City of Foley Background

- Located in South Baldwin County Approximately 8 Miles from the Beaches of Gulf Shores/Orange Beach

- Population 18,288
  - 53% Population Growth from 1990-2000 (5,815 to 8,922)
  - 64% Population Growth from 2000-2010 (8,922 to 14,618)

- Approximately 5M visitors per year to the Alabama Gulf Coast
The Four Five P’s

- Partnerships
- Planning
- Persistence
- Performance
- (Politics)
Partnerships (and Politics)

- City Council
- Citizens
- Consultants
- ALDOT
- FHWA
- Baldwin County
- Lobbyists
- Legislators
Planning for Growth

Transportation Planning
- 2007– Transportation Network Assessment and Long Range Plan
- 2011 – Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Developed and Adopted

Asset Management
- 2012 – City Maintained Roadways Assessed and Pavement Management System Developed

Funding Sources Sought
- Annual Capital Budget Appropriations
- Alabama Transportation Rehabilitation and Improvement Program (ATRIP)
- FHWA Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER)
- Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)
Transportation Improvement Plan

- Assess existing transportation network
- Identifies current deficiencies and projected growth areas
- Develop long range improvement plan
- Priorities and plan are in place when funding programs open up
Transportation Improvement Plan

SHORT TERM IMPROVEMENTS

Legend:
- Signals
- Major Roads
- Minor Roads
- City Limits
- Short Term Improvements
- Proposed
- Widening
- Planned Developments

FIGURE 7

LONG TERM IMPROVEMENTS

Legend:
- Signals
- Minor Roads
- City Limits
- Long Term Improvements
- Proposed
- Widening
- Planned Developments
- Major Roads

FIGURE 8
Purpose - The Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan provides a framework for developing and implementing bicycle & pedestrian transportation facilities in the City of Foley

Goal – To develop and maintain “Complete Streets” which include a safe & convenient pedestrian and bicycle network within the overall transportation system
Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

Shared Roadways

Bike Lanes

Bike Paths
Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

Sidewalks

Pedestrian Crossings

Pedestrian Signal

Curb Extension

Right-Turn Slip-Lane
Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

Complete Street

Shared-Use Path

Greenway
Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

Table 2: Distances for Sidewalks and Walkways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Minimum Width</th>
<th>Recommended Width</th>
<th>Collector Width</th>
<th>Local Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>5 ft</td>
<td>5 ft</td>
<td>5 ft</td>
<td>5 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Business District</td>
<td>10.5 ft</td>
<td>10.5 ft</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>As shown in Appendix A2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Both Sides</td>
<td>Both Sides</td>
<td>Appendix A2.3</td>
<td>Appendix A2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer Strip</td>
<td>5 ft</td>
<td>2.5 ft</td>
<td>2 ft</td>
<td>2 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Buffer strip is not required if the sidewalk and roadway provide separation between the pedestrian and vehicular traffic making walking more comfortable. Also, in situations where medians or other obstructions are present along the roadway, a buffer strip provides a space outside of the sidewalk. Exceptions to this requirement may be made in areas where existing utilities or topography challenges exist and must be approved by the City Engineer or their designee.

Construction of sidewalks in already developed neighborhoods and streets have greater challenges, including right-of-way, utilities, and structures that may limit the possibility of maintaining the desired/recommended sidewalk widths and designs described above. The location of proposed sidewalk, as shown in Appendix A2.3 Pedestrian Facilities Map, excluded these challenges for each street and listed the proposed sidewalks to feasible locations. However, modifications to utilities, drainage, and existing site features will likely be required along some streets.

- Pedestrian Crossings: At both signalized and un-signalized intersections, there is an inscribed and legal crosswalk for pedestrians at each leg of the intersection from one corner to the other, regardless of whether the crosswalk is painted. The only time this is not true is when there is a clear sign prohibiting pedestrians from crossing one corner to another.

As pedestrian facilities are constructed, painted crosswalks should be added to each leg of the intersection. Crosswalk marking in the City shall follow MUTCD standards, shown in Figure 15.

Painted mid-block crosswalks are discouraged from use in the City due to confusion and lack of awareness of their existence.

