A Vision for an Active and Healthy California:

We believe that Californians deserve every opportunity to be healthy and active in their daily lives. By increasing investments in Active Transportation networks, California can provide its citizens with numerous mobility and health benefits which will reduce health care costs and support local economies.

Increasing rates of walking and bicycling in coordination with transit and land use investments will help California capitalize on cost effective opportunities to implement AB 32 and SB 375. Investments in comprehensive bicycling and multi-use trail networks, first and last mile connections to transit, Safe Routes to School programs, and the creation of walkable neighborhoods through new and in-fill development all offer opportunities to reduce vehicle miles traveled, reduce GHG emissions, and improve public health.

By concentrating these investments in disadvantaged communities, California can provide valuable investments in the communities most in need of these improvements.

Benefits of Active Transportation Investments

- Reduce congestion and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).
- Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHGs) from transportation.
- Reduce co-pollutants from cold starts and short trips.
- Improve safety for all road users, especially children and the elderly.
- Support local economies and economic development.
- Create more jobs per million dollars spent than road only projects.
- Improve opportunities for physical activity and reduce chronic disease outcomes such as obesity and diabetes which can provide significant health care cost savings.
$360 Million in Funding Available in 2014

The Active Transportation Program (ATP) is a new grant program that encourages bicycling and walking, especially for children traveling to school and for residents of disadvantaged communities. ATP gives grants for projects that address ATP’s goals, which are outlined below. $360 million will be awarded competitively as grants to communities for Safe Routes to School, walking, and bicycling projects and programs in 2014.

Three Funding Opportunities

The ATP is divided into three competitive funding opportunities – a statewide competition for all communities, which will choose projects first; a competition for only small cities and rural regions, and a competition for large urban regions.

Statewide competition 50 percent of funding goes to projects in any size community that are competitively awarded by the California Transportation Commission on a statewide basis. At least 25 percent of this must benefit disadvantaged communities. At least 40 percent of this must be awarded to Safe Routes to School projects. The deadline for applications to the statewide competition is May 21, 2014.

Small Urban and Rural Regions 10 percent of funding goes to small urban and rural areas with populations of 200,000 or less. At least 25 percent of this must benefit disadvantaged communities. The deadline for applications to the small urban and rural competition is May 21, 2014.

Large Urban Regions 40 percent of ATP funding goes to projects in urban areas with populations more than 200,000 awarded by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). At least 25 percent of this must benefit disadvantaged communities. The deadline for applications to the large urban competitions will depend on the region. Contact your local MPO for more information.

Active Transportation Program Goals

- Increase biking and walking as a means of transportation.
- Increase safety and travel options for people who aren't traveling by vehicle.
- Reduce vehicle use and greenhouse gas emissions, especially in large urban regions.
- Enhance public health, with a special focus on reducing childhood obesity through Safe Routes to School projects and programs.
- Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully benefit from the program.
Funding Priorities

The ATP specifically prioritizes funding for projects and planning in disadvantaged communities, Safe Routes to School projects, non-infrastructure projects, and Recreational Trails projects. All projects must meet one or more of the program goals and will be ranked according to the scoring criteria on page 3.

Disadvantaged Communities

For a project to qualify for the Disadvantaged Communities priority funding requirement (25 percent of all funding) or for funding to develop an active transportation plan for a disadvantaged community (up to 5 percent of all funding), the project must clearly demonstrate a benefit to a community that meets any of the following criteria:

- The community’s median household income is less than 80 percent of the statewide median based on the most current census tract level data from the American Community Survey.¹
- An area identified as among the most disadvantaged 10 percent in the state according to the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen) scores.²
- At least 75 percent of public school students in the project area are eligible to receive free or reduced price meals under the National School Lunch Program.³ Applicants using this measure must indicate how the project benefits the school students in the project area.

Safe Routes to School Projects

The project must directly increase safety and convenience for public school students to walk and/or bike to school.

Safe Routes to School infrastructure projects and traffic education and enforcement activities must be located within two miles of a public school or within the vicinity of a public school bus stop.

What happened to the old Safe Routes to School Program?

Safe Routes to School grants are now awarded through the ATP rather than as a separate program. The same types of projects and programs are still eligible but must apply for funding through the new ATP with other types of walking and bicycling projects.

