

**CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

TO: Parking and Public Improvements Commission

FROM: Richard Thompson, Director of Community Development
Nhung Madrid, Management Analyst
Erik Zandvliet, Traffic Engineer

WBJ FOR RT
JMM

DATE: February 28, 2013

SUBJECT: Non-Motorized Transportation Prioritization Evaluation Criteria

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Parking and Public Improvements Commission review and discuss the draft Non-Motorized Transportation Prioritization Evaluation Criteria and provide staff with further direction.

BACKGROUND:

In August 2012, the City received a petition from a resident, Janet Murphy, requesting additional sidewalk on Parkview Avenue from Park Way to Market Place. Presently, there are no sidewalks on either side of Parkview Avenue at this location.

Staff performed a preliminary review of Parkview Avenue in response to the request which revealed sufficient rights-of-way to construct the sidewalk on the south side of the street; however, there were significant construction challenges with this location due to a significant slope, trees and utilities that must be relocated to accommodate the requested sidewalk. Also, the City does not possess sufficient rights-of-way to accommodate a sidewalk on the north side of the street.

Staff presented its findings to City Council in October 2012 and proposed utilizing available funding from the Non-Motorized Transportation Project Fund. Although submittal/evaluation criteria had not yet been established to use these funds, this project would be consistent with the type of project to be funded through this account (crosswalks, bike lanes, pedestrian improvements etc.). Due to the lack of criteria to evaluate the best use of these funds, City Council directed staff to develop guidelines for prioritization of such projects through the Capital Improvement Program. These criteria would also be used in prioritizing future non-motorized CIP projects.

DISCUSSION:

The City receives a number of requests every year to construct non-vehicular improvements to the existing circulation network. These requests are typically for new sidewalks, walkstreets, walking paths, crosswalks, curb extensions, bike lanes, bike racks and other pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Staff also actively seeks and applies for grant funding for improvements related specifically to pedestrian and bicycle improvements. Often these grants require local match funding.

As shown in Exhibit A, Community Development staff developed draft evaluation criteria in collaboration with Planning, Public Works, and Police Department staff. These criteria will help compare potential projects so that those with the greatest public benefit and urgent need are given priority in funding and implementation considerations. The criteria are subdivided into seven categories, and evaluation points are weighted based on the merits of the proposed project in each category. A maximum score of 100 points is possible, based on the following breakdown:

- Safety (20)
- Accessibility (20)
- Connectivity (15)
- Multi-Modal Features (15)
- Fiscal (15)
- Plan Consistency (10)
- Neighborhood Compatibility (5)

At the initial review, if a proposed project does not provide improvements for any non-vehicular transportation option, this automatically disqualifies it from this evaluation process. Specifically for the Multi-Modal Features category, a score of zero indicates that a proposed project will provide no new non-motorized transportation modes and will be automatically disqualified. A given project scoring the maximum points in each category could receive 100 points. Two projects with the same score could be re-evaluated against each other to determine ranking.

CONCLUSION:

At this time, staff recommends that the Parking and Public Improvements Commission review and discuss the draft Non-Motorized Transportation Prioritization Evaluation Criteria and provide staff with further direction. The Parking and Public Improvements Commission recommendation will be forwarded to the City Council for final action.

Exhibits:

- A. Draft Non-Motorized Transportation Prioritization Evaluation Criteria
- B. Draft Non-Motorized Transportation Prioritization Evaluation Form

February 28, 2013
City of Manhattan Beach
NON-MOTORIZED PROJECT
EVAUATION CRITERIA

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The City of Manhattan Beach receives a number of requests every year to provide non-vehicular improvements to the existing circulation network. These requests are typically for construction of new sidewalks, walkstreets, walking paths, crosswalks, curb extensions, bike lanes, bike racks and other pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Pursuant to these requests, the City has prepared evaluation criteria to determine the importance and priority of proposed projects. These criteria will help compare multiple projects so that those with the greatest benefit and cost-effectiveness are selected for limited capital funds and/or scheduling.

The following set of evaluation criteria has been developed in collaboration with Traffic, Planning, Public Works, and Police Department staff. Criteria are weighted so that projects addressing the issues of greatest public benefit and urgent need are given priority in funding and implementation considerations. The criteria is subdivided into seven categories, and evaluation points are weighted based on the merits of the proposed project in each category. A maximum score of 100 points is possible.

- Safety (20)
- Accessibility (20)
- Connectivity (15)
- Multi-Modal Features (15)
- Fiscal (15)
- Plan Consistency (10)
- Neighborhood Compatibility (5)

A given project scoring the maximum points in each category could receive 100 points. Two projects with the same score could be re-evaluated against each other to determine ranking. A score of zero in Section 1.4 Multi-Modal Features automatically disqualifies a project.

