**Complete Streets Advisory Committee Meeting**

**November 26, 2019**

**MINUTES**

Attendees:

* Steve Sharkey, DOT
* Graham Young, DOT
* Theo Ngongang, DOT
* Zachary Chissell, MDOT MTA
* Lt. Dennis Dawson, BCFD / OFM
* Matthew DeSantis, Planning
* Nick Fontanez, DOT
* Tereina Galloway, DOT
* Robert Pipik, DHDC
* Linda Taylor-Newton, Planning
* Yolanda Winkler, DPW
* Mikah Zaslow, DOT
* Hannah Davis, Wallace Montgomery
* Fred Lippert, Toole Design
* Larry Marcus, Wallace Montgomery
* Jill Patterson, Wallace Montgomery
1. Minutes from the last meeting (September 27) were approved.
2. Larry Marcus of Wallace Montgomery presented the updated project schedule with the current completion status of tasks related to the Complete Streets Manual production. The Complete Streets Manual sections have been divided into three groups. Each group has a development schedule which includes draft production, internal review, review by committee members, and final draft formatting and production. The three groups are as follows:
	1. Group A: Introduction, Modal Hierarchy, Street Types
	2. Group B: Design Guidance, Project Prioritization, Project Delivery
	3. Group C: Public Engagement, Equity

The status for each Manual section is as follows:

1. Group A: Introduction (Letter of Commitment, Why/How to use Manual, Guiding Principles) Draft text 95% complete, awaiting final comments from BCDOT staff.
2. Group A: Modal Hierarchy (Hierarchy vs. Priority) Draft text 100% complete.
3. Group A: Street Typology (10 Baltimore Street Types) Types identified, section 100% complete, awaiting final comments from BCDOT staff.
4. Group B: Design Guidance for Streets (Cross-Section Overview by Type) Cross sections 100% complete. awaiting final comments from BCDOT staff.
5. Group B: Supplemental design elements: underway as described above. Sections 25% complete.
6. Group C: Community Engagement Policies: City staff working on draft, 10% complete.
7. Group C: Equity Assessment Draft maps and text: 90% complete.
8. Larry Marcus of Wallace Montgomery presented an update on the status of the Equity Assessment. The consulting team has collaborated with City officials to create Equity Assessment Maps. The following indicators will be included in the Equity Assessment and were used as parameters when developing the maps:
	1. Four core indicators:
		1. Race/Ethnicity/National Origin
		2. Household Income
		3. Access to Automobiles
		4. Transit Access
	2. Secondary indicators:
		1. Employment
		2. Crime
		3. Commute Time
		4. Educational Attainment
		5. Age
		6. Environmental Factors
	3. There are multiple ways to define/determine and weight the threshold values for each of the indicators. This will be further discussed with subcommittee members in future meetings.
9. Graham Young of DOT presented the proposed Project Prioritization Processes the working groups have developed for the Manual.
	1. DOT projects can be categorized into three types: sidewalks, resurfacing, and CIP (this includes larger projects and everything else such as bridges, bike infrastructure, transit, and streetscapes).
		1. The current Prioritization Processes for sidewalks and resurfacing rely heavily on 311, which contributes to inequity because only reported problems get repaired, and only those who complain get “fixes”.
		2. The City should look for additional funding opportunities for all types of projects.
		3. In the future the City will implement more Complete Streets quick-build projects to benefit communities.
	2. Sidewalks Proposed Prioritization Process: Equity can be a primary factor in the Prioritization Process. Develop a scale to rank sidewalk condition with 1 being the worst and 5 being the best. The following is an example: 1 = must be replaced. (2 and 3 to be determined). 4 = good condition but not ADA compliant. 5 = good condition and ADA compliant. After all sidewalks are ranked, focus solely on sidewalks with rankings 1 and 2. Those with safety risks (1) will be replaced regardless of the Equity Assessment (use 311 to identify safety issues). The remaining funds will be dedicated to the number 2 sidewalks in equity zones.
		1. We need funding and policy change to be equitable. As long as people have to pay for 50%, prioritizing sidewalk projects based on equity zones is not equitable because lower income areas will receive the most projects, and thus cost-burden. Consider establishing a scalable owner payment system. (Note that public sidewalks aren’t included in cost-sharing).
	3. Resurfacing Proposed Prioritization Process: equity can be a primary factor in the Prioritization Process. Safety improvement and Complete Streets treatments can be implemented at the same time roads are being resurfaced. Establish a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) threshold to prevent roads from deteriorating to a point where they need replacement.
		1. Local Roads: Use equity as a primary factor, but must decide weighting. For example, on a scale of 1-5 (1 being areas with the most equity issues and 5 being areas with the least), distribute projects the following way: 1-2 areas = 50% of projects, 3-4 areas = 40%, 5 = 10%. Once we identify the number or cost of projects in each area, then use the PCI to prioritize roads.
			1. Question: how will you address vacant areas or areas that will get resurfacing due to redevelopment?
			2. Comment: don’t assume that low income communities will have access to fewer cars, and don’t restrict traffic capacity of roads due to that assumption.
			3. Question: do we have PCI rankings? Answer: yes, from 2012, but we will have an updated database in 2020.
		2. Collectors and Arterials: These are most dangerous (fatalities rarely happen on local roads). These roads also serve all populations and deteriorate faster. Along with the PCI threshold, there will be 4 equally weighted components: PCI (25%); Traffic volume with an emphasis on transit ridership (25%); Safety (25%); Equity (25%).
			1. Question: trucks and buses create more wear on roads. How do you address this? Answer: there are City maps that identify high transit ridership areas and traffic volume analysis will take transit ridership into account.
			2. Question: how much does the budget limit or dictate the prioritization process? After you address the highest-priority projects, is there enough money to do lower-priority projects? Answer: the budget has historically been limited and will continue to be limited. This Prioritization Process is to address how we use the budget we have.
	4. CIP Proposed Prioritization Process: Note that bridges are a priority and so they are exempt from this Prioritization Process. Weighted factors define areas for projects and not the projects themselves. Currently we don’t have a master list of projects to choose from because not many projects have gone through the planning process. Using a “0 or 1” or “yes or no” weighting factor will allow for subjectivity. The following factors will be considered:
		1. infrastructure condition, safety, equity, existing or planned work (other agencies or private development that we can leverage), transit dependency or commute time, economic development
			1. Comment: we will have to be prepared to publicly defend any decisions we make for projects.
			2. Comment: if we weight economic development the same as equity it could override equity. Consider double-weighting equity or changing the definition or threshold of economic development so it doesn’t obscure other factors.
			3. Comment: consider setting an equity threshold or minimum equity requirement so we avoid prioritizing projects that score high on all other issues but not on equity.
			4. Question: How do we decide thresholds? What departments should be involved?
			5. Question: does the City have maps of privately-owned areas that should be privately maintained?
10. Larry Marcus presented the draft Manual layout for Group A (Introduction, Modal Hierarchy, Street Types) and asked Advisory Committee members to submit pictures for use in the Manual. Graham Young presented the draft Letter of Commitment from the City.
11. An update on Community Engagement was given.
	1. Toole has started outreach at planned city events: Waverly Farmers Market, Lexington Market, and a table at the 5th annual Cranksgiving event. They will have three more events in December at City Markets.
	2. Tereina Galloway, the Chief of Stakeholder Engagement, will coordinate the Ambassador Program. The Complete Streets Ordinance mandates that we have a community engagement period to present the draft Manual to the public for comment. Tereina will utilize different types of outreach including taking a non-traditional approach as way to reach residents who aren’t necessarily active in the association, but who are active in their communities.