Recreational Trails Projects

For trail projects that are primarily recreational, the projects must meet the federal requirements of the Recreational Trails Program.⁴

Multi-purpose trails and paths that serve both recreational and transportation purposes are generally eligible in the ATP, so long as they are consistent with one or more goals of the program.

The case for Safe Routes to School in California

Kids already walk and bike

26-31 percent of CA kids already walk or bicycle to school, more than 2x the national average.

Fewer school busses

Only 13 percent of students in CA have the option to ride a school bus compared to 37 percent nationally, these children need safe alternatives.

Kids need safe routes

Statewide, 27 percent of all victims aged 5-15 of traffic fatalities and serious injuries are pedestrians and bicyclists – nearly twice the national average.

All communities matter

African-American and Latino children, and children from lower-income households, are more likely to walk or bicycle to school but are less likely to have safe streets on which to travel.
### Project Types

**Infrastructure**
planning, design, and construction of walk and bicycle facilities.

**Non-infrastructure**
education, encouragement, enforcement, and planning of walk and bicycle activities.

**Combined**
infrastructure projects with non-infrastructure components.

### Example Eligible Projects

- Development of new bikeways and walkways that improve mobility, access, or safety for people who are on foot or bicycle.
- Safe Routes to School projects that specifically improve safety for children and encourage walking and bicycling on the trip to school.
- Improvements to existing bikeways and walkways.
- Safe routes to transit projects, which will encourage transit by improving biking and walking routes to mass transportation and school bus stops.
- Secure bicycle parking at employment and transit centers.
- Development of a bike, pedestrian, Safe Routes to School, or active transportation plan in disadvantaged communities, with priority to communities without an existing plan.
- Non-infrastructure programs
  - Conducting bicycle and/or pedestrian counts, walkability and/or bikability assessments or audits, or pedestrian and/or bicycle safety analysis to inform plans and projects.
  - Conducting pedestrian and bicycle safety education programs.
  - Development and publishing of community walking and biking maps, including school route/travel plans.
  - Development and implementation of walking school bus or bike train programs and bike-to-school or walk-to-school or work day/month programs.
Eligibility

The following entities are eligible to apply for Active Transportation Program funds.

- Local, Regional, or State Agencies; Examples include: cities, counties, Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Regional Transportation Planning Agency, Natural Resource or Public Land Agencies
- Transit Agencies
- Public schools or School districts
- Tribal Governments: Federally-recognized Native American Tribes
- Private nonprofit tax-exempt organizations may apply for Recreational Trail Projects

Prepare and submit your application

Project applications must be submitted online and in hard copy. Hard copy project applications (5 hard copies and 1 electronic copy, via CD or USB) should be addressed or delivered to:

Caltrans
Division of Local Assistance, MS-1
Attention: April Nitsos
P.O. Box 942874
Sacramento, CA 95814

An additional copy must also be sent to the Regional Transportation Planning Agency or County Transportation Commission where the project is located and to the MPO.

A project application must include the signature of the Chief Executive Officer or other officer authorized by the applicant’s governing board.

Where the project is to be implemented by an agency other than the applicant, documentation of the agreement between the project applicant and implementing agency must be submitted with the project application.

A project application must also include documentation of all other funds committed to the projects. Deadline to apply for funding is May 21, 2014.

Important Dates

March 21, 2014
Statewide call for project applications released – 60 days to submit applications for funding

May 21, 2014
Deadline to submit statewide competition project applications

June/July 2014
MPOs in certain large urban regions will open separate calls for projects

August 20, 2014
California Transportation Commission announces awards for the statewide competition and small urban/rural competition

November 2014
MPOs announce awards for large urban regions

Resources

Full ATP Guidelines
catc.ca.gov/programs/ATP.htm

1American Community Survey Data
1.usa.gov/1d11ehm

2CalEnviroScreen Scores
bit.ly/1JJKwZA

3National School Lunch Program Data
bit.ly/1e1XpNA

4Recreational Trails Program
1.usa.gov/1ekjGm4

5California Conservation Corps
www.ccc.ca.gov
and Community Conservation Corps
www.californialocalconservationcorps.org

6Project Application will be available at
bit.ly/1d12lZ5

7MPO Contact List
www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/orip/

Upcoming events and new information can be found on our website:
saferoutescalifornia.org/srts-atp-funding
The California Department of Transportation: 
SSTI Assessment and Recommendations

Executive Summary

This report provides an assessment of the performance of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and recommendations for improvement. It is the product of a team assembled by the State Smart Transportation Initiative (Appendix A), which interviewed Caltrans staff and stakeholders (Appendix B) and reviewed a wide range of materials from and about the department (Appendix C).