1.1 SAFETY (20 points maximum)

The Safety category makes up 20 percent of the overall project score due to the significance placed on safety considerations by the City and the public. Factors that should be considered to evaluate the Safety category include the following:

- Will the conceptualized design generally meet the accepted practices and guidelines (CA MUTCD) related to the proposed facility?
- Are there existing conditions that obstruct or prevent convenient non-vehicular use?
- Will the project improve travel safety for more than one transportation mode?
- Will the project address a documented collision history? SWITRS (accident) data can provide more details about a location and possible solutions
- Will the project improve access for a significantly non-vehicular land use (i.e. park, recreational facility, school children, mobility challenged, wheelchairs, medical facilities, senior centers)?
- Will the project enhance access or reduce response time for emergency vehicles and/or first responders?

A project could receive one of three scores for the Safety category. A Safety score of zero indicates that a project will not significantly enhance the safety of users. For example, upgrading a sidewalk with priority pedestrian treatments (increase width, separation from traffic, etc.) will make the sidewalk more comfortable for pedestrians, but not necessarily safer, since there is already a sidewalk in place. A safety score of 10 indicates that safety is improved for only one transportation mode. The addition of a bicycle lane, for example, improves safety for cyclists, but not necessarily for pedestrians or vehicles. A score of 20 means that the facility improves safety for more than one transportation mode.

1.2 ACCESSIBILITY (20 points maximum)

There are two categories addressing issues of Access: ADA Access and Destinations. The ADA Access sub-category addresses universal accessibility, while the Destinations sub-category measures how many destinations that would be served by a proposed project. The Accessibility category makes up 20 percent of the total project score.

The ADA Access sub-category is very straightforward. If the proposed project improves access for disabled persons in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 (or the most current adopted version), 10 points will be awarded and zero if it doesn't meet the requirements. The ADA Access sub-category accounts for 10 percent of the project score.

The Destinations sub-category is measured by identifying the total number of destination sites within 500 feet of the proposed facility. Destinations sites include retail stores, shopping centers, medical facilities, government buildings, religious facilities, schools, parks and recreational facilities. Residential uses are not considered destination sites. If the proposed project provides access to 10 or more of these destination sites, it receives a score of 10. If the project serves fewer than 10 destinations, the score equals the number of qualifying destination sites. If the project does not provide access to any destinations, it receives a score of zero. The Destinations sub-category accounts for 10 percent of the project score.

1.3 CONNECTIVITY (15 points maximum)

Connectivity concerns are addressed by three evaluation sub-categories which make up 15 percent of the project score. The "Fills Gaps" sub-category determines whether or not the proposed project will fill gaps in the existing multimodal transportation network. A proposed project that connects on one end to an existing multimodal facility (suitable to the same mode) but does not connect to an existing facility on the other end would receive a score of 3. A project that connects to existing multimodal facilities on both ends, or which spans gaps within the project limits would receive a score of 5. A project that does not connect to any existing facilities would receive a score of zero. The "Fill Gaps" sub-category accounts for 5 percent of the total project score.

The second connectivity evaluation sub-category called "Transit Access" addresses the impact the proposed project will have on transit access. If the proposed project provides direct access to an existing transit route, the project receives a score of 5. If there are no transit routes or stops within the project limits, it receives a score of zero. The Transit Access sub-category makes up 5 percent of the total project score.

The last connectivity evaluation sub-category called "School Route" addresses the impact the proposed project will have on access along a school route. If the proposed project provides direct access to, from or along an existing school route, the project receives a score of 5. If

there are no designated school routes along the course of the proposed project, it receives a score of zero. The School Route sub-category makes up 5 percent of the total project score.

1.4 MULTI-MODAL FEATURES (15 points maximum)

The multi-modal category makes up 15 percent of the total project score. At the initial review, if a proposed project does not provide improvements for any non-vehicular transportation option, this automatically disqualifies it from this evaluation process.

If the proposed project will provide improvements for non-vehicular transportation, factors that need to be considered include:

- Will the project provide non-motorized transportation improvements to an existing facility that does not currently exist?
- Will the project reduce the effectiveness of any existing non-vehicular transportation modes?
- Will the project add one or more non-vehicular transportation modes to a regionally significant corridor/facility or does it create a new regional non-vehicular corridor/facility?

A project could receive one of three scores for the Multi-Modal Features category. A score of zero indicates that a proposed project will provide no new non-motorized transportation modes and will be automatically disqualified. A score of 7 indicates that the project will add one mode of non-motorized travel to an existing facility. A score of 15 indicates that the proposed project will add more than one mode of non-motorized travel to an existing facility.

