



BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following references are organized by section and followed with a brief description of each reference.

ALLEYS/SERVICE

1. Austin. Texas Design Commission. *Downtown Austin Design Guidelines*. Austin, TX. City of Austin. May 2000. pp 30, 32, 42, 58, and 69.

These various articles discuss limiting closing down streets, alleys or walkways between buildings. Increases pedestrian traffic and limits the 'alley' as an unpleasant place to travel, park or view.

2. Boulder. Downtown Alliance. *Downtown Urban Design Guidelines*. Boulder, CO. City of Boulder. 2002. pp. 32, 42, 43, 58, 69 & 70.

These various pages describe ways to improve alley ways from simply places to put refuge to alternative walking areas, to main street access points to areas that can be visually pleasing and not areas to avoid whenever possible.

BICYCLE

3. Abbott, Carl "Urban Growth and Environmental Concerns." *Planning and Urban Design Standards*. Comp. American Planning Association. Hoboken, NJ. John Wiley & Sons. 2006. pp. 84-85.

This article discusses the problem of 'sprawl', suburbanization and its' effects on the environment and how to design with nature.

4. Advanced Stop Lines. Cambridge. *Cambridge Cycling Campaign*. Cambridge, UK. July 1998.

This document describes why 'advanced stop lines' (ASL)'bike boxes' are so valuable to cyclists, and discusses a number of design issues which should be taken into consideration when they are planned

5. Allen, John S. "Why and how the Vassar Street project needs to be modified". *Truewheelers.org*. 12 June 2002. 11 April 2006. www.truewheelers.org/cases/vassarst/record/handout.htm.

6. Alta Planning & Design and Parisi Associates. San Francisco. Department of Parking and Traffic Staff. *City of San Francisco Bicycle Plan Update: Supplemental Design Guidelines*. San Francisco, CA. Department of Parking and Traffic Staff. 2003.

These guidelines are a supplement to the 2003 San Francisco Bike Plan and are meant to clarify not replace material from

the HDM, AASHTO, and MUTCD guidelines.

Reviewed material on the use of 'back in' diagonal parking to help limit conflicts with cyclist utilizing bicycle lanes.

7. Anderson-Pinsof, Suzan, and Terri Musser. *Bicycle Facility Planning*. Chicago, IL. American Planning Association, October 1995.

This is the APA's guide to designing bicycle facilities. It focuses on six elements to help plan for bicyclists: planning and regulation, hazard removal, traffic calming, additional roadway width, designated bicycle facilities, and bicycle parking.

8. Arizona. *Bicycle Parking Facility Design Requirements*. City of Tucson, Pima County.

This is a 'draft' copy of the bicycle parking design guidelines that layout the amount of bicycle parking, type of racks and the parking area layout. These guidelines are very thorough and also gives examples of unacceptable bike rack examples. Also refer to the apbp 'Bicycle Parking Guidelines'.

9. Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals (apbp). *Bicycle Parking Guidelines*. Washington, DC. 2002.

Discusses best practices for bicycle parking which will in turn decrease barriers to bicycle usage.

10. "Bicycle Box" 8 July 2003. Metropolitan Transportation Commission. 13 June 2006. www.bayareatrafficsignals.org/toolbox/Tools/BikeBox.html.

11. "On-Street Facilities. Pedestrian and Bicycling Information Center". *Bicyclinginfo.org*. 11 April 2006. www.bicyclinginfo.org

This page of the website has design and reference information for 'on-street bicycle facilities'. It references other websites, the AASHTO guide, various studies, etc and has Q&A for many of the topics.

12. "Bicycle Parking". Mass Bikes. Mass Bikes. 22 March 2006. www.massbike.org/bikelaw/parking.htm

This document gives the zoning ordinances for bicycle parking requirements in various places around the country.

13. Bishop, Diane. "City of Eugene, Oregon". *New 'Bike Box' Gives Cyclists a Safe Zone at Seventh Ave and High Street*. Press Release City of Eugene's Bicycle Program Coordinator. 3 December 2001. www.ci.eugene.or.us/pw/bike/bikesite/bikeboxrelease.htm

Press release for the implementation of new bike box at Seventh and High St.

14. "Cambridge Massachusetts Bicycle Parking Requirements". Mass Bikes. Mass Bikes. 22 March 2006. www.massbike.org.

INDIANAPOLIS REGIONAL CENTER & METROPOLITAN PLANNING AREA MULTI-MODAL CORRIDOR AND PUBLIC SPACE DESIGN GUIDELINES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

org/bikelaw/pcamb.htm

This document gives the zoning ordinances for bicycle parking requirements in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

15. Canada. *Bike Boxes & Advanced Stop Lines*. Vancouver, BC, Canada. City of Vancouver.

A pamphlet that informs and educates both motorists and cyclists regarding the use of bike boxes and ASL's.

16. Chicago. Chicago Department of Transportation. *Chicago's Bike Lane Design Manual*. Chicago, IL. City of Chicago. Oct 2002.

A "best practices" manual on how to integrate bicycles into an urban environment. Contains bicycle facility designs and engineering standards. Very comprehensive.

17. Denver. *Bicycle Programs. Rules and Regulations for Bicycle Parking Areas in Denver*. City of Denver, Co. December, 1998.

Document lays out objectives and standards for bicycle parking in the City of Denver, including preferred types of racks.

18. Greenway Collaborative, Inc. *State Street Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan*. City of Ann Arbor, MI & City of Ann Arbor Downtown Development Authority. December 2003.

This work deals with bike/ped/auto traffic conflicts in the central business district. It covers common conflicts and how to avoid through design, enforcement, education and infrastructure improvements. It also covers ways to grow non-motorized transportation in the area by improving bike parking and pedestrian right of way.

19. Hallett, Ian, David Luskin and Randy Machemehl. *Evaluation of On-Street Bicycle Facilities Added to Existing Roadways*. Austin, Tx. Center for Transportation Research. Texas Department of Transportation. Aug 2006 Evaluation of retrofitted bicycle facilities on current roadways without changing curb to curb width.

20. Hunter, William. United States. Office of Safety and Traffic Operations Research & Development. *Evaluation of an Innovative Application of the Bike Box*. McLean, VA. Federal Highway Administration. August 2000. pp. 1, 11, 12 & 17. (entire document)

The results of this study found that the 'bike box' is beneficial to cyclists in that it helps them avoid conflicts in certain types of intersection movements but there were issues with automobile encroachment. More bike boxes need to be installed and evaluated to further determine their effectiveness.

21. Indiana. Department of Natural Resources. *Hoosiers on the*

Move: The Indiana State Trails, Greenways and Bikeways Plan. July 2006. Indianapolis, Indiana.

Comprehensive trail plan for the state of Indiana.

