



## Chapter 6

# Pedestrian Project Prioritization Process

*A project as discussed in this chapter, is a grouping of improvements that generally would cost more than \$25,000 to implement. Wherever possible, groupings of improvements should be considered in order to obtain magnitude of cost savings.*

*A project prioritization process is needed to assure cost effective use of limited public and private funding for pedestrian facilities. Safety, followed by accessibility, then connectivity and walkability are the general priorities set forth in this plan. However, the project that addresses the greatest number of the priorities listed above, should be given the top priority.*

A substantial amount of funding is needed to bring all of the city's public pedestrian facilities up to a standard that makes them safe, walkable, accessible, connected and assets to our neighborhoods. The amount far exceeds what is likely to be obtained. To be cost effective, a system of ranking and selecting priority projects for funding has been developed.

### 6.1 PROJECT DEFINITION AND ORIGIN

A repair or an improvement to a pedestrian facility does not necessarily make it a project. A project should be defined as new construction or a major retrofit that is likely to require the development of design and engineering plans and will result in a permit or other ministerial or discretionary review and will likely be built by a contractor or substantial city work forces. A project as discussed in this chapter, is a grouping of improvements that generally would cost more than \$25,000 to implement. Wherever possible, groupings of improvements should be considered in order to obtain magnitude of cost savings.

### 6.2 PRIORITY OBJECTIVES

#### Multiple Benefit Criteria

1. Projects in areas of high pedestrian use that provide improvements for safety, access, connectivity and walkability issues, that also increase walking as an alternative transportation mode, should receive the highest scoring overall.

#### Safety Criteria

2. Walkways and crosswalks that are along wide, high speed, high traffic volume streets should take priority over residential and local collector streets with lower speeds and volume. Streets where collision data, speed, street geometry all indicate potential safety concerns, should receive the highest score for safety improvements.
3. Projects that improve safety and connectivity to schools and other public facilities such as community centers, libraries and recreation centers, especially those attracting a high concentration of seniors, should be considered to be the second highest priority for safety improvements.

#### Accessibility Criteria

4. Projects that modify a completely non-accessible route with fully accessible pedestrian routes in areas identified by this Master Plan as having high pedestrian activity (or by the most recent version of the ADA transition plan) will be given the highest accessible priority.
5. Other pedestrian improvements that enhance accessibility along lower use pedestrian routes that already have some level of access, will be given the next highest level of accessibility priority.

#### Connectivity Criteria

6. Projects that increase connectivity around "smart growth" mixed use projects that will generate significant levels of pedestrian activity but are in need of off-site connections, should receive the highest connectivity scoring.
7. Projects that remove barriers, close gaps or increase connectivity with other high pedestrian uses, should receive the second highest connectivity scoring.

#### Walkability Criteria

8. Projects that improve overall site amenities, protection from adjacent environmental conditions and improve clarity, comfort and interest for walking, should receive the highest scoring for walkability.
9. Projects that support greater interaction amongst the public, should be given the second highest priority for walkability.



Steps that can be taken ...



• A refinement of the checklists and priority forms are needed. Ultimately, the forms should take into

account most all of the questions and priorities identified by the various funding sources.

• The City should continue to coordinate with SANDAG staff in regards to the criteria used and the forms supplied for the annual ranking process. Certain modifications would help to integrate the City's efforts with SANDAG's and benefit other municipalities that are competing for these funds as well.

• A formal process for project identification, initial review, application completion, application verification and overall ranking of all pedestrian projects within the City of San Diego is needed. Several optional forms and processes are indicated in this Chapter.

6.3 OPTIONAL PRIORITY CHECKLISTS

Tables 34 - 36 have been included to show different methods of prioritizing pedestrian projects. Table 34 is one methodology that puts an emphasis on the PPM GIS maps that indicate areas of high or potentially high pedestrian use. A project that has multiple characteristics of improvements across the safety, accessibility, connectivity and walkability categories, and is also in a high use zone, will rise to the surface of this ranking system. This system will require some ongoing effort by planning staff to review the project location and have the GIS system pinpoint the project extent, buffer the extent by 1/4 mile, summarize the raw score of all pixels in the buffer, then divide by the total number of pixels in the total area to arrive at an average score per pixel.

Table 35 represents the current FY 2007 selection criteria from SANDAG, with this PMP's suggested revisions shown in red. If the reasons for these revisions are logical and compelling, the hope is that the City of San Diego can provide input on future versions of the SANDAG ranking form. Even without these changes to the SANDAG form, the system can be used to identify specific important items to the City, while still keeping as paramount, the ranking criteria that SANDAG is likely to use in selecting the projects. Ultimately, since many of the funding sources are managed by SANDAG and the Bike and Pedestrian Working Group under the administration of SANDAG rank all San Diego County bike and pedestrian projects, some consistency with the SANDAG prioritization model is needed. Table 36 is the latest version of the selection and priority criteria developed by the City of San Diego. It includes some criteria that neither Table 34 or Table 35 have included.

