



Community Mobility Plan

DRAFT

Cities of Manchester & Tullahoma, TN
October 2019



42'

5'

5'

8'

.5'

5'

3'

12'

Prepared by



Department of
Transportation

Funded through the Community
Transportation Planning Grant Program



Contents

Introduction	1
Section 1.0 Overview	2
Section 2.0 Issues & Opportunities	4
Section 3.0 Evaluation of Existing Conditions & Future Needs	6
Section 4.0 Multimodal Recommendations	28
Section 5.0 Implementation	56

DRAFT



CITIES OF MANCHESTER & TULLAHOMA, TN

Community Mobility Plan

The Tennessee Department of Transportation (TOOT) established the Community Transportation Planning Grant (CTPG) program to assist Tennessee's small and rural communities in developing transportation plans to address transportation, land use, and growth management issues. The program is designed to better integrate multimodal transportation systems with local land use objectives and achieve statewide transportation goals.

The Cities of Manchester and Tullahoma were jointly awarded one of the 22 grants from the CTBG program's 2018-2019 grant cycle. This report documents the findings and recommendations of the Community Mobility Plan.

Section 1.0

Overview


The Cities of Manchester and Tullahoma are the two primary cities in Coffee County, Tennessee. Manchester, with a 2018 population of 10,916, is the county seat while Tullahoma, with a 2018 population of 19,370, is the county's largest city. The cities' close proximity to one another – they are located approximately 12 miles apart – creates a natural interdependency between the two. Residents and visitors regularly commute from one city to the other for employment, shopping, recreation, and entertainment. The cities also share a Joint Industrial Park, located along State Route (SR) 55, which is currently home to four industries and 135 employees with approximately 300 available acres for additional industrial development.

This interdependency necessitates close coordination of decision making, particularly for shared resources such as transportation infrastructure. The Community Mobility Plan focuses on a holistic regional evaluation of the mobility challenges and opportunities that both cities will face going forward. As the cities continue to grow, a shared vision for community mobility will ensure the continued safe and efficient movement of people within and between Manchester and Tullahoma. To this end, the plan focuses on the five primary corridors (Figure 1-1) serving the two cities:

- SR-55 between Manchester and Tullahoma;
- US-41 (SR-2) in Manchester;
- Old Manchester/Tullahoma Highway;
- US-41A (SR-16) in Tullahoma; and
- SR-55/Wilson Avenue in Tullahoma.

The Community Mobility Plan will act as a blueprint for multimodal mobility and safety along these five corridors and the parallel and intersecting routes that support them. The plan recommendations will promote multimodal safety, provide needed connections to community facilities and amenities, and ensure a coordinated approach to meeting the transportation needs of the region's population and employment growth.

Figure 1-1. Community Mobility Study- Study Corridors



Section 2.0

Issues & Opportunities

The transportation system in Manchester and Tullahoma is largely centered around the use of the personal automobile. Indeed, most residents use an automobile to move within and between the two cities. However, both cities have a relatively compact development pattern, making active transportation, including walking and biking, a viable choice for short trips to destinations close to home, work, or school. Improving the active transportation network while ensuring the safe and efficient movement of automobiles is the primary focus of the Community Mobility Plan. As both cities continue to grow and attract new residents and visitors, ensuring safety for all users of the transportation system will be paramount to securing a viable and attractive community. As such, the Community Mobility Plan directly addresses the following key issues and opportunities:

- A. Consider the safety and mobility needs of all travel modes and people of all ages and abilities;
- B. Enhance and expand walking and biking facilities by providing a mix of new or improved facilities along both major and local streets;
- C. Target transportation improvements in areas experiencing residential and commercial growth;
- D. Connect key districts and activity centers, such as neighborhoods, schools, parks, and commercial areas; and
- E. Improve transportation connections between Manchester and Tullahoma, particularly for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Each of the issues and opportunities is discussed in greater detail below.

A. Consider All Travel Modes and People of All Ages & Abilities

The five study corridors form the foundation of the joint transportation system for Manchester and Tullahoma, accommodating through traffic and providing access to key destinations and activity centers. As the communities continue to grow, safety and mobility along these corridors will face additional challenges. Growth and increased local traffic create conflict between local commuters and through traffic, such as the heavy truck traffic that regularly travels through Tullahoma to and from the Jack Daniels distillery in nearby Lynchburg. Furthermore, the high traffic volumes and speeds, combined with often-frequent driveway cuts, create conflict points between vehicles and bicycles and pedestrians. Improvements are needed to ensure safe and efficient mobility for all users, including those who walk or bike.

B. Enhance & Expand Walking & Biking Facilities

Safe and comfortable walking and biking facilities provide a wide range of benefits to individuals, their communities, and the surrounding environment. From increased property values to better health outcomes, active transportation facilities are efficient ways to increase the quality of life for residents and provide a more attractive destination for visitors. While both Manchester and Tullahoma currently have both bicycle and pedestrian facilities, these tend to be isolated facilities, fragmented by network gaps and served by unsafe street crossings. These issues create barriers to existing and potential users, discouraging active transportation for short trips.

C. Target Improvements in Growth Areas

Both cities have a shared small town, rural history. As they attract new residents and jobs, the transportation infrastructure is often inadequate to accommodate the additional demand that accompanies such growth areas that originally served low-density residential development or agricultural land, such as Hill Chapel Road in Manchester and Cedar Lane in Tullahoma, are now experiencing safety and capacity issues as vehicle and active transportation traffic have increased. Such legacy facilities can actually increase demand on the surrounding corridors as users seek established high-volume roads for local travel. Ensuring that transportation facilities are adequate to accommodate growth can strengthen the cities' overall transportation networks.

D. Connect Key Districts & Activity Centers

The current road network generally provides connections for automobiles to existing districts and activity centers. However, conditions at intersections serving these areas can be unsafe, particularly during peak hours. For bicyclists and pedestrians, conditions can be even less favorable, particularly around schools, parks, and public facilities. Strengthening multimodal connections to community facilities, as well as commercial districts, creates a more inviting environment for users as well as increased traffic and patronage for community facilities and local businesses.

E. Improve Connections Between Manchester & Tullahoma

Both SR-55 and Old Manchester/Tullahoma Highway provide the primary connections between Manchester and Tullahoma. Ensuring the safe and efficient movement of vehicles on these roads is paramount to both communities. Additionally, in recent years members of the community have advocated for a stronger bicycle and pedestrian connection between the two cities, which would provide better multimodal connectivity as well as an ideal route for recreational use.

Section 3.0

Evaluation of Existing Conditions & Future Needs

Existing conditions along the five corridors were evaluated to determine the multimodal solutions that would most effectively address the issues and opportunities discussed in Section 2.0.

Public Participation

Two rounds of public workshops were held concurrently with key project milestones to solicit feedback from local residents. The workshops were supported by an online survey and interactive map. The first round of outreach consisted of two workshops:

- May 14, 2019, D.W. Wilson Community Center – Tullahoma; and
- May 16, 2019, Manchester City Hall – Manchester.

This round of workshops focused on establishing a common vision for mobility along the study corridors by asking residents to consider two key questions:

1. What transportation goals are important to you?
2. What kind of improvements would you like to see?

Over 60 people participated either in-person at the public workshop or online through the survey and/or interactive map. Table 3-1 summarizes the responses received regarding community goals for the mobility study. Focusing walking and biking connections on local streets along key destinations and emphasizing improved connections along major streets and highways were identified as “More Important.” Table 3-2 shows the preferred types of improvements respondents identified. Sidewalks, separated bike lanes, and greenways were the most preferred walking, bicycling, and trail facility types or improvements. Mixed-use development and access management were identified as preferred complementary development strategies.

Participants were also encouraged to identify specific improvement suggestions in an interactive mapping exercise. Figures 3-1 and 3-2 show the improvement suggestions provided for Manchester and Tullahoma, respectively.

A final public workshop on August 27, 2019, presented the study’s draft recommendations.

Table 3-1. Corridor Goals

Goals/Objectives	More Important		Important		Less Important	
	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage
Ensure that transportation improvements consider the needs of all travel modes and people of all ages and abilities	21	47%	20	44%	4	9%
Target transportation improvements in areas experiencing residential and commercial growth	23	55%	13	31%	6	14%
Improve transportation connections between Manchester and Tullahoma, especially for pedestrians and bicyclists	14	30%	9	20%	23	50%
Emphasize walking and biking improvements on major streets and highways	31	65%	12	25%	5	10%
Focus walking and bicycling connections on local streets between neighborhoods, schools, parks and commercial areas	31	66%	11	23%	5	11%

Table 3-2. Preferred Improvements

		Total	% of Category
Walking	Pedwalks	38	58%
	Streets Trees and Light	16	25%
	Crosswalks	10	15%
	Crosswalks	1	1%
Bicycling	2% Separated Bik nes	2	24%
	53% Buffered Bike Lanes	12	27%
	Bike Lanes	7	16%
	Bike Boulevards	2	4%
Trails	Greenways	20	40%
	Sidepaths	18	36%
	and Squares	9	18%
	Trailheads	3	6%
Development Strategies	6% Mixed Use Development	19	37%
	Managing Driveway Access	17	33%
	Building Setbacks	8	16%
	Parking Behind or On Side	7	14%

Figure 3-Interactive Map Comments- Manchester





Figure 3-2. Interactive Map Comments- Tullahoma



Corridor Traffic Analysis

Both Manchester and Tullahoma recently updated their respective transportation plans. The Manchester Transportation Master Plan was last updated in 2018 and the Tullahoma Comprehensive Transportation Plan was last updated in 2013. These documents, as well as projects currently under development by TDOT, were reviewed to identify planned roadway improvement projects within both jurisdictions. Planned projects on key parallel or intersecting routes were reviewed as well. Tables 3-3 and 3-4 identify relevant planned roadway improvements for Manchester and Tullahoma, respectively.