22. Indianapolis. Department of Public Works. *Cultural Trail Scoping Report*. N.p. DLZ & Storrow Kinsella Associates Inc. July 2004.

Detailed preliminary description of Cultural Trail route, infrastructure and streetscapes.

23. Indianapolis. Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization. *Indianapolis Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian System Plan, Part 2, Facility Design Guidelines*. Indianapolis, IN. n.d.

The system plan contains information on all aspects of bicycle infrastructure from design of on and off street facilities to signage and from bike parking to traffic calming methods.

24. Kinsella, John. Letter to File. *Blue Bike Box and Blue Bike Lanes*. 22 May 2006.

This letter discusses the use of 'blue bike boxes' and 'blue bike lanes' in certain areas and includes an abstract on writings on each topic.

25. McCann, Barbara. 2004. *Complete Streets Report, Analysis of a survey of Complete Streets Laws, Policies, and Plans in the United States*. Thunderhead Alliance. N.p. Dec 2004. pp 9, 27.

This report is a comprehensive look at national complete streets policies. We primarily reviewed the information regarding funding mechanisms across the country and how the report addresses 'Pedestrian Policies'.

26. Moeur, Richard, C. *Bicycle-Specific Traffic Control-Is it "Bicycle-Friendly"?*. Institute of Transportation Engineers Annual Meeting. Phoenix, AZ. 1999. pp. 5-6.

In this article, the author, Mr. Moeur questions whether the 'bike box' is truly a 'bicycle friendly' design. He questions whether driver's habitual behavior and certain traffic laws may cause problems with this particular design feature.

27. "MUTCD Frequently Asked Questions". MUTCD. Federal Highway Administration. 30 November 2001. <http://mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov/kno-amend.htm>

This webpage explains the MUTCD process on amending their standards.

28. Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates. *Back-in/Head-out Angle Parking*. San Francisco, CA. January 2005.

29. Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates. *On-Street Bike Lanes preferred Alternative*. San Francisco, CA. February 2005.

30. Oakland, CA. Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Office of Planning. *Bicycles & Pedestrians, Safety Toolbox: Engineering, Bicycle Box*. 14 June 2006 <www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/bicyclespedestrians/tools/bicycleBox/index.htm>

Design guidelines in addition to advantages and disadvantages to the 'bicycle box' in Oakland, CA.

31. "European Bikeway Examples". City of Portland, Office of Transportation. 29 November 2001. www.trans.ci.portland.or.us/Traffic_Management/Bicycle_Pro.../european.htm.

BICYCLE FACILITIES

32. Austin. City of Austin Transportation, Planning and Sustainability Department. *Downtown Great Streets Master Plan*. 15 Nov 2001. 30 Aug 2005 <<http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/greatstreets/default.htm>>.

This report was the precursor to the *Downtown Austin Design Guidelines* and it was Austin's first attempt to 'improve the quality of downtown streets and sidewalks, aiming ultimately to transform the public right-of-ways into great public spaces'.

33. Brazel, Anthony, Jay Golden & James Schwab "Air Quality." *Planning and Urban Design Standards*. Comp. American Planning Association. Hoboken, NJ. John Wiley & Sons. 2006. pp. 101-102.

This article explains how we define, how we measure and where air pollution originates.

34. Brazel, Anthony, Jay Golden "Air Sheds." *Planning and Urban Design Standards*. Comp. American Planning Association. Hoboken, NJ. John Wiley & Sons. 2006. pp. 103-104.

This article defines and explains air sheds.

35. Indianapolis. Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization. *Indianapolis Regional Pedestrian Plan*. Indianapolis, IN: March 2006. p.5

Definitions of 'component zones'

36. Kinsella, John. "RC Guidelines Review and Comment--TOD. E-mail response to definition of TOD. 21 Feb. 2006.

This email discusses the definition of TOD, discussed using definition supplied by TOD Association from the State of California.

37. Mendes, Diana C. "Impact Assessment." *Planning and Urban Design Standards*. Comp. American Planning Association. Hoboken, NJ. John Wiley & Sons. 2006. pp. 514-517.

This article outlines how to do a thorough 'environmental impact assessment'. According to the article it is important to identify, evaluate, discuss and document the potential benefits and consequences of the project.

38. Steiner, Frederick R. "Environmental Planning Considerations." *Planning and Urban Design Standards*. Comp. American Planning Association. Hoboken, NJ. John Wiley & Sons. 2006. pp. 99-100.

This article looks at the 'environmental planning' process holistically. He points out that the term 'environmental' means not only ecology but also landscape. So, we need to look at the physical, biological and built environments when completing an environmental plan.

39. U.S. 40 Boulevard By Way (West Terre Haute to Terre Haute). Cross-sectional drawing. Indianapolis, IN: n.d.

BIKE LANE EXAMPLES AND IMAGES.

40. Ohio. Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission. *Breaking Barriers to Bicycling: Bicycle Lanes Best Practices and Pilot Treatments*. Columbus, OH. Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission. October, 2005. 31

41. "On-Street Facilities. Pedestrian and Bicycling Information Center". Bicyclinginfo.org. 11 April 2006. www.bicyclinginfo.org

This page of the website has design and reference information for 'on-street bicycle facilities'. It references other websites, the AASHTO guide, various studies, etc and has Q&A for many of the topics.

42. Oguntoyinbo, Kristin. "HSRC Research Paving the Way for Bicyclists". *Directions*. Volume VI, Number 2. Winter 2001. p. 5

Summarized the 'blue bike lanes' study done with City of Portland, Or. The study found that motorists were much more likely to yield to cyclists with the colored bike lanes.

43. Oregon. Department of Transportation. *Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan*. Salem, OR. 1995. 113-120.

Referenced chapter 11.6, which discusses where multi-use paths should be installed, important considerations (i.e. road crossings, access security, maintenance), design and standards.

44. Pein, Wayne. *AASHTO and Door Zone Bike Lanes*. *Bicycling Matters*. May, 2004.

This paper discusses the dangers of AASHTO designed bike lanes when placed next to on street parking.

45. Portland. Office of Transportation. *Portland's Blue Bike Lanes, Improved Safety through Enhanced Visibility*. City of Portland, OR. 30 November 2001.

This is the entire study done in conjunction with the University of North Carolina's, Highway Safety Research Center in regards to the use of colored lanes in high bicycle/motorist

conflict areas.

46. Portland. Office of Transportation. *Portland's Blue Bike Lanes, Improved Safety through Enhanced Visibility*. City of Portland, OR. 30 November 2001. p.3.

This reference was for funding of project, which was a 2 year ODOT grant (80% state and 20% local match).

