged and utilized.
- If people understood the true costs of transportation projects—capacity projects and livability projects—they would be inclined to support livability efforts.
- The issue does not lie in the lack of funds, but rather how decisions are made to spend this money. For examples, decisions regarding bridge reconstruction are not optional and are not likely to become optional in the future. There are limited choices remaining about system preservation. Incorporating livability considerations, such as adding a bike lane, add costs to

already expensive projects. By making smarter decisions, we should be able to accomplish all desired outcomes with the funding that is available.

Messaging
- Regions should focus on developing and identifying language that can be used to explain what livability means within their particular region. People need to better understand the concept of livability.

Design Guidelines
- Mandate that certain criteria be considered for project design and provide training for department personnel and municipality personnel to learn about these requirements. This has proven effective in areas with complete streets policies. As people have been developing projects, the burden of proof is on them to show that their project addresses all users. There has been a gradual increase in the number of projects that incorporate livability into their designs. Many areas have seen progress because of these policies. While this has not yet occurred on the corridor-level, it has become more prevalent at the project level.

Other
- Legacy projects have become an issue. There is a strong need to reevaluate these projects. Perhaps this could involve a gap analysis to see if these projects could be altered to incorporate livability elements and help meet additional community needs.
- Road diets should get points in categories for both safety and livability.

Closing and Next Steps: To finish the day, the facilitators and FHWA thanked participants and explained the next steps in the creation of the supporting guidance materials for organizations around the country that are interested in pursuing or advancing livability in transportation efforts in their community.

Evaluation Forms & Changes for Next Meeting:

In general, workshop participants provided reviewed the workshop favorably. The facilitators separated the challenges and solutions discussion more firmly and provided more closure to the first discussion session on "Identifying Challenges to Livability." In response to participant requests for receiving a more detailed agenda up-front, an agenda was provided with more information on the discussion topic areas and questions. The subsequent workshops will continue to build off the challenges mentioned in the Atlanta Kansas City, and Boston workshops. A few participants suggested less regional presentations. One participant suggested that a quick update on the Partnership's activities would be useful. Because of these recommendations, the Sacramento meeting will reduce the number of regional speakers and the format of the afternoon will be changed to introduce breaks between the afternoon speaker presentations. Additionally, small group discussions in the afternoon will focus on gathering feedback on the primer content, as identified from the first three workshops.

Workshop Participants	
Amy Pettine	Rhode Island Public Transit Authority
Amy Rainone	Rhode Island Housing
Andy Blake	City of Ranson, WV
Andy Swords	New Jersey DOT
Carol Weston	Burlington, Vermont Public Works
Cathy Buckley	Central Transportation Planning Staff
Cathy Kuzsman	New York State DOT
Chris O'Neill	Capital District Transportation Committee
Christine Walker	Upper Valley Lake Sunapee RPC
Colleen Kissane	Connecticut DOT
David Kooris	Regional Plan Association
David White	City of Burlington, VT
Dorathy Martel	Eastern Maine Development Corporation
Gary Toth	Project for Public Spaces
Glen Abrams	Philadelphia Water Department
Jared Rhodes	State of Rhode Island
Joe Cosgrove	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority
Kevin Flynn	State of Rhode Island
Lucy Gibson	Smart Mobility, Inc.
Mike Callahan	Central Transportation Planning Staff
Ned Codd	Massachusetts DOT
Paul Murphy	Downeast Transportation, Inc.
Peter Kasabach	New Jersey Future
Ranjit Walia	Civic Eye Collaborative
Rollin Stanley	The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Sandy Fry	Capitol Region Council of Governments
Sean Pfalzer	Central Transportation Planning Staff
Tigist Zegeye	Wilmington Area Planning Council
William Rose	New Hampshire DOT
Federal Participants	
Barbara Breslin	FHWA – Rhode Island Division Office
Carl Dierker	EPA
Carlos Pena	FHWA – Maine Division Office
Christopher Jolly	FHWA – Vermont Division Office
Corey Bobba	FHWA – Rhode Island Division Office

Damaris Santiago	FHWA – Massachusetts Division Office
Ernie Zupancic	HUD
Gail McFadden-Roberts	FTA – Region 3
Jessica Dominguez	EPA
Joanne Weinstock	FTA
Lucy Garliauskas	FHWA – Headquarters
Mary Beth Mello	FTA
Noah Dorius	HUD
Pam Stephenson	FHWA – Massachusetts Division Office
Richard Beers	FHWA – New York Division Office
Rosemary K. Monahan	EPA
Sandra Brillhart	FHWA – New Jersey Division Office
Shana Baker	FHWA – Headquarters
Victor Waldron	FTA – Region 2
Vince Pitruzzello	EPA – Region 2
William Gordon	FTA – Region 1
Consultant Team	
Elizabeth Wallis	ICF International
Harrison Rue	ICF International
Kate Ange	Renaissance Planning Group
Kathleen Rooney	ICF International

Livability Examples Provided by Boston Participants

In order to draw on the vast experience and knowledge of the selected participants, participants were asked to send the facilitators relevant information on best practices related to livability within their communities prior to the workshop. This information, along with the information that regional representatives presented during the workshop, are listed below. This information serves as an informal collection of examples that could be used in future guidebook/primer efforts when discussing best practices and developing case studies.

- Transit-Oriented Development PowerPoint Slideshow (file sent by Joe Cosgrove), Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority
- City of Burlington, Vermont Efforts

    Sidewalk Strategic Plan Implementation
    - o Outreach page and survey results for the Sidewalk Strategic Plan: http://www.dpw.ci.burlington.vt.us/transportation/projects/sidewalk/
    - o Sidewalk Strategic Plan PowerPoint Slideshow (file sent by Carol Weston), City of Burlington, VT, Department of Public Works (June 2009)
    - o Burlington's Walking and Biking Page: http://www.dpw.ci.burlington.vt.us/transportation/bikewalk/local/ (includes the City's Bike map, North/South Bike Study report, information on Bike Parking and information on Bike Racks as art demonstration projects).

    Complete Streets Demonstration
    - o Colchester Avenue Complete Streets Demonstration Project PowerPoint Slideshow (file sent by Carol Weston), City of Burlington, VT Department of Public Works, the Chittendon County MPO, and the Resource Systems Group, Inc. (January 2011)
    - o Comprehensive streetscape improvement projects that Burlington has undertaken over the last 10 years include Lake Street, Main Street, North Street, and Riverside Avenue. Changes were made to increase multimodal transportation, aesthetics, pedestrian safety, and traffic calming.

    Burlington Legacy Project: http://burlingtonlegacyproject.org/ (articulates Burlington's long-term vision as a sustainable community)

    City of Burlington, VT Municipal Development Plan: http://www.ci.burlington.vt.us/planning/comp_plan/municipal_development_plan/ (put the Burlington Legacy Project vision into a land use planning context and serves as the City's central policy guide regarding future land use and development)

    Burlington Transportation Plan, "Moving Forward Together" (file sent by David White) (newly adopted plan, now the Transportation chapter of the City's Municipal Development Plan; the first to articulate a complete streets policy for Burlington).

    Chittenden County Transit Authority's Transit Development Plan: http://www.cctaride.org/resources/documents.html (describes plans for the City's regional transit system and how it integrates as an essential component to fulfilling some of Burlington's land use and transportation goals).

    Burlington's Downtown and Waterfront Plaster Plan Project: http://www.ci.burlington.vt.us/planning/comp_plan/downtown_waterfront_plan/ (file also sent by David White) (Will place an emphasis on ways to promote and improve mixed uses and quality urban design, affordable and workforce housing, transportation and parking management, and the quality and capacity of public infrastructure. This HUD Sustainable Communities Challenge Grant-funded effort is specifically intended to address the Federal Partnership for Sustainable Communities six livability principles.)

- New Jersey DOT and NJ Transit Efforts
    - o New Jersey's Complete Streets efforts:http://policy.rutgers.edu/vtc/bikeped/completestreets/index.php
    - o New Jersey DOT's NJFIT program: http://www.State.nj.us/transportation/works/njfit/ (an effort to coordinate NJDOT transportation improvements with community needs)
    - o NJ TRANSIT's Transit Friendly Land Use Program:
    - o http://www.njtransit.com/tm/tm_servlet.srv?hdnPageAction=CorpInfoTo (or go to www.njtransit.com , click on About Us, and then scroll down to Transit Friendly Land Use.)
    - o Sustainable Jersey: http://www.sustainablejersey.com/ (a municipally driven program, to which NJDOT and NJ TRANSIT staff provide technical assistance. The lead is the Municipal Land Use Center at The College of New Jersey.)

- o Relevant NJDOT research projects:
  - o Economic Development Benefits of New Transit Service, RiverLINE: http://www.State.nj.us/transportation/refdata/research/reports/FHWA-NJ-2009-010-TB.pdf and http://www.State.nj.us/transportation/refdata/research/reports/FHWA-NJ-2009-010.pdf
  - o Eliminating Barriers to Transit-Oriented Development: http://www.State.nj.us/transportation/refdata/research/reports/FHWA-NJ-2010-002-TB.pdf and http://www.State.nj.us/transportation/refdata/research/reports/FHWA-NJ-2010-002.pdf
- ■ Central Transportation Planning Staff (Boston Region MPO) Livability Program: http://www.ctps.org/bostonmpo/3_programs/5_livability/livability.html (draft website)
  - o Started in 2011 and seeks to support livability throughout the region by way of three program components: regional forums, community workshops, and a website of online resources. CTPS recently completed a draft website that includes a database of livability indicators. The database provides access to data regarding demographics, available transportation options, and existing transportation patterns by municipality to begin to better understand the necessary conditions to facilitate livability. CTPS' intent is for the website to serve as a source of information for all, from State, regional and municipal officials and staff to individual residents.
- ■ Capital District Transportation Committee Efforts
  - o New Visions for a Quality Region (Regional Transportation Plan): http://www.cdtcmpo.org/rtp2030/brochure.pdf
  - o The CDTC Congestion Management Process PowerPoint slideshow presented by CDTC at a recent FHWA-sponsored webinar (file sent by Chris O'Neill) (the CMP is strongly integrated with the New Visions plan)
  - o Linkage Program (used to implement the New Visions plan): http://www.cdtcmpo.org/linkage/brochure11-12.pdf
    - o Addressing Livability and Sustainability in MPO Regional Transportation Plans: New Visions for a Quality Region PowerPoint slideshow (file sent by Chris O'Neill)
- ■ Massachusetts Deparmtent of Transportation, "Transportation Reform Legislation" (2009), http://www.massdot.State.ma.us/main/Documents/HealthyTransportationCompact/TransReform_Ch25_Sect33.pdf
- ■ Massachusetts Department of Transportation, GreenDOT Initiative, http://www.massdot.State.ma.us/main/greendot.aspx
- ■ Massachusetts Department of Transportation, Livability and Sustainability Initiatives, http://www.mhd.State.ma.us/default.asp?pgid=content/environ/sustainability&sid=about
- ■ New York and Connectivcut Sustainable Communities Initiative, http://www.sustainablenyct.org/
- ■ Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Annual Growth Policy, http://www.montgomeryplanning.org/research/growth_policy/growth_policy09/agp_growing_smarter.shtm
- ■ State of Maryland, GreenPrint, http://www.greenprint.maryland.gov/
- ■ State of Maryland, Transit-Oriented Development Designations, http://www.mdot-realeState.org/tod.asp
- ■ Capital District Transportation Committee, "New Visions 2030," http://www.cdtcmpo.org/rtp2030/nv.htm and http://www.cdtcmpo.org/rtp2030/brochure.pdf
- ■ Capital District Transportation Committee, Linkage Program, http://www.cdtcmpo.org/linkage.htm
- ■ Rhode Island Housing, http://www.rhodeislandhousing.org/
- ■ The Penobscot Valley, ME Community Greenprint, http://tplgis.org/Penobscot_Greenprint/
- ■ Mobilize Maine, http://www.mobilizemaine.com/

This page intentionally left blank

Sacramento, California Summary

Discussion Summary: The discussion emphasized the content outline, and format of a livability primer whereas previous meetings had focused on major elements. Key discussion points included:

- Challenges such as the historical cultural emphasis on car ownership and sprawl, lack of flexibility and funding availability to fund livability projects, and the need to see livability as an economic need rather than a side item.

- Solutions such as making sure that all stakeholders – including state DOTs and MPOs – are involved, encouraging livability through streamlined funding and demonstrating economic and other livability co-benefits.

- Priorities for content of a livability primer, which includes technical analysis and performance measures, ways to incorporate community vision and goals, and outreach materials with broad appeal.

- Communication and outreach methods, such as the need to ensure that any materials are visually stimulating and clear, using social media and web 2.0, and personalizing the message of livability while also making its economic benefits clear.

Based on input from this workshop, continued work in the subsequent workshop focused on developing these ideas further. The meeting structure included a number of presentations on regional practices, as well as a significant amount of brainstorming, facilitated discussion, and idea sharing. A summary of activities and key outputs follows.

Workshop Specifics:

Location:

Sacramento Area Council of Governments Office
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

Date / Time:

May 3, 2011 from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm

Sacramento workshop discussions.

Welcome and Introductions:

Shana Baker from FHWA's Office of Human Environment welcomed participants to the workshop and thanked them for coming. She thanked the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) in particular for hosting the workshop. Ms. Baker reviewed the workshop purpose, which focused on helping FHWA identify what the agency's stakeholders need by hearing about challenges and solutions from those on the ground. She noted that the workshops are part of the larger initiative, the Strategies for Livable Communities project, which will allow FHWA to develop tools to assist their field offices, as well as the HUD-DOT-EPA Partnership for Sustainable Communities.