Table 3-3. Planned Roadway Improvements - Manchester

Route	From	To	Description	Source	Agency	Horizon Year
US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard	Near Doak Road	Walmart Access Road	Signalization	Transportation Master Plan	Manchester	2019
Kennedy Drive	SR-55/McArthur Street	Hills Chapel Road	Improvement and extension (new location)	Transportation Master Plan	Manchester	2022
US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard	Joe Hickerson Road	AEDC Road	Widening	TDOT STIP	TDOT	2022
Hills Chapel Road	Forrestwood Drive	US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard	Widening with sidewalks	Transportation Master Plan	Manchester	2027
Oak Drive/Clover Lane	SR-55/McArthur Street	US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard	Widening	Transportation Master Plan	Manchester	2027
Skinner Flat Road	US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard	Forrestwood Drive	Widening	Transportation Master Plan	Manchester	2027
Forrestwood Drive	Hills Chapel Road	Skinner Flat Road	Improvement and extension (new location)	Transportation Master Plan	Manchester	2037
US-41/Murfreesboro Highway	Dunk Street	North City Limit	Widening	Transportation Master Plan	Manchester	2037
Burger Drive	US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard	Hunt Creek Road	Widening	Transportation Master Plan	Manchester	2037
Joe Hickerson Road	US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard	Southern Terminus	Widening	Transportation Master Plan	Manchester	2037

Table 3-4. Planned Roadway Improvements - Tullahoma

Route	From	To	Description	Source	Agency	Horizon Year
SR-55/Wilson Avenue	First Avenue	US-41A/North Jackson Street	Widening with sidewalks and bike lanes	DOT STIP	TDOT	2018
SR-55/Wilson Avenue	First Avenue	Corporate Boundary	Widening with sidewalks and bike lanes	Metropolitan Transportation Plan	Tullahoma	2018
Cedar Lane*	US-41/North Jackson Street	William Northern Boulevard	Widening with sidewalks and bike lanes	Metropolitan Transportation Plan	Tullahoma	2018
Cedar Lane	William Northern Boulevard	Connector Lane (SR-130)	Widening with sidewalks and bike lanes	Metropolitan Transportation Plan	Tullahoma	2018
Cedar Lane	Connector (Cedar Lane/SR-130)	SR-55/Wilson Avenue	Widening with sidewalks and bike lanes	Metropolitan Transportation Plan	Tullahoma	2018
Connector (Cedar Lane/SR-130)	Cedar Lane	SR-130	Extension (new location) with sidewalks and bike lanes	Metropolitan Transportation Plan	Tullahoma	2018
Cedar Lane/Westside Drive	SR-55/Wilson Avenue	Clemens Drive	Widening with sidewalks and bike lanes	Metropolitan Transportation Plan	Tullahoma	2022
Atlantic Street	Kings Lane	US-41A/South Jackson Street	Widening with sidewalks and bike lanes	Metropolitan Transportation Plan	Tullahoma	2022
Kings Lane	Ovoca Road	Marbury Drive	Widening with sidewalks and bike lanes	Metropolitan Transportation Plan	Tullahoma	2027
Kings Lane	Country Club Drive	Ovoca Road	Widening with sidewalks and bike lanes	Metropolitan Transportation Plan	Tullahoma	2027

*Project has been constructed

Using these projects as a baseline, projected traffic volumes and levels of service (LOS) for the five study corridors were analyzed to determine whether additional improvements are necessary to address existing and/or projected traffic issues along the corridors.

Due to the varying presence of traffic signals along the corridors, both the Highway Capacity Software (HSC7) and ArtPlan2012 were used to analyze the non-signalized and signalized portions of the routes, respectively.

As shown in Tables 3-5 through 3-11, LOS along the routes remains largely static through the design year of 2040. All of the routes, when analyzed as a whole with a weighted average, operate at acceptable LOS for both current (2019) and future (2040) projections.

Table 3-5. US-41 Level of Service

US-41					2019			2040			
LM	ID	LM	ID	Calc.	Speed Limit	ADT	Avg. Speed	LOS	ADT	Avg. Speed	LOS
11.68	Enter Manchester City	12.35	Begin 40 mph	HCS	55	9,310	49.8	D	10,710	49.6	D
12.35	Begin 40 mph	13.02	Traffic Count STA 041	HCS		9,310	40.5	D	10,710	40.4	D
13.02	Traffic Count STA 041	13.47	Harmon Ln.	HCS	40	9,310	33.6	D	10,710	33.5	E
13.47	Harmon Ln.	13.60	Woodbury Hwy.	HCS	40	9,310	33.7	A	10,710	33.7	B
13.60	Woodbury Hwy.	13.91	W. Fort St.	ArtPlan	40	12,900	29.5	C	15,840	29.1	C
13.91	W. Fort St.	14.10	S. Spring St.	ArtPlan	40	12,900	16.8	E	15,840	15.9	E
14.10	S. Spring St.	14.65	McMinville Hwy.	ArtPlan	40	13,950	28.1	C	15,410	27.7	C
14.65	McMinville Hwy.	14.88	Jackson St.	ArtPlan	40	19,770	16.4	E	21,850	15.3	E
14.88	Jackson St.	15.12	Hills Chapel Rd.	ArtPlan	40	19,770	23.9	C	21,850	23.4	C
15.12	Hills Chapel Rd.	15.34	Clover Ln.	ArtPlan	40	19,770	21.7	D	21,850	20.8	D
15.34	Clover Ln.	16.31	Shopping Center	ArtPlan	40	19,290	31.4	B	21,780	30.3	C
16.31	Shopping Center	16.61	Expressway Dr.	ArtPlan	40	19,290	19.5	D	21,780	18.6	D
16.61	Expressway Dr.	16.69	I-24 S	ArtPlan	40	19,290	11.5	F	21,780	11.0	F
16.69	I-24 S	16.90	I-24 N	ArtPlan	40	19,290	22.0	D	21,780	21.2	D
16.90	I-24 N	17.11	Walmart Supercenter	ArtPlan	40	19,290	21.4	D	21,780	20.4	D
17.11	Walmart Supercenter	17.37	Traffic Count STA 090	HCS	40	19,290	41.0	B	21,780	41.0	C
17.37	Traffic Count STA 090	17.5	Leave Manchester City	HCS	40	16,470	36.8	C	22,330	36.8	C
Weighted Average Speed:					41.7		31.7			31.1	
Weighted Average LOS:							D			D	

Table 3-6. Spring Street Level of Service

Spring Street						2019			2040		
LM	ID	LM	ID	Calc.	Speed Limit	ADT	Avg. Speed	LOS	ADT	Avg. Speed	LOS
0.060	Begin 45 mph	0.127	Traffic Count STA 46	HCS	45	2,560	39.6	B	2,920	39.5	B
0.127	Traffic Count STA 46	0.800	Begin 30 mph	HCS	45	2,560	39.8	B	2,920	39.7	B
0.800	Begin 30 mph	1.06	End Study Route	HCS	30	2,560	27.3	B	2,920	27.2	C
Weighted Average Speed:					41.1	36.5			36.4		
Weighted Average LOS:						B			C		

Table 3-7. SR-55/McArthur Street Level of Service

SR-55/McArthur Street						2019			2040		
LM	ID	LM	ID	Calc.	Speed Limit	ADT	Avg. Speed	LOS	ADT	Avg. Speed	LOS
13.07	Oak Dr.	13.52	Coffee St.	ArtPlan	40	18,430	30.5	C	25,270	27.6	C
13.52	Coffee St.	13.79	SR2	ArtPlan	40	19,360	17.1	E	21,390	16.2	E
13.79	SR2	15.17	Interstate Dr.	ArtPlan	40	13,150	39.2	B	14,530	39.0	B
15.17	Interstate Dr.	15.40	Begin 55 mph	HCS	55	13,150	45.0	A	14,530	45.0	A
15.40	Begin 55 mph	15.49	Traffic Count STA 38	HCS	55	13,150	57.0	A	14,530	57.0	A
15.49	Traffic Count STA 38	15.55	Leave Manchester City	HCS	55	13,830	52.0	A	15,280	52.0	A
Weighted Average Speed:					41.9	36.6			36.0		
Weighted Average LOS:						C			C		