47. Portland Department of Transportation. *Blue Bike Lanes, for Greater Safety*. City of Portland, OR. July 1999.
48. "Portland's Blue Bike Lane Project: A Study in Improving Cyclist Safety". Presentation. City of Portland Bicycle Program. & University of North Carolina's, Highway Safety Research Center. Portland, OR.

Power Point presentation of the City of Portland & University of North Carolina's, Highway Safety Research Center.

49. South Bend. MACOG. *The Bicycle/Pedestrian Element of the MACOG 2015 Transportation Plan: Chapter II, Bicycle Facilities..* South Bend, Indiana. December, 1995.
50. Pucher, John, Lewis Dykstra. "What Germany and Holland Can Teach NYC About Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety". 2003. *Transportation Alternatives Magazine* 14 June 2006. <www.transalt.org/press/magazine/034Fall/18europe.html>

Article discusses what actions could or should be taken in NYC to make the city as pedestrian safe as European cities. The actions range from passing laws to allow speed and red light cameras to design of the roadway and public space.

51. Surface Transportation Policy Partnership (STPP). 2006. *From the Margins to the Mainstream, A Guide to Transportation Opportunities in Your Community*. Washington, DC. pp 83-107

Descriptions of different federal transportation funding programs (i.e. CMAQ, JARC, etc) and how to access funds. It gives details on funds (i.e. are matching funds needed, what are the permissible use of funds, etc).

52. Traffic Advisory Unit (TAU). "Advanced Stop Lines for Cyclists". Department of Transportation, London, England
- Summarizes 'bike box' study findings, which provides basic design and placement details and possible further developments.
53. United States. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. *Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities*. 1999. Washington, DC. U.S. DOT. 22,-32.

This section of the guide describes the physical attributes of a AASHTO approved bicycle lane.

54. United States. Federal Highway Administration. *Lesson 9, Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections to Transit*. December,

2000. Washington, DC. U.S. DOT.

This section covers barriers and improvements to increase ridership for pedestrians and cyclists on transit. The improvements range from adding bicycle parking facilities at stations/stops, streetscape improvements around stations to improve pedestrian accessibility to including ways to carry bicycles on busses and trains.

55. United States. Federal Highway Administration. *Signalized Intersections: Informational Guide. Chapter 9 – Intersection-Wide Treatments*. Washington, DC. U.S. DOT. 1, 22, 23.
56. United States. Federal Highway Administration. *Part 9, Traffic Controls for Bicycle Facilities, MUTCD 2000*. December, 2000. Washington, DC. U.S. DOT.

This manual gives detailed descriptions of federal requirements when it comes to bicycle infrastructure. Including markings, signage, bicycle lanes and path information.

57. Wilbur Smith Associates, 2M Associates and HPV Transportation Consulting. *Bicycle Boulevard: Design Tools and Guidelines*. Berkley, CA. City of Berkeley. Planning and Development Department Advance Planning Division, City of Berkley. April 2000.

Report discusses implementation of various bicycle boulevards located in Berkley, CA. and some of the traffic calming and other measures utilized to maintain low traffic speeds and volumes.

BOULEVARDS

58. Jacobs, MacDonald, Rofe, *Boulevard Book: History, Evolution, Design of Multiway Boulevards*, MIT Press. 2002, particularly pp. 207-234..

The definitive source on Boulevards.

59. "The Urban Network: A New Framework for Growth", Peter Calthorpe, for potential transit median spacing and transit boulevard details.

BUS TRANSIT BTZ

60. Aaby, Zeeshan Raza. "Transit Signal Priority: Giving the Buses a Leg Up". *Imprint, The University of Waterloo Student Newspaper*. 2003.

This article debates the superiority of 'queue jumping' lanes as opposed to 'transit signal priority' turn lanes. The first is a lane on the right side of traffic, at intersections, that is dedicated to transit only and then gives a early green to the bus. TSP would keep the light green in order to let a bus through. This may have the result of backing up traffic on intersecting roads.

61. Austin. Texas Design Commission. *Downtown Austin Design Guidelines, Enhance Key Transit Stops*. Austin, TX. City of

Austin. May 2000. p 51.

Issues and recommendations for improving transit stops in Austin.

62. Canada. BC Transit. Transit Stop Installation Checklist. Victoria, British Columbia.

Design guidelines for building transit facilities, transit related infrastructure and streetscape projects that can effect transit usage.

63. Edwards & Kelcy, Engineers, Architects, Planners and Constructors. "IndyGo Shelter Site Design" IndyGo. 21 April 2004. PowerPoint Presentation

Presentation presents 'best practices' on IndyGo bus shelter design, placement and access for potential riders.

64. United States. Federal Highway Administration. Signalized Intersections: Informational Guide. Chapter 9 – Intersection-Wide Treatments. Washington, DC. U.S. DOT. 40

65. United States. Federal Highway Administration. Lesson 9, Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections to Transit. December, 2000. Washington, DC. U.S. DOT.

This section covers barriers and improvements to increase ridership for pedestrians and cyclists on transit. The improvements range from adding bicycle parking facilities at stations/stops, streetscape improvements around stations to improve pedestrian accessibility to including ways to carry bicycles on busses and trains.

66. United States. Transportation Research Board. Transit-Friendly Streets: Design and Traffic Management Strategies to Support Livable Communities. Washington, DC. National Academy Press. 1998. Report 33. p. 14

Case Study 3-1 discusses the use of bulb-outs/curb extensions. These extensions were added to deal with waiting transit riders conflicting with traveling pedestrians. The end result was that the bulb outs were a positive fix to this problem with out too much added problems to street users.

CORRIDOR CRITERIA

67. Charlotte. Charlotte Department of Transportation 2005 Urban Street Design Guidelines (USDG). Charlotte, NC. n.d. pp. 1-11

The USDG allows CDOT to design and implant better street design within Charlotte. The guidelines incorporate different transportation mode types, i.e. bicycling, pedestrian and transit. Part of the way it does this is by classifying streets by different types of mode orientation.

68. "Forum on Sustainable Infrastructure with Emphasis on Sustainable Streets and Streetscapes." Key Tower, Seattle

WA. 13 May 2004.

This is the summary of aforementioned forum held to discuss sustainable streets. These notes discuss important information regarding projects from design to public involvement and some of the pitfalls from funding of projects to on going maintenance

69. Hinshaw, Mark. "Physical Structure of Downtowns." Planning and Urban Design Standards. Comp. American Planning Association. Hoboken, NJ. John Wiley & Sons. 2006. pp. 416 & 417.

This article defines and describes various public spaces, street typologies and special elements (i.e. civic structures and public art).

70. Indianapolis. Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization. Regional Transportation Plan Update, Indianapolis, IN. Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization pp 66-75.