Representatives from the regional Partnership agencies provided additional opening remarks. *Sue Kiser, the Director of Planning and Air Quality for FHWA California Division Office,* discussed reauthorization efforts, which are focused on incorporating livability and sustainability principles. Ms. Kiser noted that SACOG is on the forefront of planning initiatives through their Blueprint Planning Process, which has helped local agencies begin to implement integrated planning efforts. *Cynthia Abbot, the Field Office Director for HUD Fresno Office,* highlighted the agency's current budget, which is focused on incorporating livability principles as it relates to grant selection and program support. Grants will be focused on making effective long-term changes by supporting sustainability and helping maintain

neighborhoods where people can live and work. *Carolyn Mulvihill, an Environmental Protection Specialist from EPA Region 9 Office,* noted that her division has been focused on bringing in expertise from various division offices to help advance regional activities. Region 9 has also been working closely with the headquarters Smart Growth office in Washington, DC to advance interagency partnership efforts, particularly as it relates to EPA's brownfields grant program. *Eric Eidlin, the Regional Tribal Liaison from FTA Region 9 Office,* discussed that there are a number of partnership initiatives underway to help leverage investments for livability. One of these initiatives is focused on how to engage local partners and gather input from the expertise that currently exists within all levels of government. Participants introduced themselves, as did the meeting facilitators and managers from ICF International and Renaissance Planning Group.

Setting the Stage for Livability:

Harrison Rue from ICF International reviewed the purpose and outcomes of both the overall project and the day's workshop in particular. As the majority of participants indicated that they had read the background paper developed for this project, *The Role of FHWA Programs in Livability: State of the Practice Summary,* Mr. Rue provided a brief overview of the paper's content. This overview included a review of the Sustainable Communities Partnership and the associated principles, components included in the definition of "livability in transportation," benefits of incorporating livability, overall research findings, and a review of state of the practice examples from areas that have successfully incorporated livability into a variety of efforts.

Identifying Challenges to Livability:

During this large group discussion session, participants were asked to focus on the following three questions:

1. What are the big challenges to implementing transportation solutions that support and advance livable communities?
2. How do the challenges and solutions differ in:
   a. Urban, suburban, and rural contexts?
   b. Local, regional, and State agencies?
3. What is one solution that has worked for your agency?

Participants identified five main categories of challenges, as well as potential solutions that could be used to overcome some of these challenges. During the discussion, participant recommendations were listed on flip charts and posted around the room for participants to reference during discussion. Using a dot voting exercise, the five below reflect the priorities from the participants.

Overcoming past development patterns and the automobile culture
- The history of the car culture makes it difficult to get people to shift their ideas away from automobiles. This culture extends into State DOTs, engineering departments, and other governmental organizations as well.
- There is a need to change the negative public perception toward transit and raise awareness of transit options and its role as it relates to regional livability.
- Many communities are built on a history of sprawl. There is a need to acknowledge this and work to respond to this reality in a reasonable way. Now that development in many areas has slowed, there is an opportunity to focus on planning rather than the prior focus on permitting and marketing. With a renewed focus on planning, areas can work on incorporating livability into the existing infrastructure and development.

- It is difficult to overcome existing development patterns, which do not support livability and the culture it supports. There is a need to retrofit existing areas to overcome the actions supported by this culture.
- The culture of building the train system on time and on budget is sacrificing livability issues. Instead, transit construction should be approached the same way that highways have traditionally been approached.
- High densities and a culture of rural communities have generated gated communities, a development pattern which has been allowed in many areas. This development pattern pushes all of the traffic onto the roadways and does not leave any room for pedestrians, transit, or bikers. Developers are not supportive of reducing the development area to widen sidewalks, which has meant that the public domain is squeezed out.
- As we increase density on busy roadways, health concerns become an issue. These health concerns include both mobile and stationary toxin sources. The planning and development costs become higher as health elements are considered and mitigation efforts are implemented. A variety of stakeholders—including those involved in health—should be included at the table up-front during the project development process.
- Look at the history of planning and the history of how land was platted historically to identify lessons that can be learned and incorporated into present and future efforts. Lessons related to land use implementation could prove particularly helpful.

Flexibility of funding to implement livability concepts
- There is an overall lack of funding.
- For the funding that is available, there is a lack of flexibility for implementing some of the livability concepts.
- Many cities face a difficult fiscal situation, which has contributed to a lack of buy-in. These issues are only becoming more of a challenge.
- Implementing livability priorities is difficult when budgets already cannot be met.
- There is uncertainty surrounding local and Federal funding, which makes it difficult to support sustainable communities.
- A significant amount of funding is allocated to moving cars through cities rather than helping move people around cities. Targeting State agency funding toward safety, preservation, and capacity could allow some flexibility with the traditional focus on cars. The State level funding structure hampers efforts to allocate funding outside of traditional focus areas.
- At present, funding is not awarded toward livability programs, which presents challenges for implementation.
- Livability is considered a side line item.
- The three Federal agencies use very different methods of getting grant/project funds to recipients and there is very limited understanding of the HUD and EPA channels by transportation agencies. The agencies' different project planning time frames are also an issue. The long lead time that has been enforced on transportation projects through the RTIP process puts transportation projects beyond the time frame of many HUD/EPA grant programs.

Selling the economic benefits of livability
- Livability should be framed as a solution that will be cost-effective in the long-term because efforts will be more strategic and efficient. For planning in particular, there is a need to address the fact that business as usual is more expensive. Some arguments that can be used include:
  o Implementation costs have become a much higher percentage of project costs.
  o Planning is becoming more complex while the resources are staying the same.
  o A significant amount of money is being spent on outdated projects.
- The public perception of livability needs to be changed. People need to view livability as a core responsibility and concern for their business rather than as an add-on that only occurs when there

is funding to address livability concerns. Particularly in times of fiscal challenges, the need to be smart about growth and cut housing, transportation, and energy costs is more critical. There is a significant challenge surrounding education and helping people to realize that addressing livability is a core responsibility.

- The message of livability's economic benefits has not been selling. Visualization illustrations tend to convey messages related to residential happiness. New marketing efforts should change the message to focus on economic benefits with examples of how livability efforts benefitted a community in terms of revenues and success stories from local business owners.
- Planning work is not being effectively connected to the work that elected officials are doing. By making the connection between planning and economic benefits clearer, it will raise the priority of this work for decisionmakers.
- Continue spreading the message of a "new way of doing things" for elected officials. There is a need to identify unique messages that work for various sets of elected officials.

Transforming the "silo" culture within State and local agencies
- There are a number of projects that have been stagnating for years, but are unable to move ahead due to a lack of local buy-in. The lack of a State presence at the table when discussing these efforts contributes to this issue.
- Individual agencies often have siloed areas of expertise that are focused on a very limited area. In particular, there is often a lack of understanding by transportation professionals as to how livability strategies can be applied and how they can make transportation planning easier. New educational efforts should focus on broadening people's basic understanding to encompass a wider variety of topic areas that is not limited to cars only. Education should focus on an integrated planning approach and the value of bringing partners together.
- It has been difficult to involve the development community and to draw them into the project development discussion.
- Training materials are needed to help educate employees within State agencies about the benefits of livability. These materials should use terms that all people could understand so that the message is effectively conveyed. Many staff members do not have the ability or desire to get out of their comfort zone and learn about the possible benefits of livability. These benefits include how to leverage investments and identify solutions.
- There is often a resistance to regional cooperation, as many communities are concerned about protecting their particular economy and their individual community's identity. It is a challenge to balance the priorities and concerns of an individual community with coming together as a region to identify solutions that cross community boundaries.
- There is a disconnect between the regional concept of livability and the idea that communities can buy into it at a regional level. At the local level, there is a disconnect when regional density is ultimately focused in one community's area. There is a need to work on how communities understand these connections and the decisionmaking process behind it.
- It is difficult to gain local agency buy-in within a community.
- The US DOT has indicated that there will be a shift in the way that programs are focused. Given this potential change, local governments, State DOTs, and sub-regions need to work on identifying a way to embrace and anticipate these changes so that they will be easier to implement. By starting to understand this shift and its importance in the way that business will be conducted, there is a need to begin understanding upcoming changes.
- There is a stark difference between rural and urban contexts that needs to be recognized when discussing livability. Within a local context, livability means a variety of things, and livability principles operate very differently. Recognizing these differences and using this understanding to work with communities to identify what is important for livability within their community in particular will help implementation within a local context.

- Even with silos being broken down, challenges remain for changing traditional and/or legacy organizational policies and procedures that have been in existence for decades. Beginning the discussion about necessary changes is important.
- Within each individual's agency, it is challenging to make necessary changes to evolve the agency from a silo or narrow area of expertise to a broader buy-in of knowledge. The pace of agency evolution is integrally tied to the amount of time an individual is willing to devote to making these changes, as short- and long-term demands are also at work. There are many changes to make and limited time in which to implement them.

Creating new tools, methods, and data sets to analyze and evaluate livability
- The livable street or livable community concept is a much more complex organism than has been examined or modeled in the past. Increasingly, tools are becoming available to measure the impacts of various decisions; however, these have not been universally applied and could be used on a wider basis to bring more elected officials on board.
- It is difficult to create new tools/methodology/data sets to measure quality of life and to develop standards that take livability into account. There is a lack of existing tools/methodologies/data sets that can be used to define success for livability or sustainability.
- There is a need to continue developing a robust field of models and examples of livability successes so that a real life example of livability project implementation can follow each computer-generated visualization. These examples should be gathered to help tell the story of livability.
- Support the public involvement process by demonstrating how livability and transportation can support broader community goals, and by helping to identify those goals. With more real life examples, areas can overcome this challenge and barrier and they will be able to use existing livability goal examples when developing their own community goals.
- The courts should allow a more creative interpretation of "trip counts," as the legal definition is very narrow. Environmental regulations adhere strictly to this definition, which presents a challenge for implementing and gaining support for livability.
- Many Federal regional agencies do not understand existing programs, which presents a barrier to leveraging funds for implementation.
- Without having private investment happen on its own, economic development will face many barriers. This is particularly true given the conservative lending industry that completes project renderings.
- Education is needed to inform residents about the value added from implementing livability principles. When livability is mentioned, residents sometimes feel that they are being asked to add more density to their area, which can generate equity concerns. Thus, many communities feel the need to defend their community against livability, which they equate with gentrification and displacement. Educating people on livability is a true challenge. Oftentimes, instead of housing, roads become a focal point because this is the only area residents are willing to change.
- Transportation and land use are often not integrated. Much of the decisions regarding land use happen at the local level.
- Rural areas do not have the capacity to go beyond basic planning. Within this limited capacity, rural areas are often not very knowledgeable about how to implement livability and sustainability ideas. Additionally, many rural areas view livability and sustainability as negative concepts.
- It is important to begin integrated planning and to coordinate land use planning. Letting the planning process work to develop, prioritize, and implement projects is critical.

A summary of the solutions that participants mentioned are listed below. As many of these solutions are broadly applicable to a variety of challenges, they are not grouped into discrete categories.
- Work on identifying ways to save money by re-framing the discussion surrounding project development as it relates to a lack of planning dollars

- Move information onto the internet to force agencies to be more transparent about their information and reduce silo effects. Agency employees are more likely to see inter-agency connections if this information is readily available and easy to access. This information should also be made accessible to the public so that they are able to see connections as well.
- The sustainable communities grant money has been very helpful in advancing partnership efforts. For example, it has allowed some agencies to hold meetings with representatives from other agencies to discuss partnership and overlapping efforts.
- The MPO model of interagency coordination should be applied on a broader basis to a larger framework. FHWA has been supportive of interagency efforts and should continue to do so.
- Partnership agencies should publish joint notices of funding availability. When awarding funding, the applications should be reviewed by all partnership agencies as well. This will be effective for breaking down silos and barriers.
- Change the existing culture and vision as it relates to livability by focusing on educating the younger generation, who is receptive to these messages and interested in livability-related efforts. For residential development in particular, the younger generation is driving the market away from suburban areas and toward communities that reflect livability principles.

Following this discussion, participants received four dot stickers, which they used to vote for the challenges they thought were the most significant. No limit was placed on this voting process, and participants were allowed to use one or all four dots on any one particular challenge, depending on the significance they placed on it. As mentioned above, the categorization of the five identified challenges reflect the voting priorities from this exercise.

Overcoming Challenges:

Three of the workshop participants presented on successful livability efforts in the region, allowing all workshop participants to see and hear about successful livability examples in their region. *Martin Tuttle of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)* discussed the Department's current focus on coordinating efforts with local development agencies, as they play a vital role in helping identify community assets and using these effectively to implement livability. Mr. Tuttle also stressed the importance of local governments reaching out to State DOTs to work together on livability efforts, as the States can help to make sure that there is a common language spoken among local partners, and they have funds to help implement local efforts. *Mike McKeever from SACOG* discussed the organization's integrated planning efforts, known as the "Regional Blueprint Planning Program," which is modeled off Portland's efforts. Along with this program, SACOG has included a growth strategy in their regional plan, which is being implemented through a partnership with development agencies, and has been successful in bringing about a period of rapid improvement and change. *Paul Zykofsky from the Local Government Commission* presented on road diet and roundabout implementation on La Jolla Boulevard, Bird Rock in San Diego, which has helped to improve safety and promote local economic development. One of the biggest challenges the project faced was funding, but by working with a variety of local, regional, and State partners, the project was implemented successfully. Afterwards, there was a panel discussion, focusing on the key elements of their success:
- Political will is a driving force in success. For the La Jolla Boulevard project, City Council members were determined to implement the project quickly and make the project successful so that residents could begin seeing project benefits right away.
- A core commitment for the project is vital. The project cannot be viewed as an add-on. Ideally, this commitment would involve leadership from staff, board members, and representatives from the stakeholder community. By having a group of representatives who are committed to seeing the project through to the end, it is more likely to succeed.
- Project delivery and process management was very important for Caltrans. At the beginning of the process, elected official transition and politics presented an issue. The developers were ultimately the group that was involved from the beginning through to the end of implementation.