The report is quite critical of Caltrans’ management and operations. However, we note at the outset that almost all the problems we point to are longstanding, so should not be blamed on Caltrans current management. We also note that Caltrans has many strengths that give us rational hope for its reform. Chief among these is the dedication of much of its top leadership and most of its staff to serving the public interest and improving their department’s performance. This strength was evident to us in the more than 100 interviews we conducted with current Caltrans employees. In those interviews, repeatedly, Caltrans staffers also openly acknowledged problems, many of the department’s own making. We thank our interviewees for their openness, and we acknowledge help from Caltrans administration in providing us with all manner of requested documentation.

The report provides a brief history of Caltrans and of the demands placed on it, a set of findings about Caltrans’ current state, and recommendations for improvement. Throughout, it focuses on the need for modernization and culture change at the department.

Caltrans’ legacy

Caltrans, like other state DOTs, was organized to build a network of trunk highways linking cities. In metro areas, local traffic began to overwhelm these highways, leading to massive construction. Eventually the highway system was largely built-out, and system operation and maintenance became more critical to Caltrans’ job. Yet the department continues to be oriented toward projects—both for new capacity and reconstruction of the existing system.

Two crucial policy changes, unusual if not unique for state DOTs, have reduced Caltrans’ power and capacity to act. One is the evolution of “self-help” counties, which allows local government to fund and often dictate the shaping of transportation systems, including the state highway system. The other is the state’s practice of sub-allocating state funding by formula to the local level, again empowering stakeholders vis-à-vis Caltrans and reducing funds available at the state level.

Demands and expectations on Caltrans have also changed since the Interstate-building era. As early as 1972, when Caltrans was formed out of the Department of Highways, there were calls for more multimodalism and less reliance on auto-mobility. More recent passage of state planning goals in AB 857 (2002) and transportation greenhouse gas reduction strategies SB 375 (2008), signal a need for Caltrans to support reductions in auto travel via low transportation-
demand land use patterns. These outcomes are precisely the opposite of what Caltrans was set up to do—foster higher auto-mobility—and the department has not adapted to them. At the same time, Californians are driving less, a trend that creates optimism for achieving state planning and policy goals and that should allow for less spending on highway capacity. Other expectations that have developed since the Interstate-building era include concerns for economic and environmental justice, livability, and economic development. New technologies in planning and operations, and expectations of mode choice have all complicated Caltrans’ world.

Caltrans often has not had to adapt to these changes. When the state vested more funding decisions at the local level, for example, decision-makers seem not to have thought much about how Caltrans would have to change to be a partner rather than a master builder. Sustainability initiatives have frequently worked around, not through, Caltrans—even when transportation is the topic. SB 375, for example, places the onus of GHG reduction on metro-level planning and the Air Resources Board (CARB). The legislature has required many reports from Caltrans, but these have failed to drive fundamental change in the department, which remains oriented toward projects. Note that the current management undertook a program review in 2012, which has spun off potentially important initiatives, such as a smarter system of managing risk, new relationships with self-help counties, and a streamlined design exception process. Many of the department’s program review initiatives overlap with or complement our own recommendations, but the important ones are still works in progress.

**Caltrans today**

Partly because of its own actions or lack thereof, but also because of how it has been treated by stakeholders, Caltrans today is significantly out of step with best practice in the transportation field and with the state of California’s policy expectations. It is in need of modernization—both in the way it sees its job and how it approaches that job—and of a culture change that will foster needed adaptation and innovation.

We focus on three important areas for improvement: 1) how the department expresses its mission; 2) what resources are available to achieve that mission; and 3) how the department manages those resources to greatest effect.

*A mission, vision, and goals not well-aligned with current conditions or demands.* When this review began, Caltrans was moving toward adopting a new five-year strategic plan that would include a mission, vision, and goals. However the department put that work on hold pending the release of this report and results from the concurrent California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities (CTIP) process. We applaud that move, because the draft plan was very similar to previous iterations, and mostly unresponsive to new conditions and policy direction. Critically, the draft plan avoided the word “sustainability” or any similar concept, when one of Caltrans’ most important tasks is to understand what sustainability means to a state DOT and to operationalize it in goals, measures, and actions. For example, the department has not come to grips with the reality of induced traffic and the relationship between transportation and land use.
A portfolio of skills and practices that do not match modern demands. As it remains oriented toward project development, Caltrans has not developed the resources needed in the modern, post-Interstate building era.