This chapter discusses improving on some the current deficiencies we have in the central Indiana regional transportation system. They discuss several strategies from Intelligent Transportation Systems to improving infrastructure for alternatives to driving (i.e. biking and walking).

71. King, Michael. Bicycle Facility Selection: A Comparison of Approaches. Chapel Hill, NC. Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center Highway Safety Research Center, University of North Carolina. August 2002. pp. 9-14.

Tables/Matrices that include traffic speeds & car counts to determine the type of bicycle facility which should be used. The information to tabulated from various cities around the world.

72. Swift, Peter "Pedestrian-Friendly Streets." Planning and Urban Design Standards. Comp. American Planning Association. Hoboken, NJ. John Wiley & Sons. 2006. pp. 242 - 244.

This article covers how to design pedestrian friendly streets and what makes a street pedestrian friendly.

CROSSING ZONE CZ

73. Boulder. Downtown Alliance. Downtown Urban Design Guidelines. Boulder, CO. City of Boulder. 2002. pp. 55-57.

These sections discuss the guidelines that should dictate all pedestrian sidewalks and street crossings in the downtown areas in Boulder, Co.

74. Portland. Office of Transportation. Portland Pedestrian Design Guide. City of Portland, OR. June 1998. pp. C1-C5, C14-C19 & B1-B9

These sections cover the best practices for crosswalks as

INDIANAPOLIS REGIONAL CENTER & METROPOLITAN PLANNING AREA MULTI-MODAL CORRIDOR AND PUBLIC SPACE DESIGN GUIDELINES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

well as design guides for certain types of pedestrian/crossing infrastructure (i.e. bulb-outs, islands, etc), part B deals with the guideline for corners and how they should be designed to be pedestrian friendly.

DISTRICTS

75. Annapolis. Governor's Office of Smart Growth. *Driving Urban Environments: Smart Growth Parking Best Practices*. Annapolis, MD. Maryland State Government. p 4

This publication covers what are seen at the 'best practices' for dealing with parking issues in urbanized areas. These strategies vary from 'shared parking' to parking maximums, land use changes (i.e. TODS, smart growth) and increasing transit options.

76. Atlas, Randall. "Residential Site Security Strategies." *Planning and Urban Design Standards*. Comp. American Planning Association. Hoboken, NJ. John Wiley & Sons. 2006. 475.

This section discusses site/building designs that can help reduce the chances of criminal activity. These can include lighting, window installations and types of plantings, just to name a few.

77. Austin. Texas Design Commission. *Downtown Austin Design Guidelines*. Austin, TX. City of Austin. May 2000. p 29, 31, 75 & 77.

Describes what is essential to supporting a 24 hour/mixed used downtown. What is needed is a good mix of services to support the inhabitants of the area. Encourage the inclusion of local character by having special places, building types and details that are unique to the geographic area. Last but not least, the street level should be oriented towards pedestrians, not automobiles. Store/shop fronts can be smaller and more detailed than auto oriented store fronts. Peds. move at much slower pace

78. Barnett, Jonathan, *Redesigning Cities*. Chicago, IL: American Planning Association. 2003.

79. Bob Vint & Associates, Architects. *Mixed-Use Development Prototype*. N.p. n.d.

This is a prototype for a mixed use development, maybe in Tucson, AZ. It outlines all the guidelines in which to make this development mixed use and part of a walkable community, it also addresses some of the issues that the developer will face when it comes zoning.

80. Bong, Hendra, Sharon Priest. "Infill Development." *Planning and Urban Design Standards*. Comp. American Planning Association. Hoboken, NJ. John Wiley & Sons. 2006. 457.

This section discusses infill development, especially as it relates to appropriate massing and articulation. They also

cover density, transit and scale under this topic and planning for infill by including the public, phasing the project and utilizing design guidelines.

81. Boulder. Downtown Alliance. *Downtown Urban Design Guidelines*. Boulder, CO. City of Boulder. 2002. p. 28.

This section of the Boulder design guidelines discusses building frontage and how it meets the street. It illustrates how building frontage is important to continuity on the street and it also talks about how important it is that storefronts open onto the street.

82. Burden, Dan, et al. *Healthy Neighborhood Street Design Guidelines, The Streets of San Joaquin*. N.p.: Walkable Communities, Inc. n.d.

Publication defines street typologies with design guidelines on the street layout and the buildings and land use for each type.

83. Calthorpe, Peter and William Fulton. *The Regional City*. Washington, DC: Island Press, 2001, and Calthorpe, Peter, "The Urban Network: A New Framework for Growth".

84. Dixon, David, FAIA, Goody Clancy, David Spillane. "Scale & Density." *Planning and Urban Design Standards*. Comp. American Planning Association. Hoboken, NJ. John Wiley & Sons. 2006. 470.

Mr. Dixon discusses attributes that make an area pedestrian friendly. He discusses the context of a building and how it should take cues from the buildings in the area also how certain buildings like courthouses or municipal buildings may warrant a more palatial feel that would not be appropriate for other buildings.

85. Florida. Systems Planning Office. *Multi-modal Transportation Districts and Area Wide Quality of Service Handbook*. N.p. Florida Dept. of Transportation. November, 2003. pp. 22-26.

We referenced the sections on 'Land Uses that Promote Walking and Transit Use' and 'Appropriate Density and Intensity of Land Uses' which helped to determine how to classify each particular district. People will walk if they have someplace to walk to and the distance isn't too great.

86. Fort Wayne. Fort Wayne, *Downtown Design Guidelines*. Fort Wayne, IN. N.p. 5 Jan 2004. pp. 5-8, 20.

This section of the guidelines refer primarily to architectural issues such as building designs (i.e. height, form and scale) while explaining the importance of façade treatments and building material. Also, there are two sections referring to public spaces and public art, especially as a transition to larger facilities.

87. Hannum, Wagle & Cline Engineering and Storrow Kinsella

Associates Inc. French Lick Design Guidelines. French Lick, IN. French Lick Redevelopment Commission. June, 2006.

Design guidelines for the city of French Lick, IN. In the earlier part of the 1900's, French Lick was a resort town and would like to become a resort town again by opening a casino and keeping with the character of a small 'resort' town feel. These guidelines are meant to help them keep/regain that 'feel'.

88. Indianapolis. CAP:IC. Indianapolis Regional Center Design Guidelines. Indianapolis, IN. Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization. March 2007. pp. 1-17

These sections are meant to cover the district typologies described in this writing.

89. Jarvis, Frederick. Site Planning and Community Design for Great Neighborhoods. Washington DC: Home Builder Press, 1993. pp 48-72.

This section contains information on site planning and other infrastructure improvements to enhance new developments walkability and liveability. This particular writing seems to be more directed at suburban development instead of denser infill or urban living.