Table 3-8. US-41A/Jackson Street Level of Service

US-41A/Jackson Street						2019			2040		
LM	ID	LM	ID	Calc.	Speed Limit	ADT	Avg. Speed	LOS	ADT	Avg. Speed	LOS
0.00	Enter Coffee County	0.72	Begin 40 mph	HCS	55	20,820	56.0	B	24,930	56.0	B
0.72	Begin 40 mph	1.07	Ledford Mill Rd.	HCS	40	20,820	42.0	C	24,930	42.0	C
1.07	Ledford Mill Rd.	1.50	Hoover Ln.	ArtPlan	40	20,820	29.7	C	24,930	28.4	C
1.50	Hoover Ln.	1.52	Commerce Central	ArtPlan	40	20,820	3.1	F	24,930	2.8	F
1.52	Commerce Central	1.94	Washington St.	ArtPlan	40	20,820	23.2	C	24,930	21.5	D
1.94	Washington St.	2.19	Washburn St.	ArtPlan	40	20,820	24.0	C	24,930	22.9	D
2.19	Washburn St.	2.54	Jackson Cr.	ArtPlan	40	20,820	27.5	C	24,930	26.2	C
2.54	Jackson Cr.	3.37	Wilson Ave.	ArtPlan	40	18,570	35.6	B	20,520	35.2	B
3.37	Wilson Ave.	3.80	Grundy St.	ArtPlan	30	20,830	18.8	D	23,910	16.1	E
3.80	Grundy St.	3.88	Lincoln St.	ArtPlan	30	20,830	6.2	F	23,910	4.7	F
3.88	Lincoln St.	3.96	Lauderdale St.	ArtPlan	30	20,830	9.9	F	23,910	9.5	F
3.96	Lauderdale St.	4.36	Carroll St.	ArtPlan	30	19,990	18.8	D	23,960	16.0	E
4.36	Carroll St.	4.49	Traffic Count STA 99	HCS*	30	19,990	36.4	C	23,960	36.4	C
4.49	Traffic Count STA 99	4.92	Begin 45 mph	HCS*	30	14,470	36.6	B	15,990	36.6	B
4.92	Begin 45 mph	5.42	Exit Coffee County	HCS	45	14,470	43.6	B	15,990	43.6	B
Weighted Average Speed:					39.6	33.5			32.7		
Weighted Average LOS:						C			D		

Table 3-9. East Lincoln Street Level of Service

East Lincoln Street						2019			2040		
LM	ID	LM	ID	Calc.	Speed Limit	ADT	Avg. Speed	LOS	ADT	Avg. Speed	LOS
0.00	S. Jackson St.	0.10	Atlantic St.	ArtPlan	30	7,290	14.5	D	8,060	14.1	D
0.10	Atlantic St.	0.44	Anderson St.	ArtPlan	30	7,290	27.0	B	8,060	26.5	B
0.44	Anderson St.	0.66	Traffic Count STA 213	HCS	30	7,290	20.1	E	8,060	20.0	E
0.66	Traffic Count STA 213	1.86	Traffic Count STA 060	HCS	30	4,730	20.3	C	5,230	20.3	C
1.86	Traffic Count STA 060	2.27	Begin Speed Zone	HCS	30	4,730	20.3	C	5,230	20.2	D
2.27	Begin 45 mph	3.14	End Study Route	HCS	45	4,730	36.9	B	5,230	36.8	C
Weighted Average Speed:					34.2	25.4			25.3		
Weighted Average LOS:						C			D		

Table 3-10. SR-55/East Carroll Street Level of Service

SR-55/East Carroll Street						2019			2040		
LM	ID	LM	ID	Calc.	Speed Limit	ADT	Avg. Speed	LOS	ADT	Avg. Speed	LOS
2.59	SR16	3.03	Anderson St.	ArtPlan	30	18,920	22.0	C	24,120	13.7	F
3.03	Anderson St.	3.70	Begin 55 mph	HCS	40	18,920	41.0	B	24,120	41.0	C
3.70	Begin 55 mph	4.84	Traffic Count STA 59	HCS	55	15,550	57.4	A	24,120	57.4	B
4.84	Traffic Count STA 59	8.69	Leave Tullahoma City	HCS	55	15,550	57.8	A	20,210	57.8	A
8.69	Enter Manchester City	11.46	Begin 40 mph	HCS	55	15,550	58.4	A	20,210	58.4	B
11.46	Begin 40 mph	11.59	Traffic Count STA 47	HCS	40	15,550	43.0	B	20,210	43.0	B
11.59	Traffic Count STA 47	13.07	Oak St.	HCS	40	18,430	40.6	B	25,270	40.6	C
Weighted Average Speed:					50.7	52.7			52.4		
Weighted Average LOS:						B			B		

Table 3-11. SR-55/Wilson Avenue Level of Service

SR-55/Wilson Avenue						2019			2040		
LM	ID	LM	ID	Calc.	Speed Limit	ADT	Avg. Speed	LOS	ADT	Avg. Speed	LOS
0.00	Enter Coffee County	0.47	Begin 45 mph	HCS	55	7,400	58.6	C	8,180	60.8	C
0.47	Begin 45 mph	1.28	Traffic Count STA 157	HCS	45	7,400	39.3	C	8,180	39.2	C
1.28	Traffic Count STA 157	1.48	SR 130	HCS	45	7,400	39.3	C	8,180	39.2	C
1.48	SR 130	1.61	Traffic Count STA 156	HCS	45	7,400	46.2	A	8,180	46.2	A
1.61	Traffic Count STA 156	2.00	Begin 30 mph	HCS	45	10,120	36.2	D	12,610	36.0	E
2.00	Begin 30 mph	2.06	Cedar Ln.	HCS	30	10,120	19.9	E	12,610	19.8	E
2.06	Cedar Ln.	2.59	SR16	ArtPlan	30	10,550	24.8	B	13,400	23.4	B
Weighted Average Speed:					43.4	39.3			39.3		
Weighted Average LOS:						C			C		

Bicycle and Pedestrian Analysis

While the plan focuses on the five study corridors, a network-based approach was used for the development of bicycle and pedestrian solutions. Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is most successful when incorporated into a larger network framework, ensuring that users can safely and comfortably walk or bike among residential, employment, and leisure destinations. To this end key parallel and intersecting streets were also analyzed and considered for bicycle and pedestrian recommendations. Specifically, the analyses examined all road segments within one-half mile of the study corridors.

A review of existing planning documents established the foundation of the recommended bicycle and pedestrian network. Both the Manchester (2018) and Tullahoma (2013) Transportation Plans were reviewed for currently-planned bicycle and pedestrian facilities. As shown in Figures 3-3 and 3-4, both cities have planned bicycle and pedestrian networks. These recommendations were reviewed for consistency with national best practices and ultimately carried forward as part of the Community Mobility Plan's recommendations.

A desktop analysis was conducted to determine existing bicycle and pedestrian demand. A demand analysis determines where current bicycle and pedestrian demand might exist without regard to the presence or absence of existing facilities; in other words, where users would likely walk or bike, provided they felt comfortable doing so.

The analysis is based on five inputs to assign a composite demand score:

- Population density;
- Employment density;
- Retail, arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodations, and food services employment;
- Existing schools; and
- Existing parks.

As shown in Figures 3-5 and 3-6, these variables reveal areas of the study corridors and their environs where existing demand is located. Areas of higher demand tend to occur in areas with concentrated retail activity close to parks and schools. In Manchester, these areas consist of clearly-defined zones throughout the city. In Tullahoma, which has a relatively compact development pattern radiating away from downtown, much of the city center and its surrounding neighborhoods are included in a larger central zone of high demand, which decreases as one moves away from the city center.

Figure 3-3. Existing and Planned Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities- Manchester




Figure 3-4. Existing and Planned Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities- Tullahoma




Figure 3-5. Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Demand- Manchester





Figure 3-6. Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Demand- Tullahoma



While the demand analysis examined walking and biking potential without regard to the presence or absence of existing facilities, a level of traffic stress (LTS) analysis evaluated the existing bicycle and pedestrian network for users. The LTS analysis assigns a value between one and four for each roadway segment evaluated; the score indicates how comfortable a user would be walking or biking on that particular segment. A lower score indicates that a user would likely be more comfortable and experience little stress from automobile traffic. A higher score indicates that a user would be less comfortable and experience higher levels of stress from automobile traffic.

The criteria, which evaluate roadway segments for users of all ages and abilities, include:

- Presence of existing facilities;
- Width of existing facilities (if applicable);
- Width of buffer between existing facilities and roadway (if applicable);
- Average Daily Traffic (ADT);
- Number of lanes; and
- Posted speed.

Zones within a half mile of public elementary and middle schools were highlighted and given specific attention in the LTS analysis.

As shown in Figures 3-7 and 3-8, bicycle LTS in both cities tends to be generally low-stress on local neighborhood streets with relatively low speeds and traffic volumes. User stress is much higher on major roads, particularly the five study corridors. While lower-stress alternatives are currently available for users, existing high-volume, high-speed roads are less inviting and act as natural barriers for bicyclists, limiting citywide bicycle connectivity.

DRAFT

As shown in Figures 3-9 and 3-10, pedestrian LTS is generally poor in both cities, underscoring the need for improved pedestrian infrastructure in both cities. The LOS calculation relies heavily on the presence of sidewalks, and does not take into account low-speed, low-volume neighborhood streets on which users may feel comfortable walking. However, providing dedicated pedestrian infrastructure improves user safety and comfort by providing a degree of separation between the user and adjacent vehicle traffic. Furthermore, dedicated infrastructure signals to both motorists and potential pedestrians that walking is an encouraged activity at that location.

Bicycle and pedestrian crashes were also examined to identify particular safety hot spots. Between 2014 and 2018 a total of 58 bicycle or pedestrian crashes occurred on the corridors or key parallel or intersecting routes. As shown in Figure 3-11, Manchester experienced 23 total crashes, consisting of 16 pedestrian crashes and seven bicycle crashes. As shown in Figure 3-12, Tullahoma experienced 35 total crashes, consisting of 25 pedestrian crashes and 10 bicycle crashes.

While the geographic distribution of crashes is fairly wide over the analysis period, several key segments are notable. These include:

- US-41/Hillgro Boulevard between SR-55/MacArthur Street and Shelton Road;
- US-41/Hillgro Boulevard between Campground Road and east of Asbury Road; and
- US-41/North Jackson Street between Jack Farney and West Grundy Street.