6.4 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

Long range planners, transportation planners, facility financing planners and community planners in the City Planning and Community Investment Department as well as others in Development Services and engineers in the Engineering and Capital Projects Department as well as in Streets Division, will serve as the front line for project initiation. Requests for these projects may come from the Mayor's office, Council Offices, from the Community Planning Group or at staff level. Projects may be identified under future community plan updates, redevelopment projects or during the review of major development projects that will not be able to fully implement the area's pedestrian requirements. The institution of a regular inventory process is needed between Streets Division and Disability Services. This will help to identify needs above and beyond the CPMP or other community wide planning efforts. This process will also help to determine major maintenance issues and accessibility shortfalls.

6.5 PRIORITY SELECTION PROCESS

An initial review of the project is necessary to make sure that too much effort is not taken on a project that might only result in a low priority. Transportation planning staff will take the lead on determining the proper funding source and category that the project would best fit within. Initial review would verify if the project is included in an existing CPMP, adopted Community Plan or Facility Financing Plan. If the project did not originate with the Council Office or Community Group, a review of support by these groups is also advisable. Finally, a quick review of the PPM GIS maps is warranted to verify that it is within a high or moderate priority area. The initial likelihood of priority should be communicated to the project proponent and a copy of the adopted forms sent to them for their completion of the checklist and the development of backup materials. Once reviewed and verified by transportation planning staff, the project should be ranked with other pedestrian projects on at least a quarterly basis. This will assure that the most important projects with the greatest chance of approval for funding, will be put forward.

Table 34: Draft PMP Checklist

Pedestrian Project Prioritization Process Checklist		Project Scoring*
The project proponent will complete sections 2-5 below. GIS staff will provide the rankings for Item#1.		
<b>1. Pedestrian Use Levels (existing or potential)</b>		
<b>According to the Pedestrian Priority Model, the area has the following rating for pedestrian activity**:</b>		(Circle One Only)
Very High (50-75 Points using the Average GIS Mapping Score within 1/4 mile)	3	
High (25-49 Points using the Average GIS Mapping Score within 1/4 mile)	2	
Moderate (10-24 Points using the Average GIS Mapping Score within 1/4 mile)	1.5	
Very High (1-9 Points using the Average GIS Mapping Score within 1/4 mile)	1	
<b>2. Safety</b>		
<b>What are the current pedestrian safety issues that this project will address?</b>		(Circle One Only)
High pedestrian collision rates at intersections	10	
High pedestrian collision rates along roadway segments	8	
Low to Moderate pedestrian collision rates at intersections or roadway segments	5	
No collisions can be verified but close calls exist & comfort levels would be improved resulting in increased use	2	
<b>3. Accessibility</b>		
<b>What issues of accessibility will benefit from this project?</b>		(Circle One Only)
Adds missing segments of walkways will be added that will make a route fully accessible	8	
Adds missing curb ramps and/or accessible pedestrian signals will be added	5	
Removes obstacles from the throughway on walkways to create a wider path of travel that is obstruction free	3	
Brings existing facilities that were once considered accessible, up to new standards	2	
Adds or improves overall lighting levels of the pedestrian route	1	
<b>4. Connectivity</b>		
<b>How will this project improve connectivity and what will it help connect to?</b>		(Circle One Only)
Adds missing pedestrian facilities or connections that will support mixed-use smart growth	5	
Provides shorter, improved, safe & walkable routes to transit	4	
Provides shorter, improved, safe & walkable connections to schools or public facilities	3	
Provides safe, walkable & accessible connections between businesses & public facilities	2	
Provides safe, walkable & accessible connections between residential areas & other uses	1	
<b>5. Walkability</b>		
<b>How will this project improve walkability?</b>		(Circle One Only)
Reduces harsh environmental conditions through the addition of amenities that also support traffic calming & safety	3	
Assists in reducing crime with improved street lighting, more defensible space & more eyes on the street	2	
Creates more plazas, promenades & / or open space that will allow the gatherings for social interaction	1	
Improves comfort & convenience for pedestrians by adding places to sit, trash receptacles & drinking fountains	1	
Improves the overall streetscape design to be more inviting for people to walk, look, engage with others & shop	1	
<b>Total Score (add items # 2-5)</b>		
<b>Enter Weighting Score (Item #1)</b>		
<b>Total Weighted Score</b>		

\* suggested rating score from the consultant team that will be adjusted by staff and the PWG

\*\* ratings are determined by using a clipping of a 1/4 mile radius centered on the middle of the improvements, then taking the total points found in this radius divided by the total number of cells to obtain an average GIS Mapping Score.