90. Katz, Peter. The New Urbanism, Toward an Architecture of Community. New York, NY: McGraw Hill, 1994
91. Kulash, Walter P.E., Glatting Jackson Kercher Anglin Lopez Rinehart, Inc., Susan Handy, PhD. "Street Networks and Street Connectivity." Planning and Urban Design Standards. Comp. American Planning Association. Hoboken, NJ. John Wiley & Sons. 2006. 231.

The writings discuss street connectivity standards and the techniques cities use to determine that standard. In the past cities discouraged connectivity but more and more municipalities have found that they need to improve connectivity to improve traffic problems. These cities use either 'block length standards' or 'connectivity index' to improve traffic mobility. Block length standards allow cities to control spacing between streets and can take the form of maximum block lengths. Connectivity index is the ratio of streets to intersections.

92. Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates. Seattle Department of Transportation. Seattle Transit Network Development Plan. Seattle, WA. City of Seattle. September, 2004. pp. 4/5-4/7

These pages discuss the appropriate densities and infrastructure to help promote a walkable transit oriented development or area.

93. Planning and Urban Design Standards – American Planning Association, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., pp. 259-86
94. Scheer, Brenda and David Scheer 1998. Typology and Urban

Design Guidelines: Preserving the City Without Dictating Design. Rethinking XIXth Century City. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Aga Khan Program for Islamic Architecture. pp. 151-164

Discusses the issues with design guidelines as they relate to aesthetic controls instead of addressing the systemic problem of bad building design.

95. Urban Initiatives LLC. Town of West Baden Springs Indiana Design Guidelines. West Baden Springs, IN. April, 2006. Appendix C

Discusses feasibility of adaptive reuse of historical buildings.

96. Virginia. Rappahannock Scenic River Preservation Policies, IV. Goals, Objectives and Policies. N.p. n.d. <http://www.spotsylvania.va.us/emplibrary/Courtland_SectorPlan.pdf>

Growth and development guidelines for Rappahannock area. These guidelines include expected growth and expected developments that will come with that growth. Very detailed plans.

FRONTAGE ZONE FZ

97. Portland. Office of Transportation. Portland Pedestrian Design Guide. Portland, OR. City of Portland, OR. June 1998. pp. A9-A10

This section covers how Portland handles the design and use of the 'frontage zone' or the area between the front of the store and the pedestrian area.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE - PERFORMANCE

98. Ewing, Bartholomew, Winkelman, Walters, Chen: "Growing Cooler: The Evidence on Urban Development and Climate Change.
99. International Society of Arboriculture: Benefits of Trees. www.treesaregood.org/treecare/tree_benefits.aspx benefits including property values of 5-20%.

Some useful websites for trees and related:

100. <http://www.epa.gov/hiri/about/energysavings.html>
kWh savings were derived from this source
101. http://www.epa.gov/hiri/strategies/level3_vegairquality.html
102. <http://www.appanet.org/treeben/default.asp>
CO2 and kWh savings were derived from this source.
103. <http://www.fs.fed.us/psw/program/cufr>
104. Sherford Town Code, Prince's Foundation, B. Bolger, pp

INDIANAPOLIS REGIONAL CENTER & METROPOLITAN PLANNING AREA MULTI-MODAL CORRIDOR AND PUBLIC SPACE DESIGN GUIDELINES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

37-49.

105. USDA: *Midwest Community Tree Guide: Benefits, Costs, and Strategic Planning*, PSW-GTR-199, November 2006

Discussion of the relative costs and benefits of trees in greenscape and green infrastructure.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE - BUFFERS AND NOISE REDUCTION

106. Agroforestry: <http://www.agroforestry.net/overstory/overstory60.html>

Trees and landscaping as noise buffers

107. Cowen, James: *This Quiet House: Noise Control for the Home - Reducing the Intrusion of Outdoor Sources*, NPC Special Report, Summer 2005

108. FHWA; <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/keepdown.htm>, "Keeping the Noise Down: Highway Traffic Noise Barriers

Highway barriers as noise buffers

109. Tennessee, University of, Agricultural Extension Service; Fare, Clatterbuck, "Evergreen Trees for Screens and Hedges in the Landscape", SP517.

Trees and landscaping as noise buffers

INTRODUCTION

110. IUPUI. Indiana Center for Urban Policy and the Environment impacts of the Monon Trail. 2003 (www.urbancenter.iupui.edu)

111. IUPUI. Indiana Center for Urban Policy and the Environment impacts of the Penny Trail. 2006 (www.urbancenter.iupui.edu) jacobson,

112. Jacobs, Jane.. *Death and Life of Great American Cities*. Vintage Books. Div. of Random House.1961

113. NYC Streets Renaissance (<http://www.nycsr.org/lessons/copenhagen.php>)

LANDSCAPE

114. Boulder. Downtown Alliance. *Downtown Urban Design Guidelines*. Boulder, CO. City of Boulder. 2002. pp. 39, 59-65, 67 & 68.

These sections of the design guidelines from Boulder, Co., cover streetscape topics. They cover furniture, railings, trash receptacles and bike racks found in the 'pedestrian

way', 'pedestrian activity zone' and 'separation zone', from placement to design. There is a guide for recommended tree plantings and recommendations for ground level plants.

115. Austin. Texas Design Commission.. *Downtown Austin Design Guidelines*. Austin, TX. City of Austin. May 2000. pp. 34, 53-55, 62-65,70-72

These sections cover the 'pedestrian way', 'pedestrian activity zone' and 'separation zone' and discuss topics such as safety with lighting to plantings to furniture, railings, trash receptacles and bike racks. There is also a section that covers future care and maintenance of these areas and points out that this is often overlooked in municipalities.

116. Portland. Office of Transportation. *Portland Pedestrian Design Guide*. City of Portland, OR. June 1998. pp. A14-A21.

These pages contain all the pertinent information when it comes to placing elements in the pedestrian right-of-way. Who is responsible for installing and maintaining, what can be placed in the area, where it should be placed, etc.

117. Shaflik, Carl. *Environmental Effects of Roadway Lighting*. Vancouver, BC. International Dark Sky Association. August 1997.

This paper discusses the different types of light pollution and points out that a large percentage of light pollution comes from road way lighting. This puts the problem on the backs of roadway engineers. Mr. Shaflik does offer some solutions through new light designs.

118. Toronto. Clean City Beautiful City Program. *Street Furniture Elements*. City of Toronto, ON. n.d.

This document contains the accepted or preferred 'street furniture' list for the city.

119. Vaskovic, Joseph, & Matthew Zoll. "Real Intersection Design (RID), Leaving Theory behind for Design. Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professional. Tucson, AZ. November 2001.

Mr. Vaskovic and Mr. Zoll lead a group of people through the exercise of redesigning an intersection in Tucson at the APBP conference. The group broke into smaller groups and redesigned the corridor with different groups in mind (i.e. transit riders, disabled & pedestrians).