DRAFT

Figure 3-7. Existing Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS)- Manchester

0
 2
 4
 6
 8
 10
 12
 14
 16
 18
 20
 22
 24
 26
 28
 30
 32
 34
 36
 38
 40
 42
 44
 46
 48
 50
 52
 54
 56
 58
 60
 62
 64
 66
 68
 70
 72
 74
 76
 78
 80
 82
 84
 86
 88
 90
 92
 94
 96
 98
 100
 102
 104
 106
 108
 110
 112
 114
 116
 118
 120
 122
 124
 126
 128
 130
 132
 134
 136
 138
 140
 142
 144
 146
 148
 150
 152
 154
 156
 158
 160
 162
 164
 166
 168
 170
 172
 174
 176
 178
 180
 182
 184
 186
 188
 190
 192
 194
 196
 198
 200
 202
 204
 206
 208
 210
 212
 214
 216
 218
 220
 222
 224
 226
 228
 230
 232
 234
 236
 238
 240
 242
 244
 246
 248
 250
 252
 254
 256
 258
 260
 262
 264
 266
 268
 270
 272
 274
 276
 278
 280
 282
 284
 286
 288
 290
 292
 294
 296
 298
 300
 302
 304
 306
 308
 310
 312
 314
 316
 318
 320
 322
 324
 326
 328
 330
 332
 334
 336
 338
 340
 342
 344
 346
 348
 350
 352
 354
 356
 358
 360
 362
 364
 366
 368
 370
 372
 374
 376
 378
 380
 382
 384
 386
 388
 390
 392
 394
 396
 398
 400
 402
 404
 406
 408
 410
 412
 414
 416
 418
 420
 422
 424
 426
 428
 430
 432
 434
 436
 438
 440
 442
 444
 446
 448
 450
 452
 454
 456
 458
 460
 462
 464
 466
 468
 470
 472
 474
 476
 478
 480
 482
 484
 486
 488
 490
 492
 494
 496
 498
 500
 502
 504
 506
 508
 510
 512
 514
 516
 518
 520
 522
 524
 526
 528
 530
 532
 534
 536
 538
 540
 542
 544
 546
 548
 550
 552
 554
 556
 558
 560
 562
 564
 566
 568
 570
 572
 574
 576
 578
 580
 582
 584
 586
 588
 590
 592
 594
 596
 598
 600
 602
 604
 606
 608
 610
 612
 614
 616
 618
 620
 622
 624
 626
 628
 630
 632
 634
 636
 638
 640
 642
 644
 646
 648
 650
 652
 654
 656
 658
 660
 662
 664
 666
 668
 670
 672
 674
 676
 678
 680
 682
 684
 686
 688
 690
 692
 694
 696
 698
 700
 702
 704
 706
 708
 710
 712
 714
 716
 718
 720
 722
 724
 726
 728
 730
 732
 734
 736
 738
 740
 742
 744
 746
 748
 750
 752
 754
 756
 758
 760
 762
 764
 766
 768
 770
 772
 774
 776
 778
 780
 782
 784
 786
 788
 790
 792
 794
 796
 798
 800
 802
 804
 806
 808
 810
 812
 814
 816
 818
 820
 822
 824
 826
 828
 830
 832
 834
 836
 838
 840
 842
 844
 846
 848
 850
 852
 854
 856
 858
 860
 862
 864
 866
 868
 870
 872
 874
 876
 878
 880
 882
 884
 886
 888
 890
 892
 894
 896
 898
 900
 902
 904
 906
 908
 910
 912
 914
 916
 918
 920
 922
 924
 926
 928
 930
 932
 934
 936
 938
 940
 942
 944
 946
 948
 950
 952
 954
 956
 958
 960
 962
 964
 966
 968
 970
 972
 974
 976
 978
 980
 982
 984
 986
 988
 990
 992
 994
 996
 998
 1000




Figure 3-8. Existing Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress- Tullahoma




Figure 3-9. Existing Pedestrian level of Traffic Stress (IOS)- Manchester





Figure 3-10. Existing Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress (LOS) -Tullahoma



Bicycle and Pedestrian Crashes (2014 – 2018) – Manchester





Figure 3-12. Bicycle and Pedestrian Crashes (2014 - 2018)



Section 4.0

Multimodal Recommendations

Building on the key issues and opportunities, as well as the findings of the existing conditions evaluation, the multimodal recommendations provide a solid foundation for improved community mobility along the five study corridors in Manchester and Tullahoma. The multimodal recommendations address various aspects of mobility and specifically include:

- A. Roadway Project Recommendations;
- B. Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridor Plans; and
- C. Development Form Concepts.

Taken together, the multimodal recommendations will establish a framework for improved mobility within and between Manchester and Tullahoma.

A. Roadway Project Recommendations

Based on the review of planned projects and the analysis of projected traffic volumes and levels of service (LOS) for both cities, a suite of roadway project recommendations was developed that will secure vehicular mobility along the five corridors going forward. These recommendations largely reflect the planned projects identified in the Manchester Transportation Master Plan (2018) and the Tullahoma Comprehensive Transportation Plan (2013). As shown in Figures 4-1 and 4-2, the recommended roadway projects will strengthen the transportation networks in both Manchester and Tullahoma. While some improvements are recommended along the study corridors, other strategic improvements will improve the operations of parallel and intersecting streets. This will provide local traffic with lower-speed, lower-volume routes for short trips while preserving capacity on higher-speed arterials for through and freight traffic.

Table 4-1 lists the recommended roadway projects in Manchester – covering approximately 12 miles of new or existing roadways at an estimated cost of \$29 million. Table 4-2 lists the recommended roadway projects in Tullahoma – covering approximately nine miles of new or existing roadways at an estimated cost of \$23 million.

Figure 4.1: Multimodal Recommendations




Figure 4-2. Recommended Roadway Improvement Projects - Tullahoma




Table 4-1. Roadway Capital Improvements – Manchester

Route	From	To	Description	Miles	Estimated Cost	Horizon Year
US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard	Near Doak Road	Walmart Access Road	Signalization Integration	0.9	\$300,000	2019
Kennedy Drive	SR-55/McArthur Street	Hills Chapel Road	Improvement and extension (new location)	1.1	\$1,750,000	2022
US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard	Joe Hickerson Road	AEDC Road	Widening	2.2	\$8,000,000	2022
Hills Chapel Road	Forrestwood Drive	US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard	Widening with sidewalks	1.6	\$1,750,000	2027
Oak Drive/ Clover Lane	SR-55/McArthur Street	US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard	Widening	0.9	\$1,500,000	2027
Skinner Flat Road	US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard	Forrestwood Drive	Widening	0.7	\$2,000,000	2027
Forrestwood Drive	Hills Chapel Road	Skinner Flat Road	Improvement and extension (new location)	1.3	\$3,000,000	2037
US-41/Murfreesboro Highway	Duncan Street	North City Limit	Widening	1.9	\$6,500,000	2037
Burger Drive	US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard	Hunt Creek Road	Widening	0.2	\$800,000	2037
Joe Hickerson Road	US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard	Southern Terminus	Widening	0.5	\$900,000	2037
SR-55/McMinnville Highway	I-24 Westbound Off-Ramp	US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard	Widening	0.8	\$2,640,000	2037

Table 4-2. Roadway Capital Improvements – Thomas

Route	From	To	Description	Miles	Estimated Cost	Horizon Year
SR-55/Wilson Avenue	Fir Avenue	US-41/ North Jackson Street	Widening with sidewalks and bike lanes	0.6	\$3,000,000	2020
SR-55/Wilson Avenue	Fir Avenue	Corporate Boundary	Widening with sidewalks and bike lanes	1.9	\$7,000,000	2020
Cedar Lane	William N. Green Boulevard	Connector (Cedar Lane/SR-130)	Widening with sidewalks and bike lanes	0.4	\$1,100,000	2020
Cedar Lane	Connector (Cedar Lane/SR-130)	SR-55/Wilson Avenue	Widening with sidewalks and bike lanes	0.3	\$900,000	2020
Connector (Cedar Lane/SR-130)	Cedar Lane	SR-130	Extension (new location) with sidewalks and bike lanes	0.8	\$2,200,000	2020
Cedar Lane/ Westside Drive	SR-55/Wilson Avenue	Clement Drive	Widening with sidewalks and bike lanes	0.9	\$3,500,000	2027
Atlantic Street	Kings Lane	US-41A/South Jackson Street	Widening with sidewalks and bike lanes	3.0	\$1,900,000	2027
Kings Lane	Ovoca Road	Marbury Drive	Widening with sidewalks and bike lanes	0.7	\$1,600,000	2027
Kings Lane	Country Club Drive	Ovoca Road	Widening with sidewalks and bike lanes	0.8	\$1,700,000	2027

In addition to the roadway project recommendations, other improvements have the potential to address spot issues, though additional investigation would be warranted to identify need at specific locations. These recommendations for further study should be considered by Manchester and Tullahoma when their respective transportation plans are next updated. These include:

- Along signalized arterials investigate signal timings, coordination plans, and the elimination of left-turn signal phases on lightly-travelled side roads. Flashing yellow operations in place of traditional protected-permitted left-turn signal phase operations may also improve traffic operations;
- Investigate turn lane improvements at intersections with poor operations; and
- Investigate access management strategies to reduce driveways and improve their locations along routes.

B. Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridor Plans

Improved mobility for bicyclists and pedestrians was identified as a desired outcome of the Community Mobility Plan by the public stakeholders, and local officials. Consistent with the approach to the analysis of existing conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians, the corridor plan recommendations represent a holistic, network-based approach to improved mobility, comfort, and safety for bicycle and pedestrian users of all ages and abilities.