1.5 FISCAL

The Fiscal category makes up 15 percent of the total project score. To leverage the City's "purchasing" power for a project, all appropriate funding opportunities should be considered, especially the ability to obtain funds from all non-City sources (i.e. grants, private funds, donations, restricted funding, state or federal funds).

- Are there potential grants available to fund the proposed project?
- How much of the total cost will the non-City funds cover?
- Will matching City funds be required?
- Are there restrictions on the non-City funding source?

A proposed project could receive one of three scores for the Fiscal category. A score of zero indicates that a project will be funded only through City funds. A score of 7 indicates that up to 50 percent of the proposed project will be funded with non-City funds and/or there are significant restrictions on the use of those funds. A score of 15 indicates that over 50 percent of the project will be funded with non-City funds and there are no or limited restrictions on the use of those funds.

1.6 PLAN CONSISTENCY (10 points maximum)

The Plan Consistency category makes up 10 percent of the total project score. Factors that should be considered to evaluate the Plan Consistency category include the following:

- Is the proposed project generally consistent with a City or Regionally adopted plan(s) for non-vehicular transportation?
- Will the project help fulfill one or more of the City's General Plan Goals, Policies and Objectives or Programs?
- Will the project help fulfill or promote other plans, such as the Capital Improvement Program Plan, Safe Routes to School Plan, South Bay Bicycle Master Plan, etc.

A proposed project could receive one of three scores for the Plan Consistency category. A score of zero indicates that a project is inconsistent with City or regional plans or policies. A score of 5 indicates that the project may not be consistent but that it is not contrary to goals and objectives of the above plans and policies. A score of 10 indicates that the project is directly generated from an existing adopted plan or policy.

1.7 NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY (5 points maximum)

The Neighborhood Compatibility category makes up 5 percent of the total project score. Factors that should be considered to evaluate the Neighborhood Compatibility category include the following:

- Will the project cause unsatisfactory direct or indirect impacts within the neighborhood that cannot be mitigated?
- Does the project have the support of the neighborhood?
- Is the project similar to or compatible with other facilities in the neighborhood, specifically with regard to street width, landscaping, design and appropriate buffers (Sand Section, Tree Section, Hill Section, Manhattan Village, North Manhattan Beach, Downtown and Eastside)?
- Will the project cause unacceptable levels of through traffic on neighborhood access/collector streets?

A proposed project could receive one of three scores for the Neighborhood Compatibility category. A score of zero indicates that a project is not supported by the neighborhood and conflicts with the neighborhood/District. A score of 3 indicates that the support/opposition from the public is balanced and does not conflict with the above mentioned factors. A score of 5 indicates that the project is clearly supported by the public and does not conflict with the above mentioned factors.

February 28, 2013
 City of Manhattan Beach
 Non-Motorized Project Evaluation Form

CATEGORY	SCORING CRITERIA	SCORE
1.1 Safety (20%)		
	No notable improvement	0
	Safety improved for one mode of travel	10
	Safety improved for two or more modes of travel	20
		Enter Score <input type="text"/>
1.2 Accessibility (20%)		
ADA (10%)	Does not meet ADA requirements	0
	Meets ADA Requirements	10
		Enter Score <input type="text"/>
Destinations (10%)	No destination served	0
	Some destinations served (1-10)	(1-10)
	Many destinations served (more than 10)	10
		Enter Score <input type="text"/>
1.3 Connectivity (15%)		
Fills Gaps (5%)	Does not connect to existing facilities	0
	Connects on one end to existing facility	3
	Connects on both ends to existing facility	5
		Enter Score <input type="text"/>
Transit Access (5%)	No existing transit route/stop	0
	Direct access on an existing transit route	5
		Enter Score <input type="text"/>
School Route (5%)	No Improvement	0
	Improved access on a school route	5
		Enter Score <input type="text"/>
1.4 Multi-Modal (15%)		
	No improvement (AUTOMATICALLY DISQUALIFIES PROJECT)	0
	Improved access for one non-vehicular mode of travel	7
	Improved access for two or more non-vehicular modes of travel	15
		Enter Score <input type="text"/>
1.5 Fiscal (15 %)		
	100% City funded (no non-City funds)	0
	Less than 50% non-City funds used to pay for project	7
	50%-100% non-City funds used to pay for project	15
		Enter Score <input type="text"/>
1.6 Plan Consistency (10%)		
	Project is inconsistent	0
	Project lacks consistency	5
	Project is generated from an existing approved/adopted plan	10
		Enter Score <input type="text"/>
1.7 Neighborhood Compatibility (5%)		
	Not supported or creates neighborhood impacts	0
	Balanced support/opposition and does not create impacts	3
	Wide support and does not create neighborhood impacts	5
		Enter Score <input type="text"/>
		Total Score
		0