Though it produced an important guide to fostering low-travel land use, *Smart Mobility 2010*, the department has almost completely ignored the report and failed to implement its important recommendations for practice. Caltrans’ use of automotive level of service (LOS) standards in determining exactions from developers has been a barrier to the compact development sought by state policy and may have induced the opposite—low-density, high travel exurban development. Caltrans’ analytic capacity on these issues has fallen behind that of local and regional partners.

Though it now controls a mature system, Caltrans continues to view it on a project-by-project basis. Consequently, systemic and operational issues have not received enough attention. There is no modern asset management system yet in place to guide investments and extend facility lifespans. System planning documents, such as the *California Interregional Blueprint*, may have sound guidance, but these often do not effectively guide investment or policy, as they garner little interest among the project-oriented department. Operational needs, such as maintenance of ITS infrastructure, are not a top priority.

Caltrans, again with a focus on capital projects, has not fully adapted to the multi-stakeholder environment in which it finds itself. It participates in some partner-driven initiatives, such as the nationally significant integrated corridor management (ICM) program in San Diego, but rarely leads on these and tends to view off-system activities as irrelevant. Goods movement, involving a mix of state and local and public and private systems, is a particular challenge.

Important standard operating procedures, such as those in design guides, are too inflexible and do not do enough to mainstream facilities for non-SOV (single-occupancy vehicle) travel into project development. Caltrans’ peculiar standards on bicycle facilities even pertain to locally owned streets, precluding some active transportation initiatives. The rigidity of the guidance gives rise to requests for design exceptions, which all stakeholders characterized as a painful and time-consuming process.

Caltrans has not developed sufficient communications skills and procedures to either explain its own decisions well or to take into account important material from communities and partners. It is undertaking an effort to improve reporting on its performance, inspired by the Washington State DOT’s *Gray Notebook*. Its website is in need of an overhaul.

Managerial systems and practices that are inadequate to motivate staff and to hold them accountable, and to foster innovation. Modernizing Caltrans’ mission and redirecting resources will only pay off if the department can effectively implement these changes. One reason for Caltrans’ lack of evolution, however, is that it lacks the systems to manage for change and for performance.

Interviewees told many stories of underperforming employees who stayed on the job. The department lacks a thorough performance management system that would hold everyone
accountable and reward innovators—even though such a system was envisioned in a widely-read report from two decades ago.

One reason for Caltrans’ rigidity, both with respect to projects and to its ability to change, is a culture of risk aversion and even fear. It is easier for employees to either follow an established standard slavishly—or not to make a decision at all—than to creatively come to the best solution. Staff frequently cited liability as a concern, but other DOTs have been able to innovate without exposing themselves. Caltrans is working on an enterprise risk management program to address some of these issues.

Salary levels are too low for some important groups of employees, including managers and planners, leading to a brain drain and the inability of Caltrans to reward good work with a meaningful promotion. The department has a management training program, but it has been cut during budget squeezes and lacks follow-up; managers encounter the course only once or twice in their careers.

As with most DOTs, structural boundaries—between headquarters and the districts and between various units within the department—are a serious impediment to creative problem solving and innovation.

Caltrans tomorrow

Our recommendations are aimed at modernizing Caltrans and changing its culture to be able to meet new demands. Our 10 recommendations address the three areas for improvement cited in the previous section: 1) how Caltrans views its job; 2) what resources it devotes to doing that job; and 3) how it manages those resources. The recommendations are:

**Mission, vision, and goals**

1. Establish a mission, vision, and associated goals that reflect current state law and policy.
   - *Caltrans should use its visioning and strategic planning process to explain to its staff and stakeholders how it will address established state planning and policy goals around sustainability.*
   - *System preservation should be a primary message.*
   - *Caltrans should outline a groundbreaking approach to the delivery of transportation services—an approach that is not adequately expressed in the current “improves mobility” mission.*
   - *Caltrans should have a strong focus on state interconnectivity, in particular as it relates to freight movement and port connectivity.*

2. Better match investments to policy goals expressed in the statements of mission, vision, and goals.
   - *CalSTA should see proposed STIP project lists more than a week before they go to the CTC for approval.*
   - *CalSTA and Caltrans should use the CTC review process to impose a policy review of all proposed investments.*
CalSTA should consider proposing legislation to allow the CTC to approve individual projects rather than entire programs.