**Table 35: SANDAG Pedestrian Project Selection Matrix (adaptations shown in red)**

Category	Criteria	Points	Score
<b>PROJECT STATUS FACTORS</b>			
<b>1. Community Support:</b> Consistency with Community Plan	Must have at least 1 of the following to qualify. Please attach supporting documentation. 1. Resolution or minutes from City Council, planning group, or Planning Commission. Or 2. Project is part of a Non-Motorized Plan that has been approved within the last 5 years.	Pass/Fail	
<b>2. Minimum Design Standards</b>	Must meet the minimum geometric standards set forth in the SANDAG Planning and Designing for Pedestrians manual, the <b>City of San Diego Pedestrian Master Plan</b> and the Americans with Disabilities Act.*	Pass/Fail	
<b>3. Project Readiness **</b> <b>20 Points Maximum</b>	Projects are eligible for points following completion of each phase.		
	Feasibility Study / <b>Community Master Plan</b>	4	
	Preliminary <b>Design ***</b>	4	
	Environmental Clearance	4	
	Right-of-way Acquisition	4	
	<b>Final Engineering / Design Construction Documents***</b>	4	
<b>PROXIMITY AND CONNECTIVITY FACTORS</b>			
<b>4. GIS Analysis - (done by the City) 20 Points Maximum</b>	<b>Ranked according to the average score of all points in the GIS Pedestrian Priority Model determined by buffering a 1/4 mile radius around the improvement (point or linear feature).****</b>	0 to 20	
<b>5. Trail Connection</b>	<b>Provides missing connections as part of a "Trail or Path Route Types"</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>6. Neighborhood Connection</b>	<b>Provides missing connections as part of a "Neighborhood or Connector Route Types"</b>	<b>3</b>	
<b>7. Corridor Connection</b>	<b>Provides missing connections as part of a "Corridor Route Type"</b>	<b>7</b>	
<b>8. District or Special Route Connection</b>	<b>Provides missing connections for a "District Route Type", a "Ancillary Route Type" or within or around a smart growth area</b>	<b>10</b>	
<b>9. Connection to Transit</b>	Project provides a direct connection to a local transit stop	14	
	Project provides a direct connection to a regional transit station	20	
<b>SAFETY FACTORS</b>			
<b>10 Safety Improvements</b> <b>20 Points Maximum</b>	Improves general safety of routes within existing network	4	
	Improves safety of street crossings to major public facilities	8	
	Improves safety of street crossings to schools or transit	12	
	Completes connections <b>and crossings</b> in existing network at locations with documented safety or accident history:		
	A. One to two correctable crashes involving non-motorized users within the last three years.	4	
B. Three to four correctable crashes involving non-motorized users within the last three years.	6		
C. Five to six correctable crashes involving non-motorized users within the last three years.	8		

\* Design exceptions may be presented for review by the Bicycle-Pedestrian Working Group with the understanding that proposals must include a design that meets min. st

\*\* Previous project milestones must be met before qualifying for subsequent funding.

\*\*\* Preliminary Engineering and Final Designs will be subject to design review by SANDAG.

\*\*\*\* **This average score will be compared to the median score of the community planning area the project is found within, which will represent 10 on the scale of 20 points.**

For every 5% above the median, an additional 1 point will be added up to a total of 20 points. For every 5% the project is below the median, 1 point will be taken away.

Table 35 (continued): SANDAG Pedestrian Project Selection Matrix (adaptations shown in red)

Category	Criteria	Points	Score
<b>PROJECT TYPE FACTORS</b>			
<b>11</b> Innovation & Design - 10 Points Maximum	Pedestrian priority measures such as: A. Animated eye indicators, countdown pedestrian signal, crosswalk signage and flashers, <b>advance stop bars and other walk amenities including lighting, street trees and seating</b>	2	
	B. Early pedestrian release interval, <b>reduced corner radius, 2-phase crossing signals, high visibility crosswalk markings or contrasting materials</b>	4	
	C. Improved access with curb ramps, adjusted driveways, audible & accessible signal actuators, or repaired inaccessible walkways	6	
	D. Raised crosswalk, speed table, raised intersection, median refuge, & <b>cul-de-sac to roadway pedestrian connectors</b>	8	
	E. Pedestrian bulb-out, <b>active pedestrian detection / signal control, mid-block crosswalks with in-pavement flashers</b>	10	
Subtotal			
<b>FUNDING FACTORS</b>			
<b>12</b> Matching Funds 25 Points Maximum	Matching funds can be from any of the following sources:  1. Identified & approved capital funding from identified source. Please provide proof in the form of a resolution or letter of approval. 2. Approved match grant. 3. In-kind services. Please provide adequate support documentation.	(Matching Funds x 2) / (Bike Portion of Project Cost) x 