120. <http://www.arborday.org/trees/rightTreeAndPlace>

Right tree, right place approach.

PEDESTRIAN ACTIVITY ZONE PAZ

121. Austin. Texas Design Commission.. *Downtown Austin Design Guidelines*. Austin, TX. City of Austin. May 2000. pp. 32,33,66,67&69.

These pages discuss the various topics from the visual and spatial layout of public spaces to the type of art that should be recommended for the space. It also states how public spaces can have a negative effect on the pedestrian environment.

122. Boulder. Downtown Alliance. *Downtown Urban Design Guidelines*. Boulder, CO. City of Boulder. 2002. p 71.

This section discusses the use of public art and what to consider when considering pieces.

PEDESTRIAN WAY PW

123. Austin. Texas Design Commission.. *Downtown Austin Design Guidelines*. Austin, TX. City of Austin. May 2000. pp. 46,47,50,52, 58, 59, 74, 76 & 77.

The sections referenced, discuss ways in which to make the street a pleasant place to be. From building to the street to making areas for pedestrians to gather, these pages include the essentials to an active street life.

124. Boulder. Downtown Alliance. *Downtown Urban Design Guidelines*. Boulder, CO. City of Boulder. 2002. pp 48, 67, & 70.

These three sections focus on detailed information that is no less important than some of the large infrastructure issues. Designing for public safety, including handicap accessibility and preserve historic features.

125. Fitzpatrick, Kay, Shawn Turner, Marcus Brewer, Paul Carlson, Brooke Ullman, Nada Trout, Eun Sug Park, Jeff Whitacre, Nazir Lalani, and Dominique Lord. 2006. *Improving Pedestrian Safety at Unsignalized Crossings*. TCRP Report 112/NCHRP Report 562. Washington, DC.

Guidelines for improving pedestrian safety at unsignalized and midblock crossings.

126. Fort Wayne. Fort Wayne, *Downtown Design Guidelines*. Fort Wayne, IN. N.p. 5 Jan 2004. pp. 13, 28 & 29.

These sections cover public right of way improvements from fencing, signage and awnings in the 'pedestrian way' to streetscape issues like street furniture and the placement of street amenities.

127. Garrick, Norman W. "Shared Streets: Dutch Experiment with Streets with Social rather than Regulatory Controls" *Roads & Bridges*. Volume: 42, Number 9. (August 2005)

This article discusses the use of 'Shared Streets', 'Social Streets' or 'Legible Streets' as they are sometimes called. These streets eliminate regulatory controls (i.e. signs, lights, etc) and let the users negotiate right of way. By slowing down automobiles to safe speeds (<20mph) pedestrians and

cyclists are on equal footing and social negotiation with eye contact.

128. Indianapolis. Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization. *Indianapolis Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian System Plan, Part 2, Facility Design Guidelines*. Indianapolis, IN. n.d.

The system plan contains information on all aspects of bicycle infrastructure from design of on and off street facilities to signage and from bike parking to traffic calming methods.

129. Institute of Transportation Engineers. 2006 *Context Sensitive Solutions in Designing Major Urban Thoroughfares for Walkable Communities*. Federal Highway Administration. Washington, DC.

This report outlines the use of context sensitive solutions in the planning and design of arterial and collector thoroughfares in urban areas to improve transportation for all users (pedestrian & bicycling).

130. McCann, Barbara. 2004. *Complete Streets Report, Analysis of a survey of Complete Streets Laws, Policies, and Plans in the United States*. Thunderhead Alliance. N.p. Dec 2004. pp 9, 27.

This report is a comprehensive look at national complete streets policies. We primarily reviewed the information regarding funding mechanisms across the country and how the report addresses 'Pedestrian Policies'.

131. Nozzi, Dom. "The Ingredients of a Walkable Street." *Walkable Streets*. Ed. Dom Nozzi. 27 Feb. 2006 www.walkablestreets.com/walkingred.htm.

This article outlines factors that make streets walkable, friendly and memorable. It looks at densities, human scaled dimensions, active & diverse retail, traffic calming, sidewalk widths and block lengths.

132. Portland. Office of Transportation. *Portland Pedestrian Design Guide*. City of Portland, OR. June 1998. pp. A1-A11.

This section of the Portland Pedestrian Design Guide discusses in great detail how the pedestrian area should be designed and when and where the various designs should be implemented.

133. Sucher, David 2003. *City Comforts How to Build an Urban Village*. Seattle, WA. City Comforts Inc. p. 93.

Referenced information regarding 'user' controlled traffic signals.

134. <http://www.indyculturaltrail.info/> for information on Greenways and the Cultural Trail Overlay.

PROTOTYPES FROM OTHER CITIES

135. Atlanta. Atlanta Regional Commission Quality Growth Toolkit: Mixed-Use Development. Atlanta, GA, n.d.

The publication attempts to define 'mixed use' and outline the benefits and pitfalls involved with this type of development. Offers very good generic guidelines and types of commercial development that one would want to attract.

136. Austin, Traditional Neighborhood District, Criteria Manual. Austin, TX, Aug 1997.

This manual was designed to give guidance to private sector planners, architects and builders wishing to develop within the cities Traditional Neighborhood Districts (TND). It offers basic design outlines of the public and private space, in order to enhance and maintain the character of certain neighborhoods in the City of Austin.

137. Boulder. Downtown Alliance. Downtown Urban Design Guidelines. Boulder, CO. City of Boulder. 2002.

138. Columbus. Columbus Area Metropolitan Planning Organization. Transportation Plan 2005-2030. Columbus, IN. n.d.

139. Discusses current and future transportation issues, which will effect the Columbus, IN region. Plan also covers automobile traffic mitigation procedures through various TDM programs and mode shifts.

140. Czar, James, Barry Gee, Stacey Recht, Nicolas Spencer. The Creative City. Ed. Stacey Recht. N.p. Cincinnati: 2003

This publication was created to guide Cincinnati, OH in looking at ways to reverse the decline of their population, especially their young educated citizens. This work describes was to nurture the young creative class and to foster the growth of a modern work force.

141. Indianapolis. Department of Metropolitan Development. Indianapolis Insight, The Comprehensive Plan for Marion County Indiana. Indianapolis, IN. Department of Metropolitan Development. Feb 2002. pp. vi, 10 & 60.

This guide is used by the City of Indianapolis to develop values and goals for future growth. These guidelines are evaluated every 7 to 10 years during the update of the Comprehensive Plan.

142. Seattle. Mayor's Office. The Blue Ring, Connecting Places 100 Year Vision. Seattle WA, June 2002.

A 100 year vision for public spaces in Center City Seattle. This publication was designed to coordinate and shape future public & private developments to ensure a quality public realm.

