The Upper Valley
Transportation Management Association's

Mobility Checklist

Guidlines to create efficient and livable growth



Promoting:

- Walkable Neighborhoods
- Biking
- Bus Transit

Sources

- Center for Transit Oriented Development—www.reconnectingamerica.org
- *Frequently Asked Questions*—www.SmartGrowthPlanning.org
- *Bikeability Checklist*, prepared by Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT)
- *Workability Checklist*, prepared by National Center of Safe Routes to School, Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center, USDOT, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- *Transit-Oriented Development Guidebook*. City of Austin, Texas, April 2006
- *Transit 2020 Report,* Appendix E Transit-Oriented Development Checklist, August 2002
- *Guide for Transit-Oriented Development*, prepared by Twin Cities Metropolitan Council, Minneapolis, MN, August 2006
- *Smart Choices Program—TOD Checklist*, City of Edmonton, Planning and Development Office, August 2006

This checklist is a project of

The Upper Valley Transportation Management Association
104 Railroad Row
White River Junction, VT 05001
802.291.9100
gabe@vitalcommunities.org
www.vitalcommunities.org

About Vital Communities

Vital Communities is a regional nonprofit organization based in White River Junction, VT, that works to engage citizens in community life and to foster the long-term balance of cultural, economic, environmental, and social well-being in our region.

A. Proximity to Services, Employment, and Transit

The most effective way to reduce single-occupant vehicle (SOV) transportation is to locate housing near services and employment and on transit routes.

Is the Proposal:	Yes	No	NA
1. Proximate (within a 10-minute walk) to an employment center or downtown area?	☐	☐	☐
2. Proximate (within a 10-minute walk) to an existing or proposed transit stop?	☐	☐	☐

Does the Proposal Include:	Yes	No	NA
1. Bus and/or van stops with shelters for protection from the weather?	☐	☐	☐
2. Safe, convenient pedestrian and bicycling network connections to bus routes and/or van stops?	☐	☐	☐
3. Results of discussion with local transit providers, including school district, social service agencies, and public transportation providers?	☐	☐	☐
4. Results of discussion with regional transportation authorities (Regional Planning Commissions, Upper Valley Trails Alliance, Upper Valley Transportation Management Association)?	☐	☐	☐

B. Pedestrian and Cyclist Orientation—Walking and Cycling

These features encourage people to walk and cycle instead of getting into their automobiles. Routes for pedestrians and cyclists within the proposed development should be convenient, attractive, and safe. The design also should provide for the easy use of strollers, scooters, rollerblades, walkers, and wheelchairs.

Does the Proposal Include	Yes	No	NA
1. Buildings scaled and designed to create an attractive environment for pedestrians and cyclists?	☐	☐	☐
2. Streets designed to promote slow vehicular traffic? A compact, grid-based street network with small blocks (300–500 ft) that offer multiple access points and alternative route options is ideal. (Dead-end cul-de-sacs and large blocks are not desirable.)	☐	☐	☐
3. Paths or sidewalks with adequate widths, sight lines, and, where appropriate, lighting?	☐	☐	☐
4. Paths or sidewalks separated from the street by a landscaped area with trees, where appropriate?	☐	☐	☐
5. Barrier-free pedestrian and cycling routes?	☐	☐	☐
6. Ample, convenient, sheltered, and secure bicycle parking?	☐	☐	☐
7. Access or rights-of-ways to connect with future developments, neighborhoods, or trails?	☐	☐	☐
8. Trails, sidewalks, bike lanes, or transit routes from the proposed development to typical destinations (e.g., schools, recreational facilities, business district, multi-use trail system)?	☐	☐	☐

C. Density/Location

Concentrated development supports pedestrians, cyclists, and public transportation opportunities.

Does the Proposal Promote Density (relative to context)?	Yes	No	NA
1. Does the development efficiently use the space available?	☐	☐	☐
2. Are the units sited in a compact pattern, maximizing open space, and enabling transit services to make limited stops?	☐	☐	☐

D. Mix of Uses

"Villages" at transit stops should have a mix of residential, civic, and commercial land uses, as well as other land uses nearby. The mix should offer people opportunities to live and work close to transit, to obtain at least basic goods and services, and to use transit to travel to other places.

Does the Proposal Include:	Yes	No	NA
1. A mix of housing types and/or housing unit sizes?	☐	☐	☐
2. A horizontal or vertical mix of residential, civic, and commercial (office/retail) land uses?	☐	☐	☐
3. An additional mix of uses within an already mixed-use area?	☐	☐	☐
4. Attractive public and private open spaces with amenities (e.g., landscaping, benches, waste receptacles, lighting, public art)?	☐	☐	☐
5. Commercial uses that benefit residents and are compatible with the neighborhood (e.g., neighborhood store, coffee shop, hair salon)?	☐	☐	☐

E. Parking

Parking should be minimized while encouraging active transportation alternatives to the SOV.

Does the Proposal Include:	Yes	No	NA
1. A plan to reduce reliance on the SOV (i.e., a Transportation Demand Management plan)?	☐	☐	☐
2. Parking located to the side or to the rear of buildings in general?	☐	☐	☐
3. A reduction in the number of parking spaces provided for residential buildings based on proximity to alternative transportation options?	☐	☐	☐
4. Both minimum and maximum parking standards?	☐	☐	☐
5. Shared parking among different types of land uses?	☐	☐	☐
6. Secondary entrances and/or loading spaces located to the side or rear of buildings to minimize sidewalk crossings?	☐	☐	☐
7. Structured parking instead of surface lots in high-density areas?	☐	☐	☐