The bicycle corridor plans emphasize building a supporting network of bikeways to support mobility along the five study corridors. This approach provides greater choices for users, as some may prefer more comfortable riding on or near higher-volume, higher-speed roads, while others may prefer routes that follow lower-volume roads and neighborhood streets. Table 4-3 provides a general overview of the proposed bikeway types. For planning purposes, several of the bikeway types are recommended together in the bicycle corridor plans, effectively providing a range of options for future project design phases.

The Manchester Bicycle Corridor Plan (Figure 4-3) builds upon the existing buffered bike lanes on US-41/Murfreesboro Highway just west of downtown. New buffered bike lanes will be extended along both US-41 and SR-55 in town, transitioning into bike lanes or paved shoulders as surrounding development becomes less intense. Additional buffered or separated bike lanes are recommended for high-activity or high-growth areas, specifically along Spring Street and Hills Chapel Road. A network of bike boulevards will connect these facilities along neighborhood streets in central Manchester. Extensions of the city's greenway system, proposed in the 2018 Transportation Master Plan, will provide enhanced connectivity

Table 4-3. Types of Bikeways

Type	Example	Description
Paved Shoulders		<p>Paved shoulders are typical of highways and roads in rural areas, and provide important safety benefits to minimize run-off-the-road crashes, especially on higher speed (greater than 40 mph) roads. While paved shoulders are not dedicated bikeways, for bicyclists, paved shoulders provide important operating space. Adequate width (4' minimum) and bike friendly rumble strips are important design considerations.</p>
Bike Lanes		<p>Bike lanes provide dedicated operating space for bicyclists, and with paved shoulders, have traditionally served as the foundation of bike networks for more experienced bicyclists. While bike lanes remain a good option for urban streets with moderate traffic volumes and speeds, creating more physical distance between bicyclists and motor vehicles either with buffers or physically separated facilities is important for people of all ages and abilities.</p>
Bike Boulevards		<p>Bike boulevards are lower volume, lower speed local streets that offer a safe and comfortable option for bicycling compared to major streets. Relatively low cost improvements such as shared lane pavement markings (sharrows), signage, and mini-traffic circles reinforce the role of bike boulevards as safe and comfortable places to bicycle and encourage motor vehicle through traffic in neighborhoods.</p>
Buffered Bike Lanes		<p>Buffered bike lanes add a striped buffer space between the bicycle lane and the motor vehicle traffic lane, and where applicable, between an adjacent parking lane. Used on higher volume, higher speed streets, the buffered space effectively establishes the minimum 3 foot passing space required in many states, and additionally, provides room for bicyclists to pass each other and avoid obstacles in bike lanes including the opening of parked car doors.</p>
Separated Bike Lanes		<p>Separated bike lanes add a vertical element, such as plastic posts, bollards, medians or on-street parking, that physically separates bicyclists from motor vehicle traffic. Combining vertical and horizontal separation clearly delineates the designated space for bicyclists and ensures a relatively safe and comfortable facility on higher volume, higher speed streets, including multilane streets and streets with higher truck volumes.</p>
Shared Use Paths/Sidepaths		<p>Unlike the various bike lane types, shared use paths and sidepaths are designed for use by both pedestrians and bicyclists. Sidepaths are located within the street or road right-of-way, while shared use paths are located within an independent right-of-way. Shared use paths/sidepaths have become increasingly popular with the growing demand for walking and bicycling, and can provide important connections for longer distance trips.</p>

in the city's eastern neighborhoods, which are poised for residential growth in the coming years. Additional bike lane or paved shoulder facilities will be included along Cat Creek Road, Belmont Road, and Old Manchester/Tullahoma Highway.

Table 4-4 lists the bikeway recommendations – a total of approximately 54 miles at an estimated cost of \$21 million.

Table 4-4. Recommended New Bikeways – Manchester

ID	Road / Facility	From	To	Linear Feet	Facility Type	Unit Cost (per linear foot)	Estimated Cost
M-1	SR-55 / McMinnville Hwy	N of Vaughn Speckleton Rd	Keele Rd	65	BL/PS	\$20	\$131,154
M-2	SR-55 / McMinnville Hwy	Keele Rd	Interstate Dr	950	BL/PS	\$20	\$138,992
M-3	SR-53 / Woodbury Hwy	Manchester City Limit	Hendrixson Dr	200	BL/PS	\$20	\$84,775
M-4	SR-55 / McMinnville Hwy	Interstate Dr	Old Bushy Branch Rd	412	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$123,878
M-5	SR-55 / McMinnville Hwy	Old Bushy Branch Rd	US-41/Hillsboro Rd	3,185	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$95,548
M-6	US-41/Murfreesboro Hwy	K&M Ln	Monroe L	3,773	BL/PS	\$20	\$75,469
M-7	US-41/Murfreesboro Hwy	Monroe Lake Rd	Hendrixson Dr	478	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$14,350
M-8	Hendrixson Dr	US-41/Murfreesboro Rd	SR-55 / McMinnville Hwy	5,098	BB	\$15	\$76,474
M-9	Walker St	Hendrixson Dr	Greenwood Hwy	1,752	BB	\$15	\$26,276
M-10	SR-53 / Woodbury Hwy	Hendrixson Dr	Woodbury Hwy	2,744	SUP	\$150	\$411,527
M-11	Greenway Connector	Hendrixson Dr	S Woodbury Hwy	635	SUP	\$150	\$95,230
M-12	Rec Center Connector	N Woodman St	McArthur St	599	SUP	\$150	\$89,906
M-13	E Main St	S Woodman St	Bobby Layne Dr	702	SUP	\$150	\$105,295
M-14	Bobby Layne Dr	Dave King Park	S Main St	613	SUP	\$150	\$91,970
M-15	Dave King Park Greenway	Bobby Layne Dr	N Waite St	740	SUP	\$150	\$110,937
M-16	Great Stage Greenway	Little Duck River Greenway	New Bushy Branch Rd	9,165	SUP	\$150	\$1,374,708
M-17	Great Stage Greenway	New Bushy Branch Rd	Hospitality Blvd	10,169	SUP	\$150	\$1,525,335
M-18	Little Duck River Greenway Ext	Little Duck River Greenway	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd	10,107	SUP	\$150	\$1,516,004
M-19	Little Duck River Greenway Ext	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd	Forrestwood Dr Ext	6,745	SUP	\$150	\$1,011,758
M-20	Hickory Flat Greenway	Little Duck River Greenway Ext	Expressway Dr	1,890	SUP	\$150	\$283,463
M-21	Expressway Drive	S of Hunt Creek Rd	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd	3,142	SUP	\$150	\$471,234
M-22	Emerson St / Kefauver St / Stroud Dr	Rye St	Haley Dr	6,319	BB	\$15	\$94,792
M-23	Greenway Connector	Stroud Dr	Little Duck River Greenway Ext	568	SUP	\$150	\$85,238
M-24	Jackson St	Emerson St	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd	806	BB	\$15	\$12,093
M-25	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd	SR-55 / McArthur St	Hills Chapel Rd	2,491	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$74,736
M-26	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd	Hills Chapel Rd	Haley Dr	3,714	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$111,408
M-27	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd	Haley Dr	Expressway Dr	4,137	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$124,121
M-28	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd	Expressway Dr	Joe Hickerson Rd	4,375	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$131,261
M-29	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd	Joe Hickerson Rd	AEDC Rd	10,950	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$328,511

Figure 4-3. Bicycle Corridor Plan- Manchester




Table 4-4. Recommended New Bikeways – Manchester (continued)

ID	Road / Facility	From	To	Linear Feet	Facility Type	Unit Cost (per linear foot)	Estimated Cost
M-30	Skinner Flat Rd	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd	Forrestwood Dr Ext	4,658	SUP	\$150	\$698,691
M-31	Hunt Creek Greenway	Little Duck River Greenway Ext	Skinner Flat Rd	7,859	SUP	\$150	\$1,178,859
M-32	Hills Chapel Rd	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd	Oak Dr	1,765	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$52,936
M-33	Hills Chapel Rd	Oak Dr	Forrestwood Dr	6,783	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$203,483
M-34	Spring St	US-41 / Murfreesboro Hwy	Coffee St	2,741	BB	\$15	\$41,114
M-35	Wiley St / Oak St / Coffee St	Spring St	SR-55 / McArthur St	4,487	BB	\$15	\$67,298
M-36	Lowry St / Jackson St	SR-55 / McArthur St	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd	2,122	BB	\$15	\$36,923
M-37	Summer St	Jackson St	Hills Chapel Rd	1,578	BB	\$15	\$23,676
M-38	Summer St	Hills Chapel Rd	Carden Estates Apts	1,456	BB	\$15	\$36,837
M-39	Greenway Connector	Summer Dr	Little Duck River Greenway Ext	1,711	SUP	\$150	\$269,475
M-40	Oak Dr	SR-55 / McArthur St	Hills Chapel Rd	3,264		\$15	\$48,955
M-41	Westwood Greenway	Powers Bridge Rd	Cat Creek Rd	1,188	SUP	\$150	\$178,145
M-42	Westwood Greenway	Cat Creek Rd	Oakdale St	3,347	SUP	\$150	\$502,122
M-43	Century St	Oakdale St	SR-55 / McArthur St	2,442	SUP	\$150	\$366,294
M-44	Belmont Dr Greenway	SR-55 / McArthur St	Southside Greenway	2,847	SUP	\$150	\$427,032
M-45	Southside Greenway	SR-55 / McArthur St	Hills Chapel Rd	4,087	SUP	\$150	\$613,120
M-46	Southside Greenway	Hills Chapel Rd	Little Duck River Greenway Ext	3,143	SUP	\$150	\$471,426
M-47	SR-55 / McArthur St	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd	Oak Dr	3,879	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$116,371
M-48	SR-55 / McArthur St	Oak Dr	Kennedy Dr	7,238	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$217,152
M-49	Spring St	Coffee St	Century St	2,575	SUP	\$150	\$386,219
M-50	Oak Dr	S Spring St	SR-55 / McArthur St	1,509	BB	\$15	\$22,639
M-51	W Taylor St / Cat Creek Rd	Perry Rd	Perry Rd	4,390	BL/PS	\$20	\$87,793
M-52	Cat Creek Rd	Perry Rd	Sullivan Dr	8,277	BL/PS	\$20	\$165,530
M-53	Rail Trail Greenway	Century St	Kennedy Dr	6,985	SUP	\$150	\$1,047,797
M-54	Toliver Lake Rd	Cat Creek Rd	Kennedy Dr Greenway	2,040	BL/PS	\$20	\$40,802
M-55	Kennedy Dr Greenway	Toliver Lake Rd	SR-55 / McArthur St	4,269	SUP	\$150	\$640,285
M-56	Kennedy Dr	McArthur St	Hills Chapel Rd	5,441	SUP	\$150	\$816,124
M-57	Forrestwood Dr	Hills Chapel Rd	Little Duck River Greenway Ext	4,128	SUP	\$150	\$619,177
M-58	Forrestwood Dr Ext	Little Duck River Greenway Ext	Skinner Flat Rd	2,573	SUP	\$150	\$386,002
M-59	SR-55 / New Tullahoma Hwy	Kennedy Dr	Old Seminary Rd	10,831	BL/PS	\$20	\$216,618
M-60	SR-55 / New Tullahoma Hwy	Old Seminary Rd	N of HP Womack Rd	12,853	BL/PS	\$20	\$257,050
M-61	Rail Trail Greenway	Kennedy Dr	Belmont Dr	8,879	SUP	\$150	\$1,331,835
M-62	Cat Creek Rd	Toliver Lake Rd	Belmont Dr	4,904	BL/PS	\$20	\$98,070
M-63	Belmont Rd	Cat Creek Rd	Old Manchester/ Tullahoma Hwy	6,469	BL/PS	\$20	\$129,389
M-64	Old Manchester/ Tullahoma Hwy	Belmont Rd	HP Womack Rd	15,732	BL/PS	\$20	\$314,633