Caltrans, with CalSTA, should review legislatively mandated reports and propose discontinuing many of them.

3. Take advantage of the state’s new institutional structure to help drive change.
   - CalSTA and Caltrans should strengthen relationships with other state agencies that can help (or hinder) the achievement of the new vision.
   - CalSTA should provide leadership and oversight in implementing the mission and vision, and the recommendations of this study.
   - CalSTA should develop a “staff exchange” program.

Alignment of resources and skills

4. Align resources to desired goals.
   - Caltrans should strengthen its planning unit.
   - Caltrans should improve its ability to operate its highway system.
   - Caltrans should modernize its stewardship effort through asset management.
   - Caltrans should provide more resources, expertise or simply a real voice in planning and prioritization to the offices dealing with rail and freight.
   - Caltrans should develop an enhanced internal capability to identify and pursue innovative finance partnerships.

5. Reform critical guidance documents and standard operating procedures.
   - Caltrans should update the design and traffic control device manuals, and other guidance documents as necessary, to implement the new strategic plan and vision.
   - As an initial step, Caltrans should relinquish oversight of bike facilities on locally owned streets.
   - As a second initial step, Caltrans should give designers the option of using NACTO urban design standards in metro areas.
   - Caltrans should generally rethink its approach to facilities in metro areas and town centers.
   - Caltrans should build more flexibility into its processes.
   - Caltrans should implement Smart Mobility 2010.
   - Caltrans and CalSTA should revisit legal guidance on the risk of innovative design and practices.

   - Caltrans should assert leadership in the area of sustainable transportation in its relations with regional partners.
   - Caltrans should find ways to transfer local-serving roads to local government.
   - Caltrans and CalSTA should negotiate coverage for long-term maintenance, resurfacing, and reconstruction costs when locally controlled STIP and LTST funds are used to add capacity to state highways.
7. Focus on freight.
   - CalSTA and Caltrans should create a clear focal point for freight policy and planning within the department.
   - California’s Freight and Rail Plans should identify the major transport corridors, whether highway, rail, or air, that should receive significant attention from Caltrans in the next decades.

8. Communicate more effectively.
   - Caltrans should communicate around the performance metrics that are used to monitor progress against organizational goals.
   - To effectively communicate on performance, Caltrans should develop capacity in “performance journalism.”
   - Caltrans should work to ensure its communications with local stakeholders are genuine and two-way.

Management systems

   - Caltrans should set enterprise-wide and team-specific goals, both short- and long-term.
   - Caltrans should devise metrics to track the organizational goals.
   - The Caltrans director should assign each of his direct reports responsibility for a subset of the goals, and an associated set of numerical metrics.
   - Measures should evolve.
   - Caltrans should provide financial incentives for manager performance.
   - Caltrans should dedicate resources to push performance-based management throughout the organization.
   - To ensure that union contracts are not violated, goals and performance metrics for non-management personnel should be set at the team level, with the union engaged in the goal-setting effort.
   - At the same time Caltrans should provide room for innovative actions that further state and department goals.
   - Caltrans should re-examine internal relationships and flow of authority to foster accountability and effective collaboration.

10. Foster innovation and continuing evolution.
    - Caltrans management and CalSTA should insist on robust implementation of state policies and rely on staff for implementation details.
    - Caltrans should benchmark practice against best practices elsewhere.
    - Caltrans should work to better integrate its research program with improved practice.
    - Caltrans’ effort to develop an enterprise risk management system should continue and be viewed as a critically important resource for performance-based decision making.
    - Caltrans should improve staff training and workforce development.
    - Caltrans should strike the right balance between the cost and benefit of national engagement for Caltrans staff.
Plan of action.
This is a wide-ranging list of initiatives, not all of which can be accomplished immediately. Over the next six months, to move forward as rapidly as possible, we recommend this plan of action:

1. **Caltrans and CalSTA should develop mission, vision, and goal statements that are fully consistent with state planning and policy goals.** These statements should explain conceptually what Caltrans’ role is in sustainability, livability, and equitable economic development. One source for these statements is the department’s own 2040 long-range plan, which is being constructed in parallel to, but separately from, the five-year strategic plan. Another is the recent Smart Mobility report, which has largely been ignored. Critically, if the word “mobility” (whether described as smart or not) remains as a central focus in the department’s mission, it needs a clear definition in light of new expectations of Caltrans. Whatever the aims of management might be, currently too many in the department understand the word to mean “moving cars faster.” To jumpstart this effort, we recommend that the secretary and director accept responsibility for crafting these statements in concert with a set of key senior staff of their choosing. To demonstrate the commitment to collaboration, we suggest that these statements be produced in draft and shared with key transportation and elected officials selected by the secretary before finalization. Once CalSTA and Caltrans have developed the new statements, they must go to the district directors and other key staff to work out the details and implementation. The process we describe is different from the bottom-up approach that has characterized strategic planning in the department, which resulted in the culture endorsing itself. Strategic direction must come from top down and outside in. **Timeframe: Month 1.**

2. **Following the release of new mission, vision, and goals, Caltrans and CalSTA should use those statements, as well as the recommendations in this report, to organize teams to develop implementation actions and performance measures.** Teams may be organized around work-streams, e.g., project development or system planning, or topic areas from the recommendations, e.g., liability or guidance manuals. Ten to 12 teams of about 10 to 12 members should be able to tackle a wide range of critical issues. Membership should be across silos, e.g., if a design team is formed it should not be limited to engineers doing design, and ideally should be composed of staff members who volunteer to serve and guide implementation of the new strategic direction. Caltrans should designate a leader of this effort with sufficient staffing and enough seniority to have the ear of the secretary and the director. Going forward this staff can take responsibility for tracking and adjusting measures, and recommending strategic corrections. Staff from the agency and its other departments, as well as those from other state and local entities, may be included in the work groups where such expertise and perspectives are helpful. For example, if a group is formed around the big issue of reporting and communications, it might consider reducing or combining some of the many reports required by law, and this discussion might include legislative staff. The majority of staff, however, should be from Caltrans. To focus the effort, this work should supersede or absorb other external and internal initiatives, such as the strategic and long-range planning processes and the 2012 program review follow-ups. While there may be areas where new resources are needed in order for Caltrans to improve performance—we have argued that planning and operations are two—implementation should not assume additional resources for projects unless those resources are clearly forthcoming. **Timeframe: Months 2-6.**
3. **Caltrans and CalSTA should work to ensure the success of CEQA reform rulemaking set up by SB 743 (2013).** SB 743 could do more to advance state planning goals than anything else Caltrans has done. The statute’s assignment of the SB 743 rulemaking to another department, however, is evidence of the general lack of confidence in Caltrans’ ability to accomplish this transformative change. And that lack of confidence may be well-founded, as our interviews disclosed substantial resistance to change, with Caltrans staff, for example, arguing to extend the new rules only to the minimum area required, while the statute would permit statewide application. A successful rulemaking, leading to a predictable developer fee based on transportation system use—probably vehicle-miles traveled (VMT)—would put California and Caltrans back at the leading edge of modern transportation practice, and would remove one of the greatest institutional barriers to implementing SB 375. It would begin to make Caltrans a real contributor to the success of modern policy in the state, and it would provide a model for how the staff could help implement a challenging new charge. *Timeframe: Months 1-5.*

4. **Caltrans and CalSTA should modernize state transportation design guidance.** A complete overhaul involving the content of multiple manuals and changes to the exception process will take longer than a half-year, but the agency and department should move quickly to encourage modern multimodal improvements in metro areas. The agency and department should support, or propose if no bill is forthcoming, legislation to end the archaic practice of imposing state rules on local streets for bicycle facilities. For the many remaining state-owned metropolitan facilities—local streets designed to road standards, or “stroads”—the agency and department should follow the lead of Washington State DOT and quickly adopt modern guidance as laid out in the NACTO Urban Street Design Guide. These actions will not only improve multimodal access and safety in metro areas, but will also provide relief to local entities that have raised money and sought to implement modern design, only to be thwarted by the state and its dated, rigid design policies. These initial steps should be followed by more thorough reform of the department’s design guidance as described in the recommendations. One or more of the work groups in recommendation No. 2 should be tasked with creating a process for design reform. *Timeframe: Months 1-4.*