Complete Streets Advisory Committee Meeting

September 27, 2019

MINUTES

Attendees:

- Steve Sharkey, DOT
- Graham Young, DOT
- Theo Ngongang, DOT
- Nick Fontanez, DOT
- Matthew Hendrickson, DOT, bike planner
- Robert Pipik, DHDC
- Lauren Swiecicki, DPW
- Meg Young, DOT, shared mobility
- Mikah Zaslow, DOT
- Fred Lippert, Toole Design
- Larry Marcus, Wallace Montgomery
- Jill Patterson, Wallace Montgomery
- Jessica Shearer, Wallace Montgomery

1. Minutes from the last meeting (July 18) were approved.

2. Graham Young of DOT explained that the original October 3rd, 2019 draft due date has been changed to April 1, 2020. This will allow for more community engagement and a more developed rough draft.
    a. The legislation that extends the deadline mandates community engagement via an ambassador program, and DOT is currently working on bringing on a staff member as Engagement Manager. The Engagement Manager will set up and help run an ambassador program for the Transportation Department. This program will be for the entire department, and not just for Complete Streets. The Engagement Manager will make sure all departments, groups, and stakeholders have an opportunity for input and to be heard.
    b. Advisory committee recommendations and comments on community engagement:
        i. Complete Streets is pro-safety, pro-walking, pro-pedestrian and not "anti-car". We must make sure the public understands and accepts the Complete Street mission.

      ii. A parklet was installed recently and many community members were curious, excited about it, and asked questions. This was a good example of successful community engagement.

      iii. Recruit well-established members of underrepresented communities to help spread the word about the Complete Streets Manual in those communities.

      iv. Use data to make the argument that what we are doing is making a difference.

      v. Ensure that the public knows that project choices are not random, and that what is chosen is part of a bigger system with larger future long-term goals.

      vi. Maybe we can incentivize people to return and corral scooters by offering a dollar amount for every scooter they return.

      vii. Not only must the public be educated on the Complete Streets mission, but Council and Department members must also fully understand the binding legislation that has been signed off on, and how that applies to the future actions and choices made by the City departments.

3. Larry Marcus of Wallace Montgomery discussed the updated project schedule. Toole Design Group and Wallace Montgomery are finalizing a schedule with detailed subcommittee and advisory committee meeting dates, as well as Manual deliverable dates that accommodate the multi-step review process which involves internal, subcommittee member, and advisory committee member reviews and revision.

4. Larry Marcus of Wallace Montgomery briefed the advisory committee members on the subcommittee working group outcomes regarding street typologies and design guidance.
   a. Cross sections for each of the ten street types were labeled with design dimensions according to ordinance and city standards, AASHTO standards, NACTO standards, and recommended standards. Subcommittee members reviewed the cross sections, and comments were received from Highway Engineering Section, Planning Department and MDOT MTA. No conflicting comments were received. The comments were reviewed and revisions to the pedestrian zones, curb space zones, travel way zones, and curb side zones were made according to the received input.
      i. Advisory committee member question: Are any legislatively mandated dimensions far off from NACTO recommended dimensions? Answer: No. And those that were different are now accommodated with target and constrained measurements.

b. Lauren Swiecicki from DPW made the following comments about considerations for the Complete Streets Manual: Must consider street cleaning, traffic pickup, water meter locations, bioretention facilities, how much do/can homeowners impede on sidewalks (ex: planters), scooter parking, uber/lyft pickup and drop off, and make sure that tree roots don't interfere with utilities and maintenance. The current cross sections are now very surface based and don't show what's "under the streets".

c. The comment was made to make sure the Green Book (currently being worked on) coordinates with the Complete Streets Manual.

d. The consultant team will continue to schedule regular work-sessions with subcommittee members to discuss and review the following:

   i. Intersections, sidewalks, bike facilities, transit streets, sustainable stormwater management/green infrastructure, roadway crossings and intersections, curbspace management, corner radii, pavement surfaces, multimodal signal operations, interim / quick-build strategies.

5. Graham Young of DOT briefed the advisory committee members on the subcommittee working group outcome regarding the project prioritization process:

   a. DOT will work with the Baltimore Metropolitan Council and the Planning Department to create a power map similar to the one developed my Morgan State (website: equitybaltimore.org/powermap/)

      i. The equity factors that should be included (but not limited to) are: transportation access, employment, housing market, health, education, public safety, historical planning decisions

      ii. The 7 colors represent equity components, with green scoring lowest, yellow being transitional (example: Pigtown, Harbor East), and red scoring highest for equity concerns.

   b. Resurfacing and sidewalk repair/replacement projects' prioritization processes should be straightforward and be easy to interpret by city staff and the public. Historically best practices have included the following methods: pavement condition index (resurfacing projects), spreading projects amongst city council districts (resurfacing projects), complaint driven approach (sidewalk projects)

      i. These methods can be inherently inequitable. An equity powermap can help to address those inequalities in the prioritization process.

   c. Advisory committee member questions and comments:

      i. Is race included as a factor? Answer: not in the example powermap, but it can be added.

      ii. Consider adding safety and crash locations

      iii. Look at Equity Analysis of Baltimore City's Capital Improvement Plan (2014) as a good resource for CIP

   iv. We must make the process of choosing projects simple so people will follow it. To prioritize red areas, for example, you can do 55% of projects to 3 shades of red, 15% to yellow, then 30% to green.

   v. An asset management inventory is being done. This will be very useful for prioritization because then we will have data of what currently exists where, and we can then overlap that with equity maps to see the current conditions and to back-up postulations.

   vi. CIP is much more nuanced/involved/complicated because there are so many more components to consider when prioritizing.

6. As the Manual continues to be developed, the consultant team will ask advisory committee and subcommittee members to contribute pictures for possible inclusion. The consultant team will also distribute three Manual section groups for review in the upcoming months. Those section groups are:
   a. Introduction, Modal Hierarchy, Street Types
   b. Design Guidance, Prioritization, Project Delivery
   c. Engagement and Equity

   The sections will be posted on Sharepoint and will also be sent via email for comment.

7. The next subcommittee meeting will be scheduled for mid-October. It was proposed that we might consider combining the subcommittee and advisory committee meetings for better attendance, but Theo Ngongang of DOT suggested we keep them separate so that we can have the leadership engaging talk at the top level, but also discussion at the deeper/detailed level. If we combine the two some people might be hesitant to speak up.