NOTE: BBL/SPL = Buffered/Separated Bike Lane; BL/PS = Bike Lane/Paved Shoulder; BB = Bike Boulevard; SUP = Shared-Use Path/Sidepath

The Manchester Pedestrian Corridor Plan (Figure 4-4) complements the bikeway recommendations by building on the city's existing sidewalk system and extending it into key growth and activity centers. Specifically, sidewalks will be extended along the both US-41 and SR-55 to provide pedestrian connectivity to existing development. Strategic sidewalk extensions in the existing residential area west of SR-55 will provide a continuous pedestrian network for residents, and new sidewalks east of SR-55 will set the stage for anticipated residential growth.

Table 4-5 lists the sidewalk recommendations – a total of approximately 24 miles and an estimated cost of \$32.6 million.

Additionally, 21 intersections in the city were identified for pedestrian safety improvements. While the exact scope of improvements will vary at each location, state-of-the-practice intersection improvements at these locations would complement the pedestrian recommendations and further improve multimodal user safety and comfort. Table 4-6 lists the recommended intersection improvement locations.

Figures 4-5 through 4-7 show illustrative schematic drawings of what pedestrian crossing improvements would look like at three key locations in Manchester: US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard at Spring Street, SR-55/McArthur Street at East Concord Street, and US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard at Hills Chapel Road.

Improvements proposed include the installation of cross walks, relocation of existing stop bars, update or installation of crosswalk signals, and installation of ADA-compliant ramps.

DRAFT

Table 4-5. Recommended New Sidewalks – Manchester

ID	Road	From	To	Linear Feet	Unit Cost (per linear foot)	Estimated Cost
M-1	SR-53 / Woodbury Hwy	Manchester City Limit	Frontage Rd	5,745	\$250	\$1,436,250
M-2	US-41 / Murfreesboro Hwy	N of Dobbert Rd	E of Lakeview St	9,392	\$250	\$2,348,000
M-3	US-41 / Murfreesboro Hwy	E of Lakeview St	Hendrixson Dr	2,065	\$250	\$516,250
M-4	US-41 / Murfreesboro Hwy	Hendrixson Dr	Service Area Rd	1,699	\$250	\$424,750
M-5	SR-55 / McMinnville Hwy (north side)	N of JB Deadman Ln	S of I-24 EB On-Ramp	3,615	\$250	\$903,750
M-6	SR-55 / McMinnville Hwy (south side)	N of JB Deadman Ln	S of Hillcrest Rd	7,525	\$250	\$1,881,250
M-7	Oakdale St	W Main St	Cherry St	2,499	\$250	\$624,750
M-8	Woodrow St	W Moore St	W Taylor St	2,664	\$250	\$666,000
M-9	Oakdale St	N of Westwood School Rd	S of Elm St	3,449	\$250	\$862,250
M-10	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd	Walls St	Expressway Dr	12,088	\$250	\$3,022,000
M-11	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd	Expressway Dr	Asbury Rd	10,136	\$250	\$2,534,000
M-12	Oak Dr	SR-55 / McArthur St	Hills Chapel Rd	3,221	\$250	\$805,250
M-13	Clover Ln	Hills Chapel Rd	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd	2,005	\$250	\$251,250
M-14	Hills Chapel Rd	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd	Forrest Ln	1,529	\$250	\$382,250
M-15	Hills Chapel Rd	Clover Ln	Rogers Dr	10,694	\$250	\$2,673,500
M-16	Hills Chapel Rd	Rogers Dr	Forrestwood Dr	1,439	\$250	\$359,750
M-17	Royal Trl	SR-55 / McArthur St	Rogers Dr	3,603	\$250	\$900,750
M-18	Rogers Dr	Royal Trl	Hills Chapel Rd	2,195	\$250	\$548,750
M-19	Kennedy Dr	SR-55 / McArthur St	Kennedy Dr (southbound)	3,172	\$250	\$793,000
M-20	Kennedy Dr Ext	Kennedy Dr (southbound)	Hills Chapel Rd	2,208	\$250	\$552,000
M-21	Forrestwood Dr	Hills Chapel Rd	John Mark Ct	3,348	\$250	\$837,000
M-22	Forrestwood Dr Ext	John Mark Ct	Skinner Flat Rd	3,223	\$250	\$805,750
M-23	Skinner Flat Rd	Swinnerton Ln	Forrest Dr Ext	3,987	\$250	\$996,750
M-24	SR-55 / McArthur St	N of Belmont Ln	Belmont Dr	16,302	\$250	\$4,075,500
M-25	SR-55 / McArthur St	Belmont Ln	S of Bryan Ln	13,626	\$250	\$3,406,500

Table 4-6. Recommended Intersection Improvements – Manchester

ID	N/S Cross Street	E/W Cross Street
M-1	SR-53 / Woodbury Hwy	Hendrixson Rd
M-2	SR-53 / Woodbury Hwy	N Woodland St
M-3	SR-53 / Woodbury Hwy	US-41 / Murfreesboro Hwy
M-4	Stone Fort Dr	US-41 / Murfreesboro Hwy
M-5	Fort St	US-41 / Murfreesboro Hwy
M-6	Spring St	US-41 / Murfreesboro Hwy
M-7	SR-55 / McMinville Hwy	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd
M-8	Jackson St	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd
M-9	Hills Chapel Rd	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd
M-10	Clover Ln	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd
M-11	Whispering Pines Shopping Center Entrance	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd
M-12	Expressway Dr	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd
M-13	Walmart Entrance	US-41 / Hillsboro Blvd
M-14	Cat Creek Rd	Perry Rd
M-15	Spring St	Coffee St
M-16	Spring St	Century St
M-17	SR-55 / McArthur St	Coffee St
M-18	SR-55 / McArthur St	Oak Dr
M-19	SR-55 / McArthur St	Kennedy Dr
M-20	Hills Chapel Rd	Oak Dr
M-21	Hills Chapel Rd	Brook Hollow Ct

DRAFT

Figure 4-5. Crossing Schematic- US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard at Spring Street





Figure 4-7. Crossing Schematic- US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard at Hills Chapel Road



The Tullahoma Bicycle Corridor Plan (Figure 4-8) provides buffered or separated bike lanes along major thoroughfares in the city, including US-41A/North Jackson Street, North Washington Street, East Lincoln Street, and Cedar Lane, with some facilities transitioning to bike lanes or paved shoulders as they enter more suburban or rural portions of the city. The existing Rock Creek Greenway will be extended to provide a high-quality bicycle and pedestrian route through the eastern sector of town, providing an active transportation corridor with minimal conflict points with vehicles. Bike lanes on SR-55/New Manchester Highway and Old Manchester/Tullahoma Highway will provide a direct bicycle connection between the two cities.

Table 4-7 lists the bikeway recommendations – a total of approximately 69 miles at an estimated cost of \$26 million.