143. United States. Institute of Transportation Engineers. Design

and Safety of Pedestrian Facilities. Washington, DC, ITE, March 1998.

Comprehensive look at pedestrian information from accident rates and causes to design considerations of roadway and pedestrian facilities.

RAPID TRANSIT ZONE RTZ

144. Austin. Texas Design Commission.. Downtown Austin Design Guidelines. Austin, TX. City of Austin. May 2000. pp 48 & 49.

These sections discuss the development ingress and egress and to ensure that they are designed to operate for future street patterns (i.e. the conversion of one way street to two way) and minimizing curb cuts.

145. Burden, Dan, et al. Healthy Neighborhood Street Design Guidelines, The Streets of San Joaquin. N.p.: Walkable Communities, Inc. n.d.

Publication defines, with detail, street types and neighborhood layouts.

146. Dumbaugh, Eric. "Safe Streets, Livable Streets." Journal of the American Planning Association. 71.3 (Summer 2005): pp. 283-300.

This article discusses the conundrum between safe streets for drivers and livable streets for residents/pedestrians. He takes on the issue that traffic engineers without good data to prove otherwise, depend on the highway theory of fixed object hazards and therefore attempt to dissuade the use of street trees on some city/urban roadways by designing to the 85th/90th percentile for speed.

147. Oregon. Public Policy Dispute Resolution Program & Transportation & Growth Management Program. Neighborhood Street Design Guidelines, An Oregon Guide for Reducing Street Widths. Salem, Oregon. State of Oregon. June 2001.

It recommends a process for the development of safe street standards and discusses some of the issues that raise concerns with emergency service providers in regards to narrow streets.

148. Swope, Christopher. "L.A. Banks on Buses." Planning. 81, 5, May 2006. pp 32-36.

This article describes the benefits to using Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) over different mass transit modes in particular geographic areas. The article gives examples in LA, Hartford and gives numbers from various other cities.

149. United States. Transportation Research Board. Transit-Friendly Streets: Design and Traffic Management Strategies

to Support Livable Communities. Washington, DC. National Academy Press. 1998. Report 33. pp. 5-10.

These writings cover 'Transit-Friendly Streets' and how to accomplish them successfully. Traffic calming is discussed in detail also transit malls and transit-preferential streets with details on implementing all of these techniques correctly. It sites several examples from various cities and what they did correctly and why some projects failed.

150. Washington. Department of Community Trade and Economic Development. Modal Code Provisions, Urban Streets & Subdivisions. Olympia, Washington, State of Washington, Oct, 1998.

This document provides communities with the tools to help recreate their neighborhoods by redesigning their streets. There is information on right-of-way widths, street types, traffic calming, etc...

SEPARATION ZONE SZ

151. ANSI, American National Standards Institute A300 Pruning Standards

152. Austin. Texas Design Commission.. Downtown Austin Design Guidelines. Austin, TX. City of Austin. May 2000. pp 34, 53-55, 62-65, 68, 70-72.

These pages discuss the varied but important aspects of the 'separation zone'. The topics range from plantings to lighting and everything in between.

153. Boulder. Downtown Alliance. Downtown Urban Design Guidelines. Boulder, CO. City of Boulder. 2002. pp 39, 59-68.

These sections go into great detail regarding the 'separation zone'. There is quite a bit of information regarding plantings with a recommended tree plantings section and how to promote good growth and continued health of the plantings. There is also a section regarding 'furnishings' (seating, railings, & trash receptacles).

154. Portland. Office of Transportation. Portland Pedestrian Design Guide. City of Portland, OR. June 1998. pp. A6-A8 & A14-A21.

These sections cover curb usage, furnishing zone, grates and hatch covers. A14 through A21 contain tables for 'Elements in the Right-of-Way'

155. Toronto. Clean City Beautiful City Program. Street Furniture Elements. City of Toronto, ON. n.d. p 5.

This document contains the accepted or preferred 'street furniture' list for the city.

156. Shaflik, Carl. Environmental Effects of Roadway Lighting. Vancouver, BC. International Dark Sky Association. August 1997.

This paper discusses the different types of light pollution and points out that a large percentage of light pollution comes from road way lighting. This puts the problem on the backs of road way engineers. Mr. Shaflik does offer some solutions through new light designs.

157. Indianapolis. Indianapolis Metropolitan Planning Organization. Metropolitan Planning Area Design Guidelines. Indianapolis, IN. n.d. pp SZ1-SZ4.

The 'separation zone' section provides 'best practices' guidelines to create a safe, comfortable and successful pedestrian environment.

158. <http://www.arborday.org/trees/rightTreeAndPlace>

Right tree, right place approach.

159. American Association of Nurserymen, "American Standard for Nursery Stock".

Root balls and sizing.

160. MUTCD, Indiana Manual for Traffic Control Devices

Lateral offsets of objects in the separation zone are defined by MUTCD guidelines and not these design guidelines.

STREET PARKING ZONE SPZ

161. Annapolis. Governor's Office of Smart Growth. Driving Urban Environments: Smart Growth Parking Best Practices. Annapolis, MD. Maryland State Government.

This publication covers what are seen at the 'best practices' for dealing with parking issues in urbanized areas. These strategies vary from 'shared parking' to parking maximums, land use changes (i.e. TODS, smart growth) and increasing transit options.

162. Austin. Texas Design Commission.. Downtown Austin Design Guidelines. Austin, TX. City of Austin. May 2000. pp 56, 78-79.

This section discusses the use of parking and the transition to a pedestrian oriented downtown. Parking must be taken into consideration, especially during the beginning of this design shift. It is important to remember that parking is both expensive to build and takes away from usable land for other purposes. This section also discusses the need for pedestrian to feel protected from automobile traffic and how that can be accomplished by curb parking, planters or bollards between the walk and the road.

163. Boulder. Downtown Alliance. Downtown Urban Design

INDIANAPOLIS REGIONAL CENTER & METROPOLITAN PLANNING AREA MULTI-MODAL CORRIDOR AND PUBLIC SPACE DESIGN GUIDELINES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Guidelines. Boulder, CO. City of Boulder. 2002. pp. 45-47.

This section discusses ways in which to limit the detrimental effect of parking on an area through the use of facades, lot placement and landscaping.

164. Nelson/Nygaard Memo, February 1, 2005

SYSTEM PLAN CITY SURVEY

165. ACS: American Community Survey

Raw data for mode splits for 2005

166. US Census 1990, 2000

Raw data for mode splits

167. Austin, TX: Austin Texas Design Commission.. Downtown Austin Design Guidelines. Austin, TX. City of Austin. May 2000. pp 48 & 49.