B. Bicycle & Pedestrian Facility Goals for the next 5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Street From</th>
<th>Street To</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Approximate Distance (miles)</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N Hickory St</td>
<td>W Laurel Ave</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$80,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S Juniper St</td>
<td>E Laurel Ave</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>$124,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N Cedar St</td>
<td>W Laurel Ave</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$283,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S Cedar St</td>
<td>W Laurel Ave</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>$437,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S Juniper St</td>
<td>N Millin Rd</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>$59,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Graham Creek Nature Preserve</td>
<td>Foley Beach Express</td>
<td>Bike Path</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>$190,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Foley Beach Express</td>
<td>Millin Rd</td>
<td>Bike Path</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>$194,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Millin Rd</td>
<td>Fairway Dr</td>
<td>Shared Use Path</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>$154,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>N Cedar St</td>
<td>W Orchard Ave</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>$31,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>N Cedar St</td>
<td>W Section Ave</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>$43,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>W Magnolia Ave</td>
<td>N Oak St</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>$25,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>N Oak St</td>
<td>W Magnolia Ave</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>$105,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>W Orchard Ave</td>
<td>N Pine St</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>$48,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>W Campfire Ave</td>
<td>N Oak St</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>$75,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>W Orange Ave</td>
<td>S Mckenzie St</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City of Foley
### Maintenance Inspection Report for City Streets

**Report No.**

**Date:** 7/20/2012

---

### Quadrant

- **SW**

### Street Name

- **WEST VERBANIA**

### From To

- **SR 59**
- **SOUTH ALSTON**

### Inspection Details

- **Length:** 24.71
- **Width:** 30.2
- **No. Lanes:** 2
- **Type:** ASPHALT
- **Curb:** 2
- **Sidewalk:** 2
- **Year:** 2012

### Condition Rating

#### Surface Element

- **Rating:** 40
- **Treatments:** 10, 15, 24
- **Edge Repairs:** 5

#### Shoulder Condition

- **Rating:** 16
- **High:** 5
- **Low:** 11
- **Sidewalks:** 1

#### Drainage Element

- **Rating:** 16
- **Ditches:** 5
- **Erosion:** 1
- **Surface Drainage:** 1
- **Settlement:** 1

#### Shoulder Reversals

- **Rating:** 14
- **Spacing:** 5
- **Excessive:** 0

#### Traffic Control Element

- **Rating:** 14
- **Signs:** 0
- **Marking and Pavement:** 0

### Remarks

- **Remarks:** NO DITCHES/GUTTER

---

### Roadway Total Rating

- **Total:** 71
Streets Assessment/
Pavement Management Plan

Legend:
- Street Evaluation
- Pavement Rating

City of Foley
Street Evaluation

[Map of City of Foley with various street evaluations indicated]
Persistence

- Apply for Grants and Reapply As Required
- Identify and Correct Weaknesses in both Applications and Partnerships
- Expect a few ‘Unexpected’ Obstacles
Performance (Finally!)

- Design/Bid/Build Capital and Grant Funded Projects
2008 – CR 20 East Widening
City Budget Appropriation $3M
2014 - TIGER Grant $5M

- 13 Miles of Shared Use Paths
- 6 Miles of Complete Streets and Bicycle Lanes
- 1 Pedestrian Bridge Over State Hwy 59
2014 - TIGER Grant $5M
PRELIMINARY PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE CONCEPT
ALABAMA STATE HIGHWAY 39
FOLEY, ALABAMA

2014 - TIGER Grant $5M
2014 - TIGER Grant $5M
2015 – County Road 20 West Widening ATRIP Funding $2.5M
2015 - Pride Drive Improvements
ATRIP Funding $12M
2015 - Pride Drive Improvements
ATRIP Funding $12M
2015 - Pride Drive Improvements
ATRIP Funding $12M
2015 - Pride Drive Improvements
ATRIP Funding $12M
2015 - Pride Drive Improvements
ATRIP Funding $12M
2015 – Fern Avenue Improvements
ATRIP Funding $4M
2015 – Foley Beach Express & CR 12 Bike Paths TAP Funding $500K
2015 – Foley Beach Express & CR 12 Bike Paths TAP Funding $500K
2015 – Foley Beach Express & CR 12 Bike Paths TAP Funding $500K
$500K - $1M Annual Appropriation for Resurfacing and Pavement Management

3 ATRIP Projects for a Total of $20M in Federal/State Funding

FHWA TIGER Grant Award for $5M in Bicycle & Pedestrian Improvements

$500K TAP Grant for Bicycle Improvements
QUESTIONS?