Table 4-7. Recommended New Bikeways – Tullahoma

ID	Road / Facility	From	To	Linear Feet	Facility Type	Unit Cost (per linear foot)	Estimated Cost
T-1	US-41A / N Jackson St	Tullahoma City Limit	E of Ledford Mill Rd	4,501	BL/PS	\$20	\$90,020
T-2	US-41A / N Jackson St	N of Ledford Mill Rd	E of Ledford Mill Rd	5,760	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$172,797
T-3	Rock Creek Greenway	Tullahoma City Limit	Cedar Ln	11,125	SUP	\$150	\$1,668,776
T-4	Hunters Ln / Normandy Rd	US-41A / N Jackson St	N Washington St	1,179	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$35,359
T-5	Veterans Dr	Normandy Rd	N Washington St	1,119	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$33,575
T-6	N Washington St / Kings Ln	Veterans Dr	Ovaca Rd	3,244	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$97,325
T-7	Cedar Ln	US-41A / N Jackson St	William Northern Blvd	2,272	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$68,160
T-8	US-41A / N Jackson St	Cedar Ln	Jackson Cir	3,683	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$110,484
T-9	US-41A / N Jackson St	Jackson Cir	Big Springs Ave	2,721	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$81,629
T-10	US-41A / N Jackson St	Big Springs Ave	Lincoln St	3,845	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$115,340
T-11	Rock Creek Greenway	Cedar Ln	William Northern Blvd	1,841	SUP	\$150	\$276,193
T-12	Rock Creek Greenway	William Northern Blvd	Big Spring Park	3,158	SUP	\$150	\$473,634
T-13	Cedar Ln	William Northern Blvd	Connector Rd	1,761	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$52,837
T-14	Cedar Ln	Connector Rd	SR-55 / Wilson Ave	3,938	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$118,126
T-15	Connector Rd	SR-130 / Old Shelbyville Hwy	Cedar Ln	4,597	BL/PS	\$20	\$91,935
T-16	SR-130 / Old Shelbyville Hwy	Tullahoma City Limit	E of Chandelle Ln	8,504	SUP	\$150	\$1,275,651
T-17	Rock Creek Greenway	E of Chandelle Ln	Big Spring Park	6,219	SUP	\$150	\$932,832
T-18	SR-130 / Old Shelbyville Hwy	E of Chandelle Ln	SR-55 / Wilson Ave	3,712	BL/PS	\$20	\$74,237
T-19	SR-55 / Wilson Ave	Tullahoma City Limit	SR-130 / Old Shelbyville Hwy	7,637	BL/PS	\$20	\$152,746

Figure 4-8. Bicycle Corridor Plan - Tullahoma




Table 4-7. Recommended New Bikeways – Tullahoma (continued)

ID	Road / Facility	From	To	Linear Feet	Facility Type	Unit Cost (per linear foot)	Estimated Cost
T-20	SR-55 / Wilson Ave	SR-130 / Old Shelbyville Hwy	Cedar Ln	3,142	BL/PS	\$20	\$62,838
T-21	SR-55 / Wilson Ave	Cedar Ln	US-41A / N Jackson St	2,797	SUP	\$150	\$419,496
T-22	N Washington St	Kings Ln	Fort St	5,858	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$175,741
T-23	N Washington St	Fort St	Hogan St	1,335	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$40,064
T-24	N Washington St	Hogan St	E Lincoln St	1,872	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$56,146
T-25	Kings Ln	Riley Creek Rd	Short Springs Rd	7,047	SUP	\$150	\$1,056,988
T-26	Short Springs Rd	Country Club Ln	N College St	4,204	SUP	\$150	\$635,056
T-27	Short Springs Rd	Carter Blake Rd	Country Club Ln	797	SUP	\$150	\$869,551
T-28	Short Springs Rd	E of Powell Rd	Carter Blake Rd	169	BL/PS	\$20	\$163,385
T-29	Hogan St	US-41A / N Jackson St	Country Club Ln	2,800	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$84,025
T-30	Country Club Ln	Hogan St	N College St	6,386	B / SP	\$30	\$191,579
T-31	Greenway Connector	Country Club Ln	N Roosevelt St	2,861	SUP	\$150	\$429,106
T-32	Roosevelt St	E Moore St	SR-55 / E Carroll St	2,943	SUP	\$150	\$441,396
T-33	E Lincoln St	US-41A / N Jackson St	Washington St	1,280	BB	\$15	\$19,204
T-34	E Lincoln St	Washington St	Roosevelt St	4,652	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$139,550
T-35	E Lincoln St	Roosevelt St	West Dr	5,993	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$179,797
T-36	Old Manchester/Tullahoma Hwy	Crest Dr	N Cobb Rd	3,191	BL/PS	\$20	\$63,826
T-37	Old Manchester/Tullahoma Hwy	N of Cobb Rd	Concord Rd	11,705	BL/PS	\$20	\$234,091
T-38	Old Manchester/Tullahoma Hwy	Concord	N of Waterford Dr	7,946	BL/PS	\$20	\$158,914
T-39	Rail Trail Greenway	Roosevelt St	N of Waterford Dr	27,559	SUP	\$150	\$4,133,871
T-40	US-41A / N Jackson St	Lincoln	SR-55 / E Carroll St	2,553	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$76,581
T-41	SR-55 / E Carroll St	US-41A / Jackson St	Mitchell Blvd	4,137	BL/PS	\$20	\$82,744
T-42	SR-55 / E Carroll St	Mitchell Blvd	Industrial Blvd	4,678	SUP	\$150	\$701,707
T-43	SR-55 / E Carroll St	Industrial Blvd	Hawkersmith Rd	12,362	BL/PS	\$20	\$247,231
T-44	SR-55 / E Carroll St	Hawkersmith Rd	Bryan Ln	12,518	BL/PS	\$20	\$250,358
T-45	S Anderson St	East Lincoln St	SR-55 / E Carroll St	4,978	SUP	\$150	\$746,728
T-46	S Anderson St	SR-55 / E Carroll St	Old Estill Springs Rd	1,981	SUP	\$150	\$297,203
T-47	Mitchell Blvd	SR-55 / E Carroll St	E Monroe St	1,135	SUP	\$150	\$170,232
T-48	E Monroe St	S Anderson St	Mitchell Blvd	1,877	SUP	\$150	\$281,624
T-49	Old Estill Springs Rd	S Anderson St	Coffee County Line	3,936	SUP	\$150	\$590,326
T-50	Old Estill Springs Rd	Coffee County Line	Wiseman Rd	2,248	BL/PS	\$20	\$44,961
T-51	East Side Greenway	SR-55 (at Waggoner Park)	Wattendorf Hwy	6,564	SUP	\$150	\$984,562
T-52	East Side Greenway	Wattendorf Hwy	Old Estill Springs Rd	5,637	SUP	\$150	\$845,519
T-53	East Side Greenway	New Rock Creek Rd	Old Estill Springs Rd	4,562	SUP	\$150	\$684,284
T-54	East Side Greenway	Coffee County Line	Vocational Ln	4,827	SUP	\$150	\$723,991
T-55	US-41A / S Jackson St	SR-55 / E Carroll St	New Rock Creek Rd	2,731	BL/PS	\$20	\$54,618
T-56	US-41A / S Jackson St	New Rock Creek Rd	Wiseman Rd	5,370	BL/PS	\$20	\$107,396
T-57	US-41A / S Jackson St	Wiseman Rd	Cook Rd	8,346	BL/PS	\$20	\$166,917

ID	Road / Facility	From	To	Linear Feet	Facility Type	Unit Cost (per linear foot)	Estimated Cost
T-58	Wiseman Rd / Spring Creek Rd	US-41A / S Jackson St	Tulahoma City Limit	4,176	BL/PS	\$20	\$83,519
T-59	Stone Blvd	SR-55 / Wilson Ave	W Lincoln St	4,708	SUP	\$150	\$706,159
T-60	Cedar Ln	SR-55 / Wilson Ave	W Lincoln St	4,325	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$129,743
T-61	Bel Aire Dr / Lee St / Hickory St	Stone Blvd	Cedar Ln	2,748	BB	\$15	\$41,226
T-62	W Hogan St	Cedar Ln	N Collins St	485	BB	\$15	\$7,278
T-63	W Lincoln St	Coffee County Line	Turkey Creek Rd	11,412	BL/PS	\$20	\$228,233
T-64	W Lincoln St	Turkey Creek Rd	Cedar Ln	4,263	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$127,891
T-65	W Lincoln St	Cedar Ln	US-41A / S Jackson St	2,962	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$88,862
T-66	Turkey Creek Rd	W Lincoln St	Holt Ln	13	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$201,398
T-67	Holt Ln	Turkey Creek Rd	Tulahoma City Limit	1,354	BL/PS	\$20	\$27,074
T-68	Westside Dr	W Lincoln St	Clement Dr	2,620	B / SPL	\$30	\$78,609
T-69	Westside Dr	Clement Dr	Hermitage Dr	4,250	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$127,506
T-70	Westside Dr	Hermitage Dr	Tulahoma City Limit	1,109	BL/PS	\$20	\$22,172
T-71	Rock Creek Greenway	W Lauderdale St	Greenway Connector	2,867	SUP	\$150	\$430,080
T-72	Rock Creek Greenway	Clement Dr	East Side Dr	5,788	SUP	\$150	\$868,139
T-73	Clement Dr / W Carroll St	Westside Dr	US-41A / S Jackson St	4,471	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$134,136
T-74	Franklin St / Monroe St	W Carroll St	Greenway Connector	1,084	BB	\$15	\$16,255
T-75	Greenway Connector	Monr Street	W Creek St	835	SUP	\$150	\$125,204
T-76	Thomas St / Weaver St / Johnson Ln	W Co St	son Ln Fields	2,669	BB	\$15	\$40,040
T-77	Sims Ln	Johnson Ln	New Rock Creek Rd	1,477	BB	\$15	\$22,156
T-78	New Rock Creek Rd	US A / S Jackson St	Vocational Ln	2,289	BL/PS	\$20	\$45,776
T-79	Freeman St	E Lincoln St	SR-55 / E Carroll St	2,155	BBL/SPL	\$30	\$64,636
T-80	N Anderson St	E Lincoln t	E Hogan St	1,870	SUP	\$150	\$280,500

NOTE: BBL/SPL = Buffered/Separate Bike Lane; BL/PS = Bike Lane/Paved Shoulder; BB = Bike Boulevard; SUP = Shared-Use Path/Sidepath

The Tullahoma Pedestrian Network Plan (Figure 4-9) builds upon the city's existing sidewalk system and provides improved connectivity among key activity centers. Supported by the extensive greenway extensions around the city's perimeter, new sidewalks fill in existing gaps in the network, such as those along US-41A/North Jackson Street, and provide improved connectivity in residential areas south of downtown, particularly along Cedar Lane, Old Shelbyville Highway, and Stone Boulevard. The city's park system will be connected by the network of sidewalks and greenways and schools will be served by direct sidewalk access.