168. Boulder, CO: Modal Shift in the Boulder Valley - 1990-2003

Publication defines, with detail, street types and neighborhood layouts.

169. Chicago, IL: US Census 1990, 2000, ACS 2005

170. Columbus, OH: US Census 1990, 2000, ACS 2005

171. Davis, CA: US Census 1990, 2000, ACS 2005, 2006 SACOG, Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

172. Madison, WI: Regional Transportation Plan, US Census 1990, 2000, ACS 2005.

173. Minneapolis, MN: US Census 1990, 2000, ACS 2005.

174. Portland, OR: US Census 1990, 2000, ACS 2005.

175. St. Louis, MO: US Census 1990, 2000.

SYSTEM PLAN CONCEPTS

176. 29Sep07MORPCPedPlanPres03v.pdf

These various articles discuss limiting closing down streets, alleys or walkways between buildings. Increases pedestrian traffic and limits the 'alley' as an unpleasant place to travel, park or view.

177. Anderson, Larz: Planning and the Built Environment, Planners Press, 2000. particularly Ch8-10,12.

Transport Engineering Data, adapted graphics.

178. Planning and Urban Design Standards – American Planning Association, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., pp. 259-86. AND Bikeable Planet, "Cycling Solution", pp. 255-256.

Used heavily mode capacities and design considerations

179. Barnett, Jonathon: Redesigning Cities, Principles, Practice, Implementation, Planners Press, 2003, particularly Chs. 1-3

180. Boulder. Downtown Alliance. Downtown Urban Design Guidelines. Boulder, CO. City of Boulder. 2002. pp. 32, 42, 43, 58, 69 & 70.

These various pages describe ways to improve alley ways from simply places to put refuge to alternative walking areas, to main street access points to areas that can be visually pleasing and not areas to avoid whenever possible.

181. Calthorpe, Fulton: The Regional City: Planning for the End of Sprawl, Island Press, 2001.

Provides information about the distribution of districts and node and their patterns, walkable access.

182. "The Urban Network: A New Framework for Growth", Peter Calthorpe, for spacing and transit boulevard

183. <http://www.transact.org/PDFs/2007-09-25-Rue.pdf> Charlottesville VA

Policy Document, Models Discussion

184. Complete Streets, www.completestreets.org

185. "Portland's Green Dividend", White Paper from CEO's for Cities, Cortright, Joe, jcortright@impresaconulting.com, July 2007

186. "LUCI Model Aids Planning for Transportation and Other Infrastructure", Center for Urban Policy and the Environment

187. Farr, Douglas: Sustainable Urbanism, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2008.

Concepts of defining center and edge of districts, sustainable neighborhoods and corridors and high performance infrastructure

188. Florida ArtPlan www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/systems/sml/los/

Multi-modal level of service metrics.

189. Hamilton-Baillie, Jones: Proceedings of ICE 158 May 2005 pp. 39-47, Improving traffic behaviour and safety through urban design.

Particularly the simplification of streets to enforce traffic behavior rather than relying on signage (which is shown to be ineffective).

190. Highway Guidance for Estate Roads, Dorset County Council, Winter 2002

191. Trip Generation Handbook, RP-028, Kevin Hooper, editor,

- July 1998, ITE, Appendix B, pp. 117-120.
192. Hudnut, William: *Halfway to Everywhere: A Portrait of America's First Tier Suburbs*
Issues pertaining to salvageable suburbs
193. Idaho DOT materials; www.dot.state.id.us
flow-speed curve and related discussion of proper modeling of traffic behavior.
194. ITE: *Context Sensitive Solutions in Designing Major Urban thoroughfares for Walkable Communities*, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2006, 225 pp. www.ite.org/css
Used extensively cover to cover.
195. 2002 Official Thoroughfare Plan for Marion County, IN, Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development.
Thoroughfare data for the Regional Center
196. Jones, Boujenko, Marshall; *Link and Place: A Guide to Street Planning and Design*, Landor Publishing, 245pp <http://www.transact.org/PDFs/2007-09-25-Marshall.pdf> AND Marshall: *Streets and Patterns*, London and New York; Spon. Press (2005) Ch. 3 and 8.
Models and PowerPoint presentation on links and place which correspond to districts in corridors in current document
197. *Liveable Neighbourhoods: Street Layout, Design and Traffic Management Guidelines* (Ed. 3), Western Australian Planning Commission, June 2006, in particular elements 1, 2, and 7
Elegant and efficient transportation guidelines managed by street hierarchy, design and streetscape. Particularly effective in using street layout to delineate distinctive behaviors in different land use districts.
198. *Manual For Streets*, London: Thomas Telford (2007); www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/manforstreets/
England's equivalent of the Liveable Neighbourhoods and ITE works. Focused on residential streetscapes.
199. McShane, Roess, Prassas, *Traffic Engineering*, 2nd Ed., Prentice Hall, Inc., 1990, 714 pp.
Principal technical document for traffic engineering calculations and definitions.
200. Minneapolis 20-30 Plan BikePed.
201. PLANYC, *A Greener, Greater New York, Transportation Plan 2007*, www.nyc.gov/html/plan/transportation.shtml AND Design Trust for Public Space's *High Performance Infrastructure Guidelines* (NYC focused): www.designtrust.org/publications/publication_03hpig.html
202. *Portland Transportation System Plan, Chapter 5. Modal Plans and Management Plans.*
203. Potts, Harwood and Richard, "Relationship of Lane Width to Safety for Urban and Suburban Arterials", TRB 2007 Annual Meeting CD-ROM,
204. Schlossberg, "How Far, By Which Route, and Why? A Spatial Analysis of Pedestrian Preference", Mineta Transportation Institute, June 2007, <http://transweb.sjsu.edu/mtiportal/research/publications.html>
205. *Sherford Town Code*, Prince's Foundation, B. Bolger, submitted to South Hams District Council and Plymouth City Council, October 2007, 174 pp.
Important work on street hierarchies and the relationship of land use and intensity to the network. Code also prescribes architecture guidelines and green infrastructure.
206. Shoup, Donald: *High Cost of Free Parking*, Planners Press, 2005 particularly Ch. 6
Parking as an instrumental part of planning a multi-modal and dense network and the costs associated with not doing so.
207. TRB, Transportation Research Board: *Special Report 209: Highway Capacity Manual*, 1985.
Flow Speed Diagram.
208. *The Urban Place Supplement*, http://www.the-edi.co.uk/downloads/UPS/UPS_2007_final.pdf

VEHICLE TRAVEL ZONE VTZ

209. Burden, Dan, et al. *Healthy Neighborhood Street Design Guidelines, The Streets of San Joaquin*. N.p.: Walkable Communities, Inc. n.d.
Publication defines, with detail, street types and neighborhood layouts.