Working with them from the very beginning of the project, was a helpful, driving force for the project, as they provided funding and were the risk-takers for purchasing properties in the downtown areas where livability efforts were being implemented. Support from the developers also helped with political buy-in. This relationship has proved very helpful for staying informed on current efforts and for project success.
- o Caltrans identified the key developers to involve by looking at the Chamber of Commerce to see who was an active member. They also consulted the Urban Land Institute (ULI) and the Building Industry Association.
- o Caltrans began talking to developers by picking up the phone and starting a dialogue. Beginning at the regional level for discussions was the most effective. State transportation agencies can also play a role in assisting regional efforts by talking with the State development agencies. For MPOs, discussions with developers can begin at any step in the planning process. Taking the initiative and starting the conversation is the most important.
- o Identifying these developers that will remain in business and be important in the future is difficult. In general, the small developers are the ones leading the way for infill projects.
- ULI, FHWA, and FTA worked together a couple of years ago to partner on land use and transportation options that were being investigated from both perspectives. They looked at the nexus of land use and transportation and how each community looked at each.
- One of the challenges is the local versus regional perspective on what is good for the region outside of what is specifically good for a particular community. In general, communities have ventured into this territory very carefully, and only if they have something to offer the other communities in the region. These pressures should not dictate the conversation, as letting this dynamic be the driving force will not allow any progress.
  - o It is important to identify partners who have a multi-agency dynamic as a starting point for beginning conversations on regional efforts.
  - o Regions should be focusing on the trickle down effects that will benefit each community if a particular industry locates in one community. The focus should be on not losing the industry to another State rather than arguing over in which community the industry will locate. It is important to reframe the conversation on broader topics such as economic development and how planning can help advance this, rather than focusing on other minor issues.
- The Federal partners play an important role in helping State DOTs and local agencies engage with one another. State DOTs tend to be skipped over in the process, as local agencies tend to go right to the Federal regions when looking to implement a project. Particularly for regional economic development, State DOTs have an important role to play in helping to tie regions together to help the State economy thrive.
  - o Seattle is taking a different route by taking gas tax from the State and putting it toward local use.
- State DOTs play an important role for funding, as FHWA is not in a position to bring funding to the discussion table. If the State DOT and the MPOs are not at the table, transportation is not at the table. Projects will not be successful without the DOT involvement.
  - o FTA works differently, as they finance agencies directly.
  - o HUD has heard similar requests, as they have multiple State agencies in California. The issue of capacity presents a challenge.

Following this roundtable discussion, participants divided themselves into five groups with a mix of State, regional, local, and Federal representatives. Each group was asked to focus on one of the top five challenges, as voted on by the participants during the dot-voting process:
1. Overcoming past development patterns and the auto culture
2. Flexibility of funding to implement livability
3. Selling the economic benefits

4. Transforming the silo culture within State, MPO, and local agencies
5. Creating new tools/methods/data sets to analyze and evaluate livability

During this hour-long discussion, participants were asked to focus on identifying solutions to one of the challenge areas and answer the questions below. In doing so, participants were asked to consider examples where they had overcome a project challenge in a relevant topic area and use that experience to assist in answering the questions.
- What effective strategies have helped you to overcome challenges?
  - What was important for you to succeed?
  - How have you measured the success of your efforts?
- What helped you to align or integrated different funding and agency priorities?
- What kinds of public and interagency process worked?
- What, if anything, did the Partnership do to facilitate success?

Each group provided a quick summary of their discussion.

Overcoming past development patterns and the auto culture
- Incentivize infrastructure by providing money for Transit-Oriented Development.
- Incorporate flexibility to make it easier for agencies to implement the projects they choose to do. Make it easier to implement livability and harder to implement projects that do not incorporate the livability principles.
- Phase strategies through land banking.
- Engage business communities through MPOs and local governments.
- Provide education opportunities such as regular workshops to public officials. Use education efforts to inform public officials about new ideas or successful strategies that should receive funding.
- Provide additional resources such as data and funding for local agencies.
- Focus on retrofitting existing plans and using individual planning efforts to create new areas with the existing community infrastructure. Individual planning efforts such as walkable community plans and complete streets standards can be effective in retrofitting existing boulevards and/or arterials.
- Change the existing zoning and other regulations that are presenting barriers to implementing livability to help agencies encourage communities that residents want.

Flexibility of funding to implement livability
- Streamline the Federal requirements for projects. Currently, projects under certain cost thresholds (generally under $5 million) are not pursued, as the regulatory burden is extremely high. For example, smaller projects, such as streetscaping and/or roundabouts, may be lower cost and can have the greatest impact for livability, but face barriers to funding.
- In recognition of the fact that livability projects are not solely focused on transportation, help livability projects become eligible for environmental funding. Funding sources can help integrate project efforts together and help projects incorporate a wider variety of concerns. Changing the funding so that there are fewer pots of money but greater opportunity to leverage that money for different types of projects would be helpful. Reauthorization may offer more flexible options.
  - For example, using CMAQ and STP funds to fund livability projects and to plan for TOD helps to create a more holistic project viewpoint.
  - It is helpful to look at the existing best practices for exchange Federal dollars for local dollars, which allows local agencies to use funding toward other projects in other focus areas. MPOs and agencies should be educated on this practice.
- Recognize the importance of leveraging private resources by building partnerships with private entities to partner in building public infrastructure. This could involve Public Private Partnerships

or Public Private Enterprises. If public dollars are spent on something that will lead to a private benefit, it is important to capture some of that value.

Selling the economic benefits
- It is important to have cohesive and strong data for the transportation effects of development. Particularly, data is needed on the advantages livability provides to neighborhoods, property owners, and business owners. Reinforce the data with success stories about efforts such as road diets and increased property values, and tell the story in a quantifiable manner to a variety of stakeholders. Neighborhoods and business owners need to understand the benefits in order to support these efforts.
- Address the health impacts for both air quality and walkability that livability offers. Show the co-benefits for a healthy, sustainable community so that people will buy in to these project efforts.
- Demonstrate how transportation projects help to attract employment. For example, transportation informs where employment centers are located, which in turn provides new employment options in an area.
- Identify the benefits of living within one-half mile of common destinations, as well as the benefits of a variety of other livability initiatives.
- FHWA should serve as a common source for livability statistics. By having a Federal agency as the leading research group, the resulting statistics have a higher credibility, and it helps when organizations are able to use the same data sets when discussing their messages with the public and elected officials. Useful statistics include measuring the benefits that come from increasing density and from constructing livable streets. These statistics should be made readily available so that organizations can use this data in communication with elected officials.
- Use consistent messaging to create a consistent theme about the benefits of livability.

Transforming the silo culture within State, MPO, and local agencies
- Silos are easy, which is the biggest barrier facing the challenge of breaking them down.
- In working toward a future where State and local agencies partner together, it is important to take a progressive viewpoint and see this culture shift occurring. This culture shift will help in creating a seamless discussion between urban, suburban, and rural entities.
- Breaking down silos will become easier as we move into a more flexible approach to approaching problem solving and funding. The current method of bucket funding will not be sustainable in the future.
- To the greatest extent possible, get direction and modeling of the integrated approach from a higher, Federal level. Those who are already working across boundaries and using an integrated approach should be rewarded in some way.
- Develop a certification process where FHWA certifies multi-agency processes as being eligible for funding from a wider range of sources.
- Work on breaking down communication barriers to facilitate and improve existing inter- and intra-agency conversations.
- Identify the various roles that stakeholders and agency members play in the decisionmaking process. Use this to develop strategies that each agency can use to help them recognize their role as it relates to the silo effect. When agencies can see and identify where the process is breaking down, they will be able to identify how they can become a "silo-buster."
- Move to performance or outcome-based planning in transportation. This approach is inherently non-silo, which is beneficial. Thus, it should be reinforced and required.
- Recognize that livability can serve as an organizing element for efforts.
- Develop education and training materials for new practitioners and agency staff. In the future, there will be a need for livability practitioners who have a unique skill set. It is important to begin identifying now what that new skill set will include.

- Do not use a process similar to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, as this process did not allow for planning to be an integral member of the conversation. Instead, a lot of funding went toward making short-term adjustments like road resurfacing.

Creating new tools/methods/data sets to analyze and evaluate livability
- Focus on completeness as an integral part of the analysis rather than what has been done traditionally or what is the easiest method. For example, Level of Service has traditionally measured success along roads only and does not account for livability. Measures such as these should be updated to reflect success along multiple access points.
- Consider all the complete suite of effects that will be generated by implementing a particular project. Traditionally, travel time has been one of the most significant measures; however, measures such as health effects and wetlands loss are also important to consider. A wider variety of measures should be incorporated into the decisionmaking process to help inform project selection.
- Recognize the difference between accuracy and precision. Decimal points tend to generate a lot of confidence, but if it is not an accurate representation, it is not ultimately helpful. The issue of accuracy has been raised in measuring livability, as it is difficult to estimate the effects from the numerous factors that go into livability; however, it is important to start somewhere and begin trying to measure these effects rather than ignoring them and assuming them to be zero. Ultimately, taking steps toward measuring these impacts will help guide decisionmakers toward good decisions.
- There a number of helpful metrics already in existence that help measure the impacts across a variety of modes. VMT has been used widely, as it covers the impacts of automotive traffic, one of the effects that livability works to counteract. VMT can be used to help measure the livability impact for travel and could be used by agencies that do not have the option to use more sophisticated modeling.
- Consider the trade-offs that will be created by implementing a particular project. Monetizing the benefits would be effective, but is difficult to measure. It would be helpful to develop a common currency that could be used to measures benefits across modes and make more informed decisions.
- Research the potential Federal role as it relates to implementing livability.
- A helpful method to move projects forward is the "Do. Measure. Learn. Repeat." cycle. Some of the efforts involved in livability have not been done before, but it is important to at least try them and see the results.

Regional Livability Planning Strategies:

Three of the workshop participants presented on their organization's success in developing and implementing livability planning strategies at a regional level. *Margi Bradway from Oregon Department of Transportation* discussed the Department's efforts to create a culture of livability and sustainability, which has involved a combination of generating local interest and securing political support. Currently, the Department is working with MPOs on developing a new approach involving technical, education, and tool support. One of the approaches is "least cost planning," which involves costing all externalities involved in a project, and the Department is working on developing a tool on how to implement least cost planning at a corridor level. *Andrea Riner from Lane Council of Governments* discussed the local Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system, which received support from the business community, who recognized the project's value in stimulating economic development, but which faced barriers from local political leaders. This project demonstrated the value of securing regional leadership and the need for a partnership effort that matches Federal requirements, local partners, and experts from a variety of different topic areas. *Martyn James from the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada* discussed current transportation initiatives, which have been focused on addressing the exponential population growth in the region and the car-focused framework that was generated to accommodate that growth.

Currently, the focus is on creating a regional multimodal network, which includes a complete streets initiative, regional trails, and a BRT system. Afterwards, there was a panel discussion, focusing on the key elements of their success:

- For Lane COG, the community's vision for the system was particularly important to the project's success. This vision involved connecting the BRT system to a full transit and land use vision. Developing the vision occurred over a long period of time, involved a number of stakeholders, and was helpful for leveraging the vision for other community benefits.
- Leadership from the top was important for RTC's success. The change in public opinion toward being in favor of current efforts has also helped. Over the last couple of years, RTC has stressed dialogue with locals and within the agency, which has been helpful for securing partners and for developing a shared vision and dialogue.
- For Oregon DOT, leadership has been helpful as well. The culture within the Department is slowly beginning to recognize that their focus is on transportation rather than highways. The focus has shifted toward looking to maximize and maintain the existing infrastructure, and to bring partners together for integrated efforts. The timing of the recession and multimodal political opportunities has helped to foster this changing environment.
- Oregon DOT has historically had a good relationship with their Federal partners, so the partnership has continued this good relationship. It has, however, been difficult for them to meet at the table with EPA and HUD, as the regional offices are not as active in Oregon. The partnership could be more effective by recognizing the role it plays throughout the entire State— not just a select number of regions.
  - Many of the initiatives Oregon DOT has pursued have happened at the State level.
  - FHWA's Oregon division has faced challenges in educating other Federal partners on how important it is to bring the State DOTs on board.
- The partnership provided Lane COG with the opportunity to move forward with the BRT project, as it faced funding challenges and competition. The partnership enabled Lane COG to begin to establish a vision that could be communicated effectively to different segments of the community.
- Southern Nevada RTC is geographically located are far away from their State and division offices, which has impacted the level of involvement. New technology has been helpful in reducing these barriers, but physical geographic locations have still proven a driving force in determining the level of involvement with the State and Federal agencies.

Harrison Rue directed each participant to turn to the person next to them and, for thirty seconds, discuss the question: What is the single most important thing that needs to be in the primer? Selected participants shared their responses. A summary of these responses is listed below.

- Recognize the importance of working closely with the business community.
- FHWA should provide clear guidelines on what livability projects look like, the requirements they incorporate, and the features they include. Make it clear for State DOTs and other agencies what is involved in implementing livability efforts.
- Tie the livability principles into design standards that developers and city planners can rely on and reference.
- It is useful to hear that the issues faced by local agencies are similar across all communities. These challenges are relevant to how changes are made and how staff members approach livability projects.
- Emphasize the importance of local government leaders.
- Incorporate case studies to help identify policy changes that are needed.

Whit Blanton from Renaissance Planning Group discussed the initial concepts for the FHWA primer on implementing livability, in which FHWA is moving away from the idea of developing a regional livability model plan and more toward a primer or guidebook discussing how to implement these strategies and make it successful, and how best to put existing plans and processes together to start

integrating livability efforts. The key elements of the primer, as identified through prior workshop discussions, could include the following: integrated planning processes; community visions and goals; technical analysis and performance measures; plans, policies, and programs; project implementation strategies; and communications and outreach.

Mr. Blanton highlighted that, in working toward an integrated regional planning process, it is important to look at existing plans and processes, as livability can be incorporated into these established processes. Existing plans and processes where livability elements could be incorporated include:

- Long range transportation plans
- Comprehensive plans (or General Plans)
- HUD Consolidated Plans)
- Regional visioning and scenario planning
- Regional environmental greenprints and watershed planning
- Regional transit plans
- Economic development plans
- Hazard mitigation plans
- Federal Emergency Management Agency post-disaster recovery plans
- Smaller scale stationary plans
- State plans (both policy level and modal plans)
- Highway design manual
- School district planning efforts
- State comprehensive recreation plans (non-vehicle focus)

The discussion on the primer was split into an hour-long discussion on each of the key elements. Participants broke into five different groups with a mix of State, regional, local, and Federal representatives. *Harrison Rue* guided the discussion by breaking it into four, fifteen-minute segments where participants were asked to focus on particular elements and answer tailored questions about each. The discussions focused on the following questions:

- Integrated planning processes & Community visions and goals
    - o For an FHWA 'primer' on livability planning and implementation…what information or new guidance is needed?
        - ▪ Which existing planning processes should we focus on? Which ones need the most guidance?
        - ▪ Which plans/processes will benefit the most from an integrated approach?
- Technical analysis and performance measures & Plans policies and programs
    - o For an FHWA 'primer' on livability planning and implementation…what information or new guidance is needed?
        - ▪ In addition to scenario planning, what other kinds of analysis support livability?
        - ▪ What types of plans do you need guidance on?
        - ▪ Which policies or programs are most effective in sparking and sustaining livability initiatives?
- Project implementation strategies
    - o For an FHWA 'primer' on livability planning and implementation…what information or new guidance is needed?
        - ▪ How do you most effectively bridge the gap between plans/policies and project development/design?
        - ▪ What are the key implementation decision points?
        - ▪ What interagency practices best support implementation of livable communities outcomes?

Following the discussion on project implementation strategies, *Jack Ecklund from the City of University Place, Washington* presented on the City's livability efforts, which are based around a city vision that is focused on using the livability principles and placemaking to transform the local streets to create a public space. The City used road diets, sidewalks, and bike lanes to help create streets that are now safer and benefit all members of the community.

Harrison Rue reviewed some successful communication and outreach efforts to identify some of the options available for messaging and marketing the concept of livability. Successful communication and outreach efforts have included fact sheets, summary brochures, summary posters, Web 2.0, and social media. Considering these efforts, participants were asked to reflect on the following questions in a small-group setting:
- What forms of products should any new guidance take?
- What messages resonate with different groups to understand and help explain livability?
- What communications and marketing materials would help you to make the case for livability?
- What tools and technical assistance do you need?

Each group summarized their discussions on each of the potential key primer elements. The main points of each summary are listed below.

Group 1
- Integrated planning process & community visions and goals
  - Change the process so that visions and goals are identified first, and then the plan is developed based on the identified vision and goals. Funding availability should be assessed last and realistically based on what is included in the plan.
- Technical analysis and performance measures & plans policies and programs
  - The document should identify the performance metrics that speak to livability and can be used across all regions. Once these metrics have been identified, analyze the technical capabilities that will be required to enable this analysis.
  - Identify the thresholds that define success.
  - In addition to having good metrics, it is necessary to develop a process for using these metrics
- Project implementation strategies
  - Develop useful design standards and guidelines, particularly as they relate to the intersection of planning and engineering. Having effective tools ensures that plans are translated into reality.
  - Shorten funding cycles.
- Communications and outreach
  - Present information clearly, succinctly, and in an attractive way.
  - Involve people who are well versed in graphics and design to help convey the messages.
  - Reach out to the general public.
  - The message should focus on the economic benefits of livability.
  - Identify new partner agencies that can help sell and convey the messages about smart growth. For example, the green realtor certification program could prove to be an effective partner.
  - Look at the location efficiencies by analyzing housing and transportation costs associated with housing location choices.

Group 2
- Integrated planning process
  - All plans—both general and specific—should address livability. If one plan ignores the topic of livability, there is a risk that livability will not be properly addressed.
  - Meaningful dialogue and discussion is important.

- o As plans are updated, they should be adapted and modernized to address and incorporate livability standards.
- o Elected officials must buy in to the process.
- Community visions and goals
  - o Departments must define the working area.
  - o It is important to have short-, mid-, and long-term visions.
  - o Go for the quick successes that will bring the most bang for the buck. These examples can help community members' view and recognize the value of livability standards.
  - o Require annual reports to check on the status of project progress. This will help to remind people in a subtle way of what they have looked at in the past and the goals toward which they are working.
- Technical analysis and performance measures & Plans policies and programs
  - o Consider a wide variety of issues, as it is important to consider the entire package and not select a small number of issues on which to focus.
- Communications and outreach
  - o Work with the marketing community to develop a message that ties livability to the economy and return on investment.
  - o Develop a national clearinghouse for livability and use it as a resource for communities that may be struggling to implement livability.
  - o Consider using social media and web 2.0 to spread the message.
  - o Use methods that community organizations are already using to spread the message to identify what works best in a particular area.
  - o Always emphasize the long-term cost and fiscal sustainability.
  - o Differentiate the products by target market. Messaging needed to engage technical staff is often very different from the messages that resonate with the public.

Group 3
- Integrated planning process & Community visions and goals
  - o Focus on an integrated approach at the regional level for implementing livability. Align this approach with Federal funding opportunities.
- Technical analysis and performance measures
  - o Recognize that regions are different across the nation. Federal agencies could develop a framework for analysis with a key menu on analysis tools that would support decisions for a variety of different regions.
  - o Develop a place-based approach to addressing local needs. This could be in the form of a FHWA analysis toolbox.
- Plans policies and programs
  - o Help ensure that plans are feasible.
  - o Recognize the importance of getting good buy-in early on from those who will be implementing the projects.
  - o Highlight the Context Sensitive Solution approach.
  - o Focus on developing a shared vision through improved scoping during the planning phase.
- Communications and outreach
  - o Framing the message is very important. Use terminology to which people can relate, personalize the message and tie it to quality of life issues and choice, and highlight community benefits.

Group 4
- Integrated planning process
  - o The key issues are facilitating coordination between transportation and land use.

- o The Federal government should provide examples and research on best practices to help local governments implement these strategies at the local level.
- Community visions and goals
  - o Focus on goal setting.
  - o Be context sensitive and recognize that there are different priorities at different levels. The approach to solutions will change depending on the geographic level at which it is being implemented.
  - o There is a lack of alignment between the steps involved in developing local goals through to securing funding. Sometimes changes in goals are required in order to secure funding. This needs to change.
- Technical analysis and performance measures
  - o Move away from traditional measures.
  - o Recognize that transportation measures tend to be outcome-focused.
  - o Help agencies develop tools to build regional models and measure outcomes.
  - o Focus on existing transportation research centers to provide a prescribed research agenda. There is almost one research center per large MPO, which could help focus national research.
  - o Better understand people's behavioral decisions related to transportation.
  - o Look at a holistic outcome rather than just a single outcome. For example, change the analysis of highway Level of Service.
- Plans policies and programs
  - o Structures such as up front agreements and cooperative agreements can be helpful in bringing partners together in a more formalized manner.
  - o Change design manuals to make complete streets planning the default. Mainstream this process to help embed it into people's thinking.
  - o Move away from the exception process.
- Communications and outreach
  - o Incorporate case studies to spread the word about best practices.
  - o The peer-to-peer aspect of communication is important. Identify different ways to facilitate communication among peers. This is particularly important for conversations between engineers and State DOT engineers.
  - o Communicate the economic benefits, as this is especially important for communicating with local electives.
  - o Recognize that the message needs to change depending on the audience.

Group 5
- Integrated planning process
  - o Improve the integration between and within land use and transportation plans and comprehensive plans. Currently, there is segmentation between them.
  - o Include a basic explanation of what is meant by "good planning." Provide a technical-friendly description about planning for non-planners.
  - o Recognize the importance of performance measures.
- Community visions and goals
  - o Identify the process links to implementation. Break down the process into its distinct elements.
  - o Recognize the importance of visualization.
  - o Include case studies that discuss challenges and missed opportunities as well as successes so that people reading those case studies can not only achieve what had been achieved in the examples, but also go beyond that and avoid the challenges.
- Technical analysis and performance measures
  - o Recognize the natural carrying capacity of areas. This idea has not been fully explored thus far.

- o Provide a menu of performance measures. Include information on the benefits of livability in a format that is readily available, and easy to use and apply. For example, providing X service will result in Y benefit.
  - o Use network analysis in order to set better performance measures for the long-term. The network analysis would be different than the Context Sensitive Solution approach, as this could be applied at the regional, local, or Statewide level.
- Plans policies and programs
  - o Use a policy filter as a way to bridge current gaps in decisionmaking. Ask the important questions before investing in something.
  - o Use pre-qualification criteria. Consider developing a certification for grant programs.
  - o Make sure that the plans, policies, and programs translate into design standards so that they make it through the entire process.
- Project implementation strategies
  - o Provide guidance on securing local political acceptance and buy-in. Fight the "quick buck" syndrome, as projects that are funded quickly may not necessarily meet the goals of a community.
  - o Include good advice on keeping the development community engaged.
  - o Professional organizations such as the American Planning Association, the American Association of Architects, may be able to offer advice to government associations on developing assistance programs. Many professional organizations have assistance programs where they bring in people with expertise and discuss a variety of issues to produce holistic results.
  - o Recognize the difference between sub-area as compared to corridor planning. The concept of corridor visioning is positive, but it is important to look at the sub-area level as well.
- Communications and outreach
  - o Social media is a key tool.
  - o Developing a clearinghouse would be good.
  - o FHWA provides a lot of networking assistance for programs like safe routes to schools. This model should be used to provide something similar for State agencies.

Identifying Opportunities:

Briefly, *Harrison Rue* summarized the previous workshop feedback about the different audiences for the final materials and the list of possible elements in the toolbox that FHWA will subsequently be creating. The potential audiences are FHWA division offices, MPOs, DOTs, local governments, Federal agencies, policymakers/ decisionmakers, general interested public. The draft toolbox concepts are in the table below.

Confirmed	Floating/Potential
Livability research paper	FAQs & fact sheets • Hypothetical situations/projects • Benefits • Multiple audience – public policy
Workshop synthesis	Brochures/roadshow materials
Livability primer	Online clearinghouse
PowerPoint template	Stock PowerPoint
Success story technical memorandum	More dynamic website
Livability in Transportation Guidebook	Image/video gallery
FHWA livability website resources	

Closing and Next Steps: To finish the day, the facilitators and FHWA thanked participants and explained the next steps in the creation of the supporting guidance materials for organizations around the country that are interested in pursuing or advancing livability in transportation efforts in their community.

Evaluation Forms & Changes for Next Meeting:

In general, workshop participants reviewed the workshop favorably. The facilitators added a one-on-one discussion activity following the afternoon presentations in order to help participants stay engaged in the conversation. Participants enjoyed the one-on-one exercise following the regional presentations, and so this format was incorporated into the Denver workshop as well. During the afternoon "Regional Livability Planning Strategies" discussion, the discussion built on the elements discussed in other workshops to help gather more input on the potential primer elements. While participants enjoyed the format of having regional presentations followed by small breakout discussions, some of the participants thought the regional presentations were too long and could have been shortened. One participant requested that the workshop go deeper into the issues and go beyond the high, conceptual level. Because of these recommendations, the Denver workshop will follow a similar format and incorporate the one-on-one discussion activity into the afternoon agenda. It will also follow a similar format for the "Regional Livability Planning Strategies" discussion to build on elements discussed in the first four workshops.

Workshop Participants	
Alia Anderson	Reconnecting America
Amy Cummings	Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County, NV
Andrea Riner	Lane COG
Bob Laurie	Alaska DOT and Public Facilities
Brian Gibson	Oahu MPO
Cecily Way	Parsons Brinkerhoff
David O'Connell	Mason Transit
Flinn Fagg	City of Las Vegas, NV
Fred Dock	City of Pasadena, CA
Gordon Garry	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
Jack Ecklund	City of University Place, WA
Jason Van Havel	Nevada DOT
Jesse Gothan	City of Sacramento DOT
John Evans	Lane Transit District
Kathy Sokugawa	City and County of Honolulu, HI
Kimo Kai	Department of Hawaiian Home Lands
Margi Bradway	Oregon DOT
Marilee Mortenson	Caltrans
Martin Tuttle	Caltrans
Martyn James	Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Michael LoGrande	City of Los Angeles Planning
Mike McKeever	Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Paul Zykofsky	Local Government Commission
Paula Reeves	Washington State DOT
Stacie Dabbs	California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley
Steven Soenksen	Alaska DOT and Public Facilities
Therese Trivedi	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Tom Kloster	Metro
Tracy Foutz	City of Henderson, Nevada
Federal Observers	
Aimee Kratovil	FHWA – California Division Office
Carolyn Mulvihill	EPA
Cecelia Crenshaw	FHWA – California Division Office
Chris Ganson	EPA
Cynthia Abbot	HUD – Region 9
Elizabeth Fischer	FHWA – Hawaii Division Office
Eric Eidlin	FTA
Hannah Visser	FHWA – Nevada Division Office
Lori Porreca	FHWA – Idaho Division Office
Michael Vanderhoof	FHWA – Alaska Division Office
Satvinder Sandu	FHWA – Oregon Division Office
Shana Baker	FHWA – Headquarters
Sue Kiser	FHWA – California Division Office
Consultant Team	
Elizabeth Wallis	ICF International
Harrison Rue	ICF International
Whit Blanton	Renaissance Planning Group
Kathleen Rooney	ICF International

Livability Examples Provided by Sacramento Participants

In order to draw on the vast experience and knowledge of the selected participants, participants were asked to send the facilitators relevant information on best practices related to livability within their communities prior to the workshop. This information, along with the information that regional representatives presented during the workshop, are listed below. This information serves as an informal collection of examples that could be used in future guidebook/primer efforts when discussing best practices and developing case studies.

- Mason County Transportation Authority, Mason Transit Community Center, http://www.masontransit.org/community/ctransctr.html
    - o "Chapter 1: Public Engagement" (file sent by David O'Connell) discussing public engagement strategy for the Mason Community Transit Center project (January 2009)
- Reconnecting America, "Realizing the Potential for Sustainable and Equitable TOD," (November 2009), http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/resource-center/books-and-reports/2009/realizing-the-potential-for-sustainable-equitable-tod/
- City of Las Vegas
    - o Green Building 2.0 Program, http://www.lasvegasnevada.gov/files/GreenBuilding_Brochure_Final.pdf
    - o CELEBRATE Employee Program (an employee-based effort to increase the sustainability and efficiency of city's day-to-day operations), http://www.lasvegasnevada.gov/sustaininglasvegas/16027.htm
    - o Club Ride (works with employers and commuters in the Las Vegas Valley to establish custom commute options programs and get commuters to try new modes for getting to work), http://www.rtcsnv.com/club_ride/
    - o "Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan—Transportation & Streets and Highways Element," http://www.lasvegasnevada.gov/files/Transportation_Streets_Hwys_Element.pdf
    - o "Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan—Transportation Trails Element," http://www.lasvegasnevada.gov/files/TransTrailsElmnt.pdf
    - o "Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan—Transit Element," http://www.lasvegasnevada.gov/files/Transit_Element.pdf
    - o Walkable Community and Corridor Plans, http://www.lasvegasnevada.gov/Government/19709.htm
    - o Unified Development Code http://www.lasvegasnevada.gov/files/CLV_Unified_Development_Code.pdf
- Hawaii Department of Transportation
    - o Complete Streets Task Force, http://hawaii.gov/dot/search?SearchableText=complete+streets
    - o Long-range General Plan Update and Regional Development Plan Updates (These regional plans include elements of complete streets and sustainability, and all city and State agencies are supposed to keep these principles in mind when developing their long range "functional" plans.), http://honoluludpp.org/Planning/OahuGenPlan.asp
    - o Transit-Oriented Development Program, http://honoluludpp.org/Planning/
    - o HUD and DOT Grant to implement a Transit-Oriented Housing Strategy, http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/States/hawaii/news/HUDNo.2010-10-20
- California Department of Transportation
    - o California Interregional Blueprint, http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/californiainterregionalblueprint/
    - o Smart Mobility Framework, http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/smf.html
    - o Complete Streets, http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/complete_streets.html
    - o Regional Blueprint Planning Program, http://calblueprint.dot.ca.gov/
- Sacramento Area Council of Governments, Blueprint, http://www.sacregionblueprint.org/
- Local Government Commission, La Jolla Boulevard, Bird Rock, San Diego Road Diet and Roundabouts, http://www.lgc.org/issues/communitydesign/street_design.html
- Regional Transportation Commission
    - o Complete Streets Study, http://www.rtcsnv.com/mpo/plansstudies/completestreets/index.cfm
    - o Current project efforts related to constructing a regional network of bike lanes and trails, http://www.rtcsnv.com/mpo/projects/index.cfm
- City of University Place, WA, City vision for redeveloping Bridgeport Way and Grandview Drive, http://www.ci.university-place.wa.us/Page27.aspx (general information)

This page intentionally left blank

Denver, Colorado Summary

Discussion Summary: The Denver workshop discussion emphasized concerns of small towns and rural areas in trying to implement livability. Key discussion points included:

- Challenges such as lack of funding both for livability and in general, a lack of "out of the box" thinking about traffic flow and transportation solutions overall, and staff capacity and time in rural areas.

- Solutions such as context sensitive messaging and messaging that demonstrates government's ability to help, funding and focusing on problems rather than projects, engaging developers and other private sector partners, and reimagining state roads that run through small towns.

- Key primer elements, which include making the document comprehensive and useful for planners in a variety of contexts, providing information on how to begin as well as case studies and examples of successful implementation of livability projects or programs.

- Communication and outreach methods, particularly visualization techniques and tools to support scenario planning, web integration for the primer, and performance metrics for livability.

This workshop culminated with the full development of ideas by the participants, building on the previous workshop participants' efforts. The meeting structure included a number of presentations on regional practices, as well as a significant amount of brainstorming, facilitated discussion, and idea sharing. A summary of activities and key outputs follows.

Workshop Specifics:

Location:

EPA Region 8 Office
1595 Wynkoop Street
Denver, CO 80202

Date / Time:

May 5, 2011 from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm

Welcome and Introductions:

Denver workshop discussions.

Lucy Garliauskas, Director of FHWA's Office of Human Environment welcomed everyone to the workshop and thanked EPA for hosting the workshop at the Region 8 office. Ms. Garliauskas discussed the USDOT's role in the Partnership for Sustainable Communities, which focuses on encouraging and facilitating a national dialogue about how to make wise decisions about using scarce resources, particularly as it relates to transportation investments. The Office of Human Environment has recently focused on defining the role of FHWA in advancing livability, which centers on facilitating people's mobility rather than the mobility of cars. The Office is also emphasizing a multidisciplinary multimodal approach to transportation decisionmaking.

Representatives from the regional Partnership agencies provided additional opening remarks. *John Cater, Division Administrator for FHWA Colorado Division Office* highlighted Region 8's efforts related to the Partnership. The regional partnership members have met regularly since the partnership started and they have also developed a common site where relevant information and resources are posted and shared. *Charmaine Knighton, Deputy Regional Administrator for FTA Region 8* noted that FTA has been working on livability-related concepts for a while, but the new partnership efforts have highlighted the silos that still exist and need to be eliminated in order to help communities implement livability. For example, interagency grant review and selection is helpful in bringing people together to discuss practices and how

they can be implemented across a variety of contexts. *Eddie Sierra, Acting Assistant Regional Administrator for EPA Region 8* discussed the use of brownfields funding to support charrette efforts that are focused on building most sustainable communities, particularly as it relates to energy and stormwater management. Additionally, EPA is focusing on helping provide people with choices on how they arrive at their destination so that community residents can live, work, and play as they desire. *Richard Garcia, Regional Administrator for HUD Region 8 Office* noted that the mountain west has a number of opportunities for infill development and transit construction, which can help advance the partnership for regional sustainability. In the long term, many of these projects will help to create livable communities with a mix of housing, a range of incomes, various economic development opportunities, and transit access. Following these opening remarks, participants introduced themselves, as did the meeting facilitators and managers from ICF International and Renaissance Planning Group.

Setting the Stage for Livability:

Harrison Rue from ICF International reviewed the purpose and outcomes of both the overall project and the day's workshop in particular. As the majority of participants indicated that they had read the background paper developed for this project, *The Role of FHWA Programs in Livability: State of the Practice Summary,* Mr. Rue provided a brief overview of the paper's content. This overview included a review of the Sustainable Communities Partnership and the associated principles, components included in the definition of "livability in transportation," benefits of incorporating livability, overall research findings, and a review of State of the practice examples from areas that have successfully incorporated livability into a variety of efforts. Mr. Rue noted that the day's workshop would focus in particular on rural areas and the livability concerns facing those areas.

Identifying Challenges to Livability:

Harrison Rue from ICF International reviewed the primary challenges identified at the four previous workshops. Keeping these challenges in mind, participants were asked to focus on the following three questions during a large group discussion session:

1. What are the big challenges to implementing transportation solutions that support and advance livable communities?
2. How are the challenges different in rural areas (including towns and small cities)?
3. What is one solution that has worked for your agency?

Participants identified six main categories of challenges, as well as potential solutions that could be used to overcome some of these challenges. During the discussion, participant recommendations were listed on flip charts and posted around the room for participants to reference during discussion. Using a dot voting exercise, the five below reflect the priorities from the participants.

Funding tailored to projects → not solving problems from a broad-based multimodal perspective
- The lack of dedicated livability funding presents a barrier to working on multimodal complete streets projects. It is difficult to identify ways to complete multimodal projects with the funding that is currently available.

- It is difficult to coordinate different types of funding sources for livability projects, as they tend to take an integrated approach and cross a number of topic areas. It is important to consider thinking about solutions from a systemic approach rather than an individual project approach. Without a change to funding, the ability to implement systematic change is limited. This change in approach may or may not be more difficult to implement in rural areas.

- Rural areas face a continuous barrier to implementing livability due to lack of funding. Many rural areas are interested in livability planning, but are unable to pay for implementation or maintenance.

- There is a lack of follow-through from design through to construction.

- Smaller communities need help in brokering access to the different funding opportunities and pots of money so that they can pursue livability.

- Many people have been trained in an old transportation paradigm where they view every problem as a transportation problem. In order to overcome this view, it is important to identify broad purpose and goals in the beginning so that the project is not narrowed to one mode from the very beginning. By keeping the goals broad, it reduces the probability that there will be a guaranteed outcome before the approaches have been examined in terms of cost effectiveness and ability to address the need.
    - To ensure a broad perspective from the beginning, it is important to have discussions early on in the project development phrase in order to define the project and make sure that a variety of features are considered and discussed. Through defining the project scope, these discussions should also identify whether or not the project would duplicate prior efforts.
    - It is important to involve nontraditional players who are interested in advancing livability projects so that the resulting TIP or STIP is truly reflective of what is going on in the State.

- Develop meaningful performance measures so that practitioners can draw on concepts that are meaningful to people.

- In rural areas, it would be helpful to provide access to expertise for those planners who are unaware of how to go about addressing livability issues. This could be addressed by hiring a livability "generalist" At the regional or county level. Given the lack of expertise with livability in rural areas in particular, it is important to have generalists who understand the overall concept of livability, but are not dedicated to one area. This can help to eliminate silos. As many rural areas rarely have a separate departments dedicated to specific functions, it is important to have someone dedicated to this issues.

Measures of traffic flow → speed and capacity dominates livability considerations

- Measuring traffic flow should account for alternative modes of transportation. There is currently a dominance of an automotive vehicle traffic flow approach to planning. There is a need to overcome the idea that traffic flow should only focus on vehicles and that vehicle capacity/speed should not account for alternative modes. Altering these measurements can help support alternative performance measures as well as help to shift funding priorities, as many funding sources are tied to traditional vehicle traffic flow measurements.

- Consider that standards may not work across all community contexts. In many areas, the State and local standards are very different.
    - Identify how to begin the conversation about what is really needed and paying for this through local funds.

Single-minded approach to solutions → need a broader framework to meet needs

- Identify how programs can help align livability principles and project focus. For those projects operating within existing developments, there is an opportunity to retrofit existing infrastructure to be more multimodal-friendly.

- When developing solutions, keep the perspective of the customer in mind. It is important to start simply and build from that. The end goal should be to help people have the best day possible.

- Even within local jurisdictions, it is difficult to get partners to discuss ideas related to livability with one another. Going beyond this to collaborate on a regional vision in order to elevate these ideas and market them at the State level is even more difficult. The challenges are not limited to interagency collaboration between jurisdictions, but rather between the different agencies within one locality.

- Help local communities understand that they are involved in the conversation about regional livability, and that the results of decisions made in other localities extends to their local community. Regional players need to understand the benefits to implementing livability projects in their community, as well as in other regional communities.

- Recognize that very different approaches work in different contexts. For example, the tools and approaches that work within urban areas do not necessarily work within rural areas. In many cases, this even requires a completely new and different set of approaches and tools for each area.

- Many small towns in rural areas are struggling with population growth related to the retirement community development. This adds a new dimension of the unique needs of an aging population.
  - Some of these needs include developing bus and van services to ensure that those residents who cannot drive can still access the services that they need. While it is likely that multiple modes will be needed, it may involve an on-demand service approach. This approach is very different than what would be used in an urban area. It is important to gain support from congressional leaders to build in new types of requirements related to these needs.

- Transforming the "project pipeline" into a "problem pipeline" is an important switch that needs to occur. This approach of identifying a solution to a problem rather than to a project will require new tools.
  - Master planning can play a role in this change; however, until the TIP and STIP are no longer the focus for funding, steps cannot be taken to move forward.
  - Construct a framework for advancing projects by identifying the assembly of needs, clarifying what the pipeline would look like, and determining how it would function. The challenge will be in finding the right kinds of projects that support and facilitate both rural and suburban needs.
  - It may be possible to have a new framework by changing the dynamic and reframing the pipeline discussion early on, before the TIP and STIP are developed. The reframing should happen during the comprehensive and/or general plan development, before project money is assigned. Communities can then focus on developing a broader vision for the community in response to current, identified challenges. Changing this framework will allow for the TIP and STIP to be responsive to the community and/or general plan.
  - For rural communities in particular, the framework may need to be different, as these areas tend to identify projects based on the funding outlined in the TIP and STIP. Rural areas generally respond to the conditions on the ground when money becomes available. It would be helpful to allocate money in a different way that is responsive to a community's values.

- To overcome interagency barriers, become more aware of what is going on in the community, including identifying the customer and the customer's needs. Identify what the choices are and how to make appropriate investments based on these choices.

- Rural areas do not have the ability to measure across all modes; therefore, in order to develop solutions, metrics should be reported in a more comprehensive way.

Changing land use policy and engaging developer and private sector partnerships

- Changing land use policies present a challenge to implementing livability.

- Stress the importance of land use as it relates to supporting transportation decisions. Housing choices must be incorporated into the decisionmaking process, as housing location factors directly into transportation trip decisions. Simply providing transportation land use and mode choice is not a sufficient choice in itself. People must have the option of living close to their ultimate trip destinations so that they have the option of making shorter trips.

- It is difficult to secure buy-in for changing land use policies. The local communities must be involved in the land use decisions, particularly about how they relate to the community's vision for livability. Private sector involvement from developers and lenders is also very important. Government resources alone will not allow many communities to achieve their visions, so having the private sector involvement will play a key role in implementation. Having a working partnership with local government involvement allows for an integrated approach and helps to eliminate many of the barriers that could arise when working to implement livability principles.

Retrofit State highways running through small communities → local capacity to initiate change

- Communities that were overdesigned in the 1960s, 70s, and 80s with a highway as their main street struggle with retrofitting this development pattern. Many of these communities struggle with identifying ways to change this pattern. Sometimes these communities are not aware of what change they want to put in place. Additionally, barriers arise when working with the State DOT to gain support for making a change, as many State DOTs view these places as capacity corridors rather than areas for placemaking. As is proposed with the reauthorization bill, it would be helpful to have a way to tie Federal money to placemaking, particularly for communities with high capacity roads running through them. With this new plan, application-based grants would be used to fund livability projects that include a broader variety of components that is not just limited to one mode. Many State DOTs are opposed to this change, as it takes away their contract authority and their funding to address basis system preservation needs. To avoid this issue, a new category of funding would need to be made available.

- As there have not been any major State highway projects constructed for a long time, the current challenge is working with the existing system and identifying ways to retrofit these highways to accommodate new purposes beyond moving cars through towns. Existing highways do not serve any of the local multimodal transportation needs. While State DOTs have generally been open to these changes, one of the barriers facing this change is the institutional capacity of changing the roads. For smaller towns, the county transportation department could become the planning department and begin addressing this issue.

- Many State DOTs have focused solely on highways, and this focus needs to shift to accommodate a new focus in many rural communities on livability. State DOTs should begin a discussion with rural areas about what is needed and what the current budget can accommodate. Many of these areas are interested in enhancing different components such as sidewalks, bike/pedestrian, and their downtown core as a part of livability, and the State DOT can play an important role in implementing these changes.

    o For those towns where State roads pass through the downtown, it is often difficult to gain support for adding a sidewalk along these routes. Often, the local highway technical engineers do not view sidewalk requests as a priority, even though it is a minimal cost. It is important to address the funding silos and the lack of lifecycle analysis as it relates to funding approval. Altering how project value is defined so that it accounts for long-term and lifecycle costs will be important in helping to shift the discussion. For sidewalks in particular, FHWA requirements are in place that require sidewalk construction unless the developer can identify a reason why it should not be constructed. It is important to

educate FHWA staff about these policies so that they begin asking questions about why livability measures such as sidewalks are not being supported. This cycle needs to be changed.
- o It is important to demonstrate the use of funds.

Other

- Communication Efforts to Support Livability Implementation
  - o Communicate and quantify the benefits of livability projects.
  - o Recognize that messaging will need to change in response to local differences and contexts.
  - o Educate local decisionmakers and State decisionmakers about the concept of livability so that they are informed and can make the best decision possible.
  - o Better define the size of a rural community. For regional planning grants, a population of 200,000 and below is considered rural whereas FTA considers 50,000 and below to be rural. This interagency disconnect on definitions presents challenges for planning.
  - o Recognize that rural is not a blanket term that can be applied nationally. There are many gradations of what is meant by "rural," and community resource needs vary based on these differences. This is particularly true when comparing rural communities on the east versus those on the west.
  - o It is difficult to identify what a "rural housing program" includes, or how it is defined. More research is needed on figuring out how housing functions in rural areas.
  - o Greater public engagement and involvement is needed. Simply informing people about proposed plans without a discussion does not quality as public engagement. The public needs to be part of the planning discussion so that beneficial outcomes result.
- Rural Issues
  - o Rural States have limited capacity, staff resources, or staff knowledge to address the lack of capacity at a local level. Particularly for small cities and towns, there is lack of staff and exposure to new, innovative ideas.
  - o For those gateway communities near national parks and refuges, there is a need for further engagement with Federal land management agency partners. There are many unique challenges related to land use, economic development, and local engagement. The dynamics for these communities are very different, as these areas succeed based on visitation numbers.
  - o Capturing the differences in what is meant by the term "rural" becomes a problem when identifying how to award funding. Rural areas want to be viable competitors for grants; however, given resource and expertise limitations, some of these areas may not be well situated to address livability challenges effectively.
  - o Many issues in rural areas stem from the fact that the local economy has collapsed. Without rebuilding these economies, it is difficult to address any of the pressing issues. Given that, when funding does become available, these areas do not tend to focus on the quality of the result or the long-term effects. Identifying a larger, regional economic development strategy that includes rural communities would be helpful. This would help rural areas to identify those value-added projects that should be pursued.
  - o Many tribes have very large sections of land in the western States, and the roadway capacity in these tribal communities is minimal to nonexistent. Oftentimes these communities must decide between one road or another, so one roadway is usually left out. Among tribal communities, there is a wide range of sophistication and level of relationship with regional areas. There are very different processes and timelines. Tribal

communities are very different than rural or small town areas, and therefore require unique descriptors and tools.

  o Keep in mind that rural towns do not have the training, staff, and/or resources to do much visioning or plan development. Identifying a way to provide those services to rural communities would be helpful.

- Now that gas prices are high, people want to move in closer to town, which can help generate support for livability.

- It is important to identify ways to get people out of their cars and convince them to use alternative modes.

- Recognize that, beyond 2014, the STIP will only contain projects related to system preservation, as there will not be any funding for new projects, capacity, etc. The biggest challenge will therefore be developing accurate methods for cost/benefit analyses to determine those projects in which areas should invest.

  o How livability is defined within this context will also change.

  o Funding requirements will likely shift to incorporate a method for vetting how funding will be spent up-front in the process.

- Recognize the shift in demographics. Traditionally, retirees have moved out of town into rural areas; however, this may change when they realize access to services is limited. The suburban demographic is also shifting. More research is needed on these populations and demographic shifts to understand the housing choices that the younger generation prefers, and the future trends. Reaching out to the variety of populations requires significant amounts of money and time.

  o Currently, many of these rural areas operate by planning in response to the money that is available in the TIP and/or STIP rather than waiting for appropriate funding to address pressing needs.

- Many areas are struggling with their maintenance responsibilities. Particularly for those areas that have been built to high standards, the cost of maintaining this infrastructure has become extremely high. In some areas, these costs are so high that they cannot afford to plow and/or shovel the sidewalks or maintain the landscape. The issue of maintaining roadways needs to be expanded to other facilities in order to generate other, viable maintenance options.

A summary of the solutions that participants mentioned are listed below. As many of these solutions are broadly applicable to a variety of challenges, they are not grouped into discrete categories.

- There are a number of opportunities for combining public and private funding sources; however, many people are unaware of these options. One example of combined funding is long-term maintenance money.

- Alter marketing and messaging efforts to convey that the government is here to help the community (both public and private partners) develop solutions rather than saying that the government is here to tell the community how to make a sustainable community.

  o Marketing messages should include how implementing livability can help communities be more efficient and save on infrastructure costs.

  o Frame livability planning as a business plan.

  o Change the message so that it is responding to people's interests and desires, including the ability to make the system more efficient.

Following this discussion, participants received four dot stickers, which they used to vote for the challenges they thought were the most significant. No limit was placed on this voting process, and participants were allowed to use one or all four dots on any one particular challenge, depending on the significance they placed on it. As mentioned above, the categorization of the six identified challenges reflect the voting priorities from this exercise.

Overcoming Challenges:

Three of the workshop participants presented on successful livability efforts in the region, allowing all workshop participants to see and hear about successful livability examples in their region. *Sandi Kohrs from Colorado DOT* discussed a number of the Department's sustainability and livability initiatives, including the Transportation and Environmental Resource Council (TERC) sustainability subcommittee, their main streets initiative, and a land use and transportation planning integration study. While the governor supports these initiatives, they have largely been successful due to community support and active involvement. *Jill Locantore from DRCOG* presented on the Board's collaborative approach to addressing regional challenges through Metro Vision, an integrated plan that seeks to incorporate planning elements related to transportation, growth, and environment. The plan emphasizes livability for all ages, with a particular focus on older adults and aging services, in response to growth projections for Denver's older adult population. DRCOG has developed evaluation criteria for the plan's elements based on desired outcomes, which were subsequently tied to quantifiable goals. *Will Toor, a Boulder County Commissioner*, discussed how the City of Boulder is using an urban growth boundary in order to ensure development is focused in certain areas. As part of the City's approach to transportation, Boulder is focusing on transit service and is working with major employers and the university to redesign the transit network so that it is more bus-based. The City of Boulder measures its improvements through performance measures focused on a variety of topics, including unemployment, foreclosure rate, and the change in mode share. Afterwards, there was a panel discussion, focusing on the key elements of their success:

- For Colorado DOT, small town involvement and local interagency coordination led to the success of the main streets program. The governor provided necessary support by emphasizing key locations for implementation.

    o The Colorado Department of Local Affairs was instrumental in bringing partners together and providing leadership for the main streets program.

- DRCOG's plan has been successful due to the inclusiveness of a wide variety of stakeholders during the initial plan development phases. Widespread involvement that was not limited to elected officials enabled the plan to be a truly regional plan. This inclusiveness has also contributed to the fact that the plan is still in place 20 years after its development.

- The City of Boulder has built upon small successes to demonstrate improvements to the public, which has generated continued public support. Starting with incremental changes has enabled them to convince people that doing things differently can actually work.

- Enabling flexibility and valuing community input led Colorado DOT to generate excitement on the part of the agencies involved. These agencies celebrated Colorado DOT's new approach of listening to the town about their desires rather than identifying what the town should do up front. Many of these towns had minimal resources and staff, but with their vision and funding from a variety of agencies, Colorado DOT was able to help the community implement their vision. Due to the success of this model, Colorado DOT hopes to implement the main streets program again.

- In response to the densification of downtown Denver resulting from the Urban Growth Boundary, Denver has adopted an approach similar to Boulder's through their Strategic Transportation Plan. This plan includes a stipulation that, due to the negative impacts that would result—both from a funding and community perspective—roads will not be widened. The focus has shifted to the capacity of roadways and how to move people instead of cars. FasTracks has played an important role in this new focus, as has the bicycle and pedestrian origin/destination program and increasing the cost of parking to make driving downtown less convenient. Denver's approach is based on recognition that congestion will always be present. Recognizing this, the city is identifying methods to improve the options that people have for arriving downtown that are not based on congested roadway routes.

- For Boulder, the way that efforts are funded has changed dramatically. It used to be much more difficult to fund complete streets projects. Twenty years ago at the MPO level, STP dollars were not flexed to go toward bike/pedestrian or transit projects.

- The shift in the way that State DOTs function has helped to advance livability efforts. Whereas State DOTs used to be highway departments that were not focused on initiatives outside of that domain, leadership has shifted to become more supportive of these efforts.

- The threat of smart growth legislation helped to motivate many local areas into demonstrating that they could manage their growth cooperatively and that mandates were not needed. The threat of legislation could potentially work for other initiatives as well. For rail in particular, the threat of legislation helped to motivate the Colorado DOT to create the Division of Transit and Rail. The Department's mission changed because of this threat, and it is transitioning away from solely focusing on moving goods and people toward an idea of supporting communities and enhancing the journey.

Following this roundtable discussion, participants divided themselves into five groups with a mix of State, regional, local, and Federal representatives. Each group was asked to focus on one of the top five challenges, as voted on by the participants during the dot-voting process:

1. Funding tailored to projects → not solving problems from a broad-based multimodal perspective
2. Measures of traffic flow → speed and capacity dominates livability considerations
3. Single-minded approach to solutions → need a broader framework to meet needs
4. Changing land use policy and engaging developer and private sector partnerships
5. Retrofit State highways running through small communities → local capacity to initiate change

During this hour-long discussion, participants were asked to focus on identifying solutions to one of the challenge areas and answer the questions below. In doing so, participants were asked to focus on the rural area perspective and consider examples where they had overcome a project challenge in a relevant topic area and use that experience to assist in answering the questions.

- What effective strategies have helped you to overcome challenges?
  - What was important for you to succeed?
  - How have you measured the success of your efforts?
- What helped you to align or integrated different funding and agency priorities?
- What kinds of public and interagency process worked?
- What, if anything, did the Partnership do to facilitate success?

Each group provided a quick summary of their discussion.

Funding tailored to projects → not solving problems from a broad-based multimodal perspective

- Fund outcomes rather than projects. One way to do this is to require corridor planning with extensive public involvements as a prerequisite to project planning. A corridor plan that is accomplished and adopted with a large amount of participation from stakeholders should then be awarded funding.

- Consider creating a new job title for something similar to a "funding concierge," a person who would look at the projects that people want to accomplish and work to apply the different funding programs so that a project can be put in place.

- Livability should be institutionalized as a given and/or primary focus and not just an add-on to a project. By starting a project with the perspective that it is an add-on, livability will always be marginalized.

- When funding is awarded for a project, the assumption is often that a complete street will be constructed. When working with stakeholder groups, it is common to only take implement what makes sense locally.

Measures of traffic flow → speed and capacity dominates livability considerations

- It is important to define a problem and not a solution. By identifying the problem and defining it clearly, it is more likely one will be able to identify the most appropriate solution. Currently, the system works to define the project first.

- There are not currently any performance measures that address livability. The performance measures are still focused on volume capacity and congestion. When capacity and congestion are the only things measured, they are the only things solved.
  - There is a strong need for different metrics other than trip delay and congestion that are focused on moving people, not cars.

- There is a lack of education across the board, particularly for community leaders, engineering students and/or decisionmakers. The education flow should be increased so that people understand the concept of livability better.

- While there is a movement toward complete streets and Context-Sensitive Solutions, there is a problem of who maintains that. There have been pilots around the country to identify funding sources for these projects and examine the criteria that should be considered when awarding funding. Currently, there is a strong focus on the up-front expenditure and on trying to figure out how a project will pay for itself over the long term. There should be more of a focus on interagency solutions and on identifying cost-sharing opportunities between agencies to fund similar outcomes.

- Projects should be driven by a broad range of interests, of which transportation should be one component. When beginning the project development process, it is important to reach out beyond the partners who are traditionally involved.

- Public involvement needs to happen up front in the project development process.

- Use scenario planning.

Single-minded approach to solutions → need a broader framework to meet needs

- At the visioning level, it is important to expand the process in the early stages of the development process in order to get input from a diverse group of stakeholders. When the process is more inclusive in the beginning, it can help carry forward various values and guiding principles. It is important to bring in broad perspectives at the project level so that the scope is more inclusive at the project delivery level.

- Use communication and messaging to prevent siloed solutions. At the implementation level, use capacity building to generate broader concepts. Having common language and concepts to connect across disciplines or political differences can begin to deconstruct silos. When problems are discussed from a broad perspective at the beginning of the process, it builds ownership and buy-in so that a prescribed solution is not guaranteed.

- It is important to have an expectation of collaboration from the beginning so that the collaborative vision carries through the entire process down to the micro level and project delivery.
  - Choices play an important part in the collaboration process.
  - One option would be to have agency representation from a variety of agencies participate in the grant selection process.

Changing land use policy and engaging developer and private sector partnerships

- It is important to incentivize private investment, as this plays an important role for land use. Density bonuses, parking reductions, shared use agreements, allowing increased height,

permitting different forms to accommodate greater density, and using tax increments or urban renewal options could be effective tools.

- Reduce risk and rezone travel corridors primarily around mixed use.

- There is a need for administrative approvals. People will not necessarily be willing to put money into projects if everything goes to one governing body, and there is only one public forum for which to comment on public projects.

- Encourage involvement from an economic development institution and/or group that would allow the articulation of a commercial vision. Many western communities have a disconnect between the suburban residential interest and all other interests. There are silos of communities where people whose interests are residential judge the commercial plan.

- Traditionally, there has been a strong focus on who wants to do business where. This should not be promoted further.

- Reach out to the private sector to see the amenities they identify as important. For example, in one community the chamber of commerce has closely identified with trails. Committing to certain modes of travel caters to particular people's interests.

- Adopting a form-based code would take us away from Euclidian zoning and would be a benefit for livability, particularly for travel and transit efficiency. County and city land use plans are often not consistent and thwart development in areas where planners may like to see it.

- There is a need for acceptance of smaller lots and higher densities. These concepts need to be communicated in a manner that suggests they are not applied in single neighborhoods, but rather across a broader community.

Retrofit State highways running through small communities → local capacity to initiate change

- Develop very distinct engineering and/or construction design guidelines that can be modified for small towns where the highway is the main street. Identify modifications so that small towns can stretch their resources and experience cost savings. Identify a flexible, tiered system that discusses these design solutions based on the type of main street and the type of small town. For example, if there is parking on a main street, there may only be one option for parking rather than considering other options.

- Work with State DOTs to help them embrace livability principles. For example, expand uses and increase the flexibility for using State monies. Many communities might be able to come up with the money to pay for plan, but often cannot pay for the engineering to implement it.

- Explore outside funds for enhancing engineering and planning. Identify whether there are outside funds that could be used from other agencies such as an economic development administration. A community could be cleared to use this money if they met grant guidelines for funding from another agency.

- Support successful hand-offs from the planning department to the engineering department to generate continuity for the project going forward.

- Educate State DOTs on the options for greater design flexibility to generate better livability projects. For example, if there is a mixed use environment, highway guidelines require certain street lighting; however, the looms might be extremely high and might create light pollution for people living in the residential context within that main street.

- Define the community more broadly to balance decisionmaking. Engage beyond transportation professionals to include a large group of stakeholders, including those involved with parks and recreation, merchants, and those who work with open space. Use a more holistic view of how the project would work together.

- Design innovation guidance for communities so that engineering staff is more engaged. Oftentimes a State DOT will approach the engineering department to request involvement, and the engineers will response that they are unable to help for various reasons. There is a need to create an environment where people are willing to be flexible and think outside of the box.

- The Colorado Department of Local Affairs has a helpful model that could be used as a toolbox for other States. In addition to the toolbox, there are some legislative initiatives on creating special improvement districts that could be included.

- Identify opportunities to create a regional transportation authority to enhance opportunities to use the funding opportunities that State DOTs have.

- Recognize that certain things that happen on our roadways are not always bad. For example, congestion indicates there is business in the community and is not necessarily a bad problem.

- Instead of always using standards, assess design innovations to FHWA guidance.

- Support more robust transportation planning.

Regional Livability Planning Strategies:

Three of the workshop participants presented on their organization's success in developing and implementing livability planning strategies at a regional level. *Patrick Shea, Project Manager and Technical Transportation Specialist for the National Park Service* discussed two alternative transportation projects: Zion National Park and Mount Rainier National Park. At Zion, there is a partnership effort between the gateway community and the National Park Service to generate a common solution for transporting visitors while at Mount Rainier, the National Park Service is applying corridor strategies to accomplish solutions. *Elaine Clegg, a Boise City Council Representative* presented on the region's livability efforts, which included using strategic planning to identify the best places to grow in the region and the best places for transit. Boise is using infill for placemaking in the region. *Tom Mason from the Cheyenne MPO* highlighted the regional livability efforts, which are built on Plan Cheyenne, a master plan based on various scenarios that are that are planned to work best for the community. This plan has allowed the community, for the first time, to look at how they would want the local public and private lands to be developed. Afterwards, there was a panel discussion, focusing on the key elements of their success:

- In Boise, stakeholders began talking to one another and having discussions in the same room, which enabled leadership across the valley.
- Cheyenne used a large public input program, which was very successful. This program helped demonstrate the strength that comes from tying community values to livability efforts. In addition to this program, many other initiatives were put out by the public planning agencies. The city focused on improving walkability and health impacts. For the small size of the community, they have achieved great success, including 30 miles of greenway.
- The National Park Service has been able to look beyond agency boundaries for constituent and resource support. Connections from the bottom up have lead to greater constituent involvement and people have begun to connect the dots between ongoing efforts. Organizations that are not normally in a collaborative environment are now working together, which has generated new forms and visions for the future from different participants.
- In designing their transit system, public involvement played a significant role for Boise. Over 2,000 individuals were involved from a variant of places.
- In Cheyenne, context sensitive solutions played a role in project and coordination success. The City allowed the MPO to take a center lane that was not serving a functional purpose and apply it to a sidewalk extension. The City realized it would improve pedestrian mobility and have positive safety implications. By connecting the planning efforts to local safety efforts, the MPO was able to meet theirs and the City's goals through one project. One of the keys to project success is

identifying another agency's concerns and making connections between one's own concerns and the other, potential partner agency.

Harrison Rue directed each participant to turn to the person next to them and, for one minute, discuss the question: What is the single most important thing that needs to be in the primer? Selected participants shared their responses. A summary of these responses is listed below.

- Education needs to occur at the leadership level and State level about what a livable community looks like.
- Help agencies reach outside of their normal boundaries and have the necessary dialogue. Agencies need to be more informed about how to partner with new people and new entities.
- Focus on addressing the needs of emerging places, particularly rural areas that are growing, but have not yet reached the size of a city.
- Understand the objectives and techniques of a variety of stakeholders.
- Provide more information on the use of performance measures. Consider using case studies as a way to convey this information. Providing guideline-based information is very helpful, as these give practitioners ranges of possibilities rather than prescriptions for applicable. It is helpful to offer a context-based approach to solving issues.
- Work more in the planning realm among all of the different stakeholders. Recognize that there is a continuum of conversations that occur from planning through project development.

Whit Blanton from Renaissance Planning Group discussed the initial concepts for the FHWA primer on implementing livability, in which FHWA is moving away from the idea of developing a regional livability model plan and more toward a primer or guidebook discussing how to implement these strategies and make it successful, and how best to put existing plans and processes together to start integrating livability efforts. The key elements of the primer, as identified through prior workshop discussions, could include the following: planning processes, including community visions and goals, integrated planning processes, technical analysis and performance measures, and plans and policies; implementation and programs; and messaging, communications, and outreach. Mr. Blanton reviewed that the primer is intended to provide some basic information that communities at all scales can apply to their local planning efforts. For this workshop in particular, participants were asked to consider the level of attention that should be devoted to discussing rural elements.

The discussion on the primer was split into an hour-long discussion on each of the key elements. Participants broke into five different groups with a mix of State, regional, local, and Federal representatives. *Harrison Rue* guided the discussion by breaking the discussion into two, twenty-minute segments where participants were asked to focus on particular elements and answer tailored questions about each. The first discussion focused on the following question, in the context of how they could be applied to integrated planning processes; community visions and goals; technical analysis and performance measures; and plans and policies:

- Which existing planning process should we focus on? Which ones need the most guidance?
- Which plans/processes will benefit the most from an integrated approach?
- In addition to scenario planning, what other kinds of analysis support livability?
- Which policies or programs are most effective in sparking and sustaining livability initiatives?

Following this initial discussion, Mr. Whit Blanton reviewed implementation strategies. In particular, he highlighted the value of multimodal corridors and networks, as they provide funding opportunities, leverage existing infrastructure, and can help to reduce capacity needs. When focusing on the maintenance needs of a project, livability is often a more cost effective option. To help with implementation, there is a need to address policies, guidelines, and standards so that they are appropriate to the scale at which they are being applied. The second discussion focused on the following questions, in the context of how they could be applied to implementation strategies:

- How do you most effectively bridge the gap between the plans/policies and project development/design?
- Where are the key implementation decision points?
- What interagency practices best support implementation of livable communities outcomes?
- How can the funding be better coordinated and leveraged?

Each group summarized their discussions on each of the potential key primer elements. The main points of each summary are listed below.

Group 1
- The guidance should be comprehensive, as practitioners often plan in a vacuum. This is particularly true of the transportation industry.
- Education should be a primary focus, as citizens and elected officials know very little about how land use and transportation is connected. Make sure there is a strong emphasis on comprehensive planning in all of the elements discussed within the primer.
- Provide a menu of options so that the public and elected decisionmakers can use a simplified selection process for solutions. In order to implement the primer and have it spread to a broad audience, it is important that people will be motivated to read and understand it.
    o Keep in mind that staff shortages are prevalent.
    o Identify how the primer will be read and the intended audience.
    o One of the main messages should be that, in the long run, the livability approach is worth it.
- Focus on scenario planning.
- Leverage ongoing activities in other agencies to achieve broader objectives. For example, consider approaching a utility company to partner on a project in the beginning stages of the project development process.
- Provide a checklist of attributes that are specific to livability (e.g. pedestrian circulation and safety). Develop a matrix that captures this information. With a matrix, people can check off the components they have considered already and then identify what they are missing. This matrix should include web links on where to find information so that people can access resources.
- Note that there is a need for a new job title—someone who brokers funding resources and brings together the financing for livability projects. Multiple agencies have different views on livability, and it is helpful to have someone who understands the differences.
- Stress the importance of identifying a leader—someone who will take risks and pushes ideas forward.
- Planning is not enough—there is a need for mechanisms that will put these ideas into action.
- Develop a standard set of codes so that developers are aware of design standards when implementing projects. It is helpful when a project is predictable for an investor.
- Provide guidance on how to get started, as people get overwhelmed with the process. This guidance could be something as simple as, begin implementing and build priorities from there. Provide simple guidance that people can use to get started.
- Highlight catalyst developments where a central, focal point is used to be the starting point for future efforts. In a very small town, it is important to have a project like this. For rural areas, the main street is often the community's best asset, and be used to build off.
- Highlight the benefits of using public private partnerships.
- Discuss how to engage nontraditional partners to cultivate champions. It is important to have diverse activists to work together. Sometimes, if there are only one or two people dominating a project, it is helpful to bring in other parties to help balance the discussion and make it more objective.
- Take an offensive approach to outreach and marketing. Getting the right people involved from the beginning can help with this strategy.

Group 2
- Planning process
  - o Emphasize the public stakeholder planning process. Describe how an agency would get to the right people. Provide examples of agencies and/or entities who should be involved. Note when to get these groups involved, as there may be certain times when it is more appropriate or inappropriate to get a stakeholder involved.
  - o Stress the importance of being detailed in outreach plans.
  - o Babysitting services can be helpful in motivating and allowing members of the public to attend public involvement sessions.
  - o Coordinate education efforts so that different messages are not floating around. With a road project, for example, it can be difficult to figure out how to combine the messages so that everyone is on the same page.
  - o Use visual preference studies, and include a description of the context and tradeoffs of the impacts. Visualization is very important for small communities, as it enables planners to describe why certain strategies work and the context that helps make projects more successful.
  - o Highlight scenarios that are tied to metrics (e.g. Envision Utah). Readers will want to see statistics that can connect benefits with cost and hold planners accountable.
  - o Stress the importance of having consistency between plans.
- Implementation strategies
  - o Ensure the budget reflects the plan, and vice versa to ensure accountability. Beyond having a great plan, it is important to be able to implement the plan.
  - o Develop performance measures tied to livability.

Group 3
- Planning Process
  - o The primer should provide an organizational framework as to how planning can be implemented in a variety of geographic settings. There is concern that small towns that do not have an MPO will be at a disadvantage to achieve some of the livability goals, and the guidebook should cater to these areas as well.
  - o Provide tools to help areas establish a vision and explore potential concepts through the various steps of the public engagement process. These tools could include charrettes and workshops.
  - o Coordinate tools and strategies to highlight other focus areas like economic development. It is important to quantify livability for people who are focused on the bottom line.
  - o Identify tools that can be used by multiple types of rural areas. For example, tools tailored to those areas that are second home communities as compared to those areas that go through boom and bust economies.
  - o In addition to discussing cost/benefit analyses of livability, provide a focused conversation on quality of life issues, as this is very important when talking with the public and decisionmakers. Storytelling can help demonstrate the importance of livability issues from a quality of life perspective.
  - o Deemphasize congestion in the project and funding prioritization process. It is important that reducing congestion is not the most important goal of a livability project from the onset.
- Implementation Strategies
  - o Identifying someone who can be a catalyst for a project is very helpful for implementation, as this person can instigate the process for change and encourage the institutionalization of different types of livability concepts.
  - o Examine possibilities for reallocating local transportation funding to support livability. Projects that address multiple focuses should be highlighted.

Group 4
- Identify how to incorporate livability into the project prioritization continuum, through to when the projects are included into a plan.
- Flexibility is important. Particularly when dealing with legacy projects, many investments may not be representative of livability and could be altered to incorporate livability principles. Currently, it is difficult to change these projects without changing the TIP or the overall program.
- Provide a matrix for messaging and communication so that users can draw on key messages when having conversations with different audiences.
- Focus on the regional Long Range Plan and the importance of having a diverse group of stakeholders. Within this discussion, highlight the cyclical nature of the plan and how this can be helpful for linking it with comprehensive plans. Note that the regional plan can also be used to elevate local needs to a higher level.
- Make multimodal data readily available so that practitioners are not constantly asked to justify the need for livability. Currently, it is easy to collect data on the number of vehicles, but it is much more difficult to find data on other modes. The lack of data makes it difficult to justify support for advancing multimodal efforts.
- Provide a cost/benefit analysis as relates to livability. Discuss the positive impact that livability investments have on the market, and how these investments pay for themselves in the long term.
- Highlight the importance of having a leader or a champion in an institution. It is not helpful when no one is in charge. Practitioners should understand the importance of starting to identify and institutionalize a champion for livability.
- Highlight the importance of including design and investment perspectives in the project decisionmaking process. These perspectives need to be solicited so that they can be institutionalized and drawn upon year after year.

Group 5
- Planning Process
  - Provide information on how to guide on visioning and scenario planning. Within this discussion, highlight the importance of involving the business perspective as well as others so that the process is driven by an integrated approach. While it is important to recognize that a lot of information is already in existence, users need to understand where to access this information.
  - Discuss the role of economic impacts in the decisionmaking process, particularly as it relates to transportation projects. Consider return on investment, potential impacts on the tax base, maintenance costs, and infrastructure construction costs. Provide tools that users can draw on to help ensure that economic considerations are included in the process.
    - Note the importance of having local buy-in from the business community for livability projects.
  - As there is a significant amount of data and information available, discuss those aspects on which users should focus for the livability discussion. Given that livability crosses a range of issues, it can be difficult to corral this information together and translate it into an output that is meaningful for the decisionmaking process.
- Implementation Strategies
  - Stress the importance of making communication and collaboration a continuous process throughout the entire decisionmaking process, and one that is inclusive of all stakeholders. During the beginning of the process, it is important to have buy-in from a variety of people. In order to do so, the decisions and visions should make sense to all of those involved. Maintaining communication efforts throughout the process enables

community engagement throughout the process, which increases the likelihood of project success.

- o Highlight accountability and the need to make sure those things are consistent throughout the process so that the values that the community established at the beginning are present at implementation. There is often a disconnect in bringing the vision through to the end of the process. One way to ensure continuity is by incorporating performance measures that are tied to the values and goals that motivated the process initially.
  - ▪ In particular, the Federal government needs to incorporate accountability to ensure that project processes are consistent.

Harrison Rue reviewed some successful communication and outreach efforts to identify some of the options available for messaging and marketing the concept of livability. Successful communication and outreach efforts have included fact sheets, summary brochures, summary posters, Web 2.0, and social media. Considering these efforts, and assuming an engaging public involvement process, participants were asked to reflect on the following questions in a large-group setting:

- What format/type of products should any new guidance take?
- What messages resonate with different groups to understand and help explain livability?
- What communications and marketing materials would help you to make the case for livability?
- What tools and technical assistance do you need?

A summary of the participants' discussion is captured below.

- Visioning is very effective in securing project buy-in, as residents are able to see what is meant by the terminology. Particularly for transportation planning, it can be difficult for residents to imagine the proposed result. One of the challenges with using this process is that it is very expensive, and therefore may not be a feasible option for rural areas. It would be helpful if visioning tools were more widely available, such as through a home office program that could be licensed out inexpensively to small towns.
- Develop an accessible photo library with descriptive captions that practitioners could drawn upon when discussing livability. It would be helpful to have photos showing different typologies and the different contexts so that there are readily available options to tell the livability story.
- There is a need for economic data to help support the conversation. This need is even more pressing now that people are so focused on the economy. The data should focus in particular on the economic benefits (e.g. overall economy, tax base, business development) that result from implementing various livability projects. Local residents and business owners are very concerned about the answers to these questions and providing real examples is helpful in demonstrating the benefits.
- Develop a framework for looking at different options and identifying what the multipliers on some of the different decisions might be.
- Develop a set of basic metrics that are officially approved by FHWA or the Partnership. Gathering these metrics takes a very long time, but if this information was readily available, it could be used in preliminary discussions with community and elected officials when discussing project benefits.
  - o This information could be made available through a clearinghouse and/or through a fact sheet that lists economic benefits.
  - o Examples of useful metrics include:
    - ▪ Main street revitalization benefits
    - ▪ By building a $5 million project, X number of people will be employed on average
    - ▪ Percentage of population that drives for one to two mile trips, and the associated economic advantage of providing bicycle facilities.
    - ▪ Cost/benefit analysis for infrastructure investments.

- Provide tools that support scenario planning. In order to keep a project moving forward, it is helpful to use scenario planning to adjust the project as needed and keep the project moving forward.
- Demonstrate how livability responds to the market and the demographics. Oftentimes the decisionmakers involved in market decisions have a very traditional point of view and are resistant to changing their practices to incorporate livability concerns. These decisionmakers often say that people do not want communities that incorporate livability, and that livability is not in line with the market. Research points in a different direction and it would be helpful to have information readily available about these demographic trends to help have this conversation.
- If the primer is directed to all audiences and constituencies, stories must be included in order to capture the segment of the audience that is not familiar with the technical language. These stories could be included in the sidebars and could include examples of community diversity in project implementation.
- Throughout the primer, indicate where Federal agencies may play a role and be involved. It is often a struggle for Federal partners to know where to enter the process, as they want to be helpful, but do not want to be too involved.
- YouTube videos can be very effective for messaging. For example, Congress for the New Urbanism created an upbeat video called "Sprawlanta" that discussed a mixed use project downtown. Similar videos could be used to show to a steering committee or planning council to help convey the message in a fun way with which people would connect.
- Social media is often underutilized for livability projects. The social media network is extremely powerful in connecting to people—particularly young generations. By tailoring messages appropriately, younger generations can be engaged so that they feel a part of the process and are excited about the outcome.
- More clearly identify the format of the primer, as it is currently unknown whether it will be a website or a published book.
- Consider changing the term "primer," as it is a very traditional word that does not make evoke engaging thoughts.
- Websites are very effective tools. Even just a simple website is a good way to share information.
- Most of the transportation engineering standards and standardized plans are aimed at urban areas and are not useful for rural areas. For example, many small towns have unpaved roads where sidewalks, street edges, and stormwater gutters are not applicable. The engineering standards and planning efforts do not apply to these places. It is important to identify real, practical, low-cost, environmentally friendly solutions that work for these rural areas.
- Develop a matrix that practitioners can use to identify different design treatments for various roadway typologies. Particularly for rural areas, it would be helpful to have solutions that communities of different sizes could easily apply to their community.

Closing and Next Steps: To finish the day, the ICF facilitators thanked participants and explained the next steps in the creation of the supporting guidance materials for organizations around the country that are interested in pursuing or advancing livability in transportation efforts in their community.

Lucy Garliauskas thanked everyone for coming. She highlighted that the main goal of the Partnership effort is to promote a new way of thinking about how problems are defined and how practitioners arrive at solutions. This new approach relies heavily on interagency collaboration and involvement. To help advance livability efforts, US DOT has been working to characterize the benefits of livability by gathering statistics and by developing performance measures that help demonstrate these benefits. Ms. Garliauskas reviewed the categories of statistics on which US DOT is focusing: 1) making the case for livability—emphasizing that sustainable communities are in demand; 2) sustainable communities reduce costs for households; 3) benefits to growing regional economies; 4) increase in home value; and 5) increase in health choices. She also highlighted some research efforts that support each of these benefits. This information will ultimately be posted on the USDOT livability partnership website.

Evaluation Forms:

In general, workshop participants reviewed the workshop favorably. The facilitators altered the afternoon format for the "Regional Livability Planning Strategies" discussion so that there were two, twenty-minute small group discussion segments rather than four, fifteen-minute discussion segments. This was the most significant format change from the Sacramento, CA workshop. Regarding the workshop focus, one participant noted that they did not feel well prepared to discuss rural issues and would have enjoyed more notice and guidance about the workshop focus. To help with the rural discussion, one participant requested greater representation from small towns. In addition, two participants requested more of a presence from HUD and EPA as workshop participants to help emphasize the Partnership goals and to balance the high representation from transportation professionals. A number of participants noted that the discussion was very high level and it would have been helpful to narrow the focus. Particularly for the small breakout sessions, some of the participants felt that there was limited guidance and they would have benefited from clearer guidance and desired outcomes. Particularly for the primer discussion, participants were unclear on the task with which they had been provided and the desired outcome from the facilitators. A number of participants requested more peer-to-peer exchange and an opportunity to share stories and experiences.

Workshop Participants	
Andrew Gruber	Wasatch Front Regional Council
Brandon Cammarata	City of Cheyenne, WY
Candi Beaudry	City of Billings, MT
Chris Quinn	Regional Transportation District
Craig Casper	Pikes Peak Council of Governments
Crissy Fanganello	Denver Public Works
Deanne Widauf	City of Cheyenne, WY
Elaine Clegg	City of Boise, ID City Council
Jeff Sudmeier	Colorado DOT
Jill Locantore	Denver Regional COG
Josh Deifel	City of Casper, WY MPO
Kenneth Johnstone	City of Wheat Ridge, CO
Kitty Clemens	Denver Regional COG
Kristen Keener Busby	Arizona DOT
Mark Wingate	Wyoming DOT
Matt Ashby	City of Cheyenne, WY
Melissa Antol	Tucson DOT
Mike Barton	City and County of Missoula, MT
Nick Britton	Salt Lake City Planning Division
Patricia Nilsson	Boise City Planning and Development Services
Patrick McLaughlin	Regional Transportation District
Sandi Kohrs	Colorado DOT
Sherry McKibben	McKibben + Cooper Architects/Urban Design
Tom Fisher	Tucson DOT
Tom Mason	Cheyenne MPO

Will Toor	Boulder County Commissioner & DRCOG Board Member
Federal Observers	
Aaron Bustow	FHWA – Colorado Division Office
Bill Hass	FHWA – Colorado Division Office
Charmaine Knighton	FTA – Region 8
Cindy Cody	EPA
David Beckhouse	FTA
Eddie Sierra	EPA
Guadalupe M. Herrera	HUD
Jeffrey Purdy	FHWA – Wyoming Division Office
John Cater	FHWA – Colorado Division Office
Larry Anderson	FHWA – Central Federal Lands
Lucy Garliauskas	FHWA – Headquarters
Patrick Shea	National Park Service
Rick Garcia	HUD – Region 8
Robin Smith	FHWA
Shana Baker	FHWA – Headquarters
Stacey Eriksen	EPA
Stephanie Lind	FHWA – Central Federal Lands
Steve Call	FHWA – Utah Division Office
Consultant Team	
Elizabeth Wallis	ICF International
Harrison Rue	ICF International
Kathleen Rooney	ICF International
Whit Blanton	Renaissance Planning Group

Livability Examples Provided by Denver Participants

In order to draw on the vast experience and knowledge of the selected participants, participants were asked to send the facilitators relevant information on best practices related to livability within their communities prior to the workshop. This information, along with the information that regional representatives presented during the workshop, are listed below. This information serves as an informal collection of examples that could be used in future guidebook/primer efforts when discussing best practices and developing case studies.

- Wasatch Front Regional Council, "Wasatch Choices 2040," http://www.wasatchchoice2040.com/.
- Missoula County, "Envision Missoula" (2008), http://www.co.missoula.mt.us/transportation/lrtpu1.htm.
- City of Boulder, "Transit Village Area Plan," http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=5346&Itemid=2277.
- FasTracks (Denver, Colorado), Transit-Oriented Development Policy, http://www.rtd-fastracks.com/main_45.
  - "RTD expands role in TOD with focus on 'communities'" (article sent by Patrick McLaughlin via email)
- East Billings, Urban Renewal District," http://ci.billings.mt.us/index.aspx?NID=843.
- City of Tucson Department of Transportation
  - Modern Streetcar project http://www.tucsontransitstudy.com/
  - Bike Boulevard Program http://cms3.tucsonaz.gov/projects/bicycle-boulevards (PowerPoint presentation sent by Ton Fisher via email)
  - Downtown Links Urban Overlay District http://www.downtownlinks.info/LandUseUrbanDesign/
- Colorado Department of Transportation
  - Transportation and Environmental Resource Council, www.coloradodot.info/programs/environmental.
  - Colorado Department of Local Affairs, "Sustainable Main Streets Initiative," http://dola.colorado.gov/sustainability/faq.html.
  - Land Use and Transportation Planning Integration Study, http://www.coloradodot.info/.
- Cheyenne MPO, "PlanCheyenne," http://www.plancheyenne.com/welcome.cfm.
- City of Boulder Livability Initiatives, Land Use Department, http://www.bouldercounty.org/government/dept/pages/landusemain.aspx.
  - Countywide Intergovernmental Agreement set Urban Growth Boundaries around every community
  - Boulder County Comprehensive Plan
  - Strong use of performance measures
- Denver Regional Council of Governments
  - Metro Vision, http://www.drcog.org/index.cfm?page=MetroVision.
  - Transportation Improvement Program, http://www.drcog.org/index.cfm?page=TransportationImprovementProgram(TIP).
- National Park Service, Alternative Transportation Projects
  - Zion National Park, http://www.nps.gov/zion/parkmgmt/upload/Zion%20NP_Executive%20Summary_Nov%2008.pdf
  - Mount Rainier National Park, http://www.nps.gov/mora/planyourvisit/shuttle.htm
- Boise, Idaho Region
  - Blueprint for Good Growth, http://www.blueprintforgoodgrowth.com/.
  - Communities in Motion, http://www.communitiesinmotion.org/
  - Development Monitoring Report, http://www.compassidaho.org/prodserv/gtsm-devmonitoring.htm