Table 4-8 lists the sidewalk recommendations – a total of approximately six miles and an estimated cost of \$8.2 million.

Additionally, 18 intersections in the city were identified for bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements. While the exact scope of improvements will vary at each location, state-of-the-practice intersection improvements at these locations would complement the bicycle and pedestrian recommendations and further improve multimodal user safety and comfort. Table 4-9 lists the recommended intersection improvement locations.

Figures 4-10 and 4-11 show illustrative schematic drawings of what pedestrian crossing improvements would look like at key locations in Manchester: US-41A/North Jackson Street at SR-55/Wilson Avenue and US-41A/North Jackson Street at Tullahoma High School.

Improvements proposed at each location include the installation of crosswalks, update or installation of crosswalk signals, and installation of pedestrian refuge islands.

Figure 4-9. Pedestrian Corridor Plan - Tullahoma





Table 4-8. Recommended New Sidewalks – Tullahoma

ID	Road	From	To	Linear Feet	Unit Cost (per linear foot)	Estimated Cost
T-1	Ovaca Rd	Fairways Blvd	Kings Ln	2,525	\$250	\$631,250
T-2	Ovaca Rd	Kings Ln	Layne St	1,411	\$250	\$352,750
T-3	N Washington St / Kings Ln	Veterans Dr	E of Oakmont Dr	1,122	\$250	\$280,500
T-4	Kings Ln	E of Oakmont Dr	Ovaca Rd	1,582	\$250	\$395,500
T-5	Cedar Ln	US-41A / N Jackson St	Forrest Gallery Entrance	171	\$250	\$42,750
T-6	US-41A / N Jackson St	N Washington St / Cedar Ln	William Northern Blvd	1,838	\$250	\$459,500
T-7	US-41A / N Jackson St	William Northern Blvd	Jackson Cir	824	\$250	\$206,000
T-8	William Northern Blvd	Cedar Ln	US-41A / N Jackson St	1,682	\$250	\$420,500
T-9	Connector Rd	Old Shelbyville Hwy	Cedar Ln	4,072	\$250	\$1,018,000
T-10	SR-139 / Old Shelbyville Hwy	Connector Rd	SR-55 / Wilson Ave	2,371	\$250	\$592,750
T-11	Cedar Ln	N of Brandywine Apts	SR-55 / Wilson Ave	3,915	\$250	\$978,750
T-12	Cedar Ln	SR-55 / Wilson Ave	W Hogan St	1,677	\$250	\$419,250
T-13	Cedar Ln	Bel Aire Dr	W Lincoln St	1,089	\$250	\$272,250
T-14	W Grundy St	US-41A / N Jackson St	N Collins St	2,002	\$250	\$500,500
T-15	N Collins St	N of W Lincoln St	W Lincoln St	3	\$250	\$50,750
T-16	Ovaca Rd / E Caltron St	Druid Ln	N Washington St	1,037	\$250	\$259,250
T-17	Country Club Dr / N College St	East Middle School Entrance	Stuart St	1,714	\$250	\$428,500
T-18	E Grundy St	N College St	N of Birch St	1,008	\$250	\$252,000
T-19	E Lauderdale St	Anderson St	Lincoln Elementary	946	\$250	\$236,500
T-20	S Anderson St	S of E Lauderdale St	SR-55 / Carroll St	1,417	\$250	\$354,250

Table 4-9. Recommended Intersection Improvements

ID	N/S Cross Street	E/W Cross Street
T-1	US-41 / N Jackson St	Ledford Mill Rd
T-2	N Washington St	Kings Ln
T-3	US-41 / N Jackson St	(Dunham's Sports Entrance)
T-4	US-41 / N Jackson St	(Northgate Mall Entrance)
T-5	US-41 / N Jackson St	(Tullahoma HS) (Midblock)
T-6	US-41 / N Jackson St	W Ogee St
T-7	US-41 / N Jackson St	SR-55 / Wilson Ave
T-8	Cedar Ln	SR-55 / Wilson Ave
T-9	SR-130 / Old Shelbyville Hwy	SR-55 / Wilson Ave
T-10	US-41 / N Jackson St	W Grizzard St
T-11	US-41 / N Jackson St	Lincoln St
T-12	Atlantic St	E Lincoln St
T-13	Anderson St	E Lincoln St
T-14	Cedar Ln	W Lincoln St
T-15	US-41 / N Jackson St	SR-55 / E Carroll St
T-16	S Anderson St	SR-55 / E Carroll St
T-17	S Roosevelt St	SR-55 / E Carroll St (Midblock)
T-18	Freeman St	SR-55 / E Carroll St (Midblock)

Figure 4-11. Crossing Schematic- US-41A/North Jackson Street at Tullahoma High School



C. Development Form Concepts

Two development concepts help better illustrate the transformative potential of the recommendations of the Community Mobility Plan. The concepts show how, taken together, the recommendations and a corresponding change in land use patterns could create walkable centers in key growth areas in Manchester and Tullahoma.


Figure 4-12 shows the intersection of US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard and Hills Chapel Road, emphasizing the new buffered bike lanes along US-41/Hillsboro Boulevard and the recommended pedestrian safety improvements at the Hills Chapel Road intersection. The multimodal improvements could be paired with a zoning overlay to create a neighborhood activity center with some businesses oriented to the sidewalk.

Figure 4-13 shows US-41A/North Jackson Street near the intersection of West Grizzard Street, showing two different means of bikeway implementation along US-41A/North Jackson Street, emphasizing the flexibility of implementation. Buffered bike lanes could be provided on both sides of street. Alternatively, within the same right-of-way, a separated bike lane, facilitating two-way traffic, could be provided on a single side of the street. In both scenarios, adjacent businesses would benefit from increased foot traffic, enhanced bicycle and pedestrian access.

Figure 4-12. Development Concept – Manchester

Walkable Centers Hillsboro Blvd. & Hills Chapel Rd.

Existing



Proposed



Figure 4-13. Development Concept – Tullahoma

Walkable Centers N. Jackson St. & W. Grizzard St.

Existing



Proposed – Buffered Bicycle Lanes



Proposed – Separated Bicycle Lane



Section 5.0

Implementation

The roadway, bicycle, pedestrian, and intersection recommendations provide the overall framework for improving community mobility in Manchester and Tullahoma. The roadway recommendations, having been largely drawn from earlier community-driven planning processes, represent specific projects suitable for the project development process.

While the lists of bicycle, pedestrian, and intersection improvements in Section 4.0 identify recommendations by street or road, they do not necessarily represent specific projects. The project development phase begins with a formal project definition, which usually describes the project's purpose and need, logical termini, and feasibility. As part of the Community Mobility Plan, prioritization criteria were developed to help prioritize the bicycle, pedestrian, and intersection improvements identified in the network plans. The criteria are closely tied to the plan's goals, objectives and can be used by both jurisdictions to evaluate and weigh different needs. As shown below, the criteria include different metrics that can evaluate project benefits with respect to user safety and estimated demand.

Safety

- ADT – Is the improvement adjacent to a high traffic volume roadway?
- Crash – How many bicycle and pedestrian crashes (2014–2017) have occurred within the improvement alignment?
- Gap - Does the improvement fill a gap in the existing network or extend an existing facility

Demand

- Schools – Does the improvement provide access to a school?
- Parks – Does the improvement provide access to a state or local park?
- Population Density – Is the improvement located in a Census Block Group with a high population density?
- Commercial/Retail – Does the improvement provide access to land zoned for or determined to consist of a commercial/retail or office use?

The prioritization tools for the bicycle, pedestrian, and intersection improvements will provide a flexible framework for local officials in both Manchester and Tullahoma to respond to current and future local priorities. For example, the ability to focus primarily on projects with safety benefits, or those that provide better access to schools, facilitates the targeted prioritization of projects meeting specific criteria for certain types of funding.

Ultimately, the implementation of these improvements will require an ongoing partnership between Manchester, Tullahoma, and TDOT. Many project recommendations can be implemented through regularly-scheduled capital projects, such as streetscape projects, street resurfacings, or public or private development. Other projects may be eligible for regular grant opportunities, such as the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Grants.

While full implementation of the Community Mobility Plan may seem challenging, this plan represents a critical first step in achieving a shared vision for mobility within and between Manchester and Tullahoma – and making the case for funding. There are, of course, multiple, often competing, needs and priorities in all communities. Because they fund these communities together, investments in shared mobility offer an opportunity to achieve multiple community goals simultaneously and in the process, deliver a great return on investment. With the Community Mobility Plan, Manchester and Tullahoma are poised to respond to future residential and employment growth while providing an excellent quality of life for their residents.

AF

AF



Community Mobility Plan DRAFT



222 Second Avenue South
Suite 1400
Nashville, TN 37201
615.770.8100
GreshamSmith.com

© 2019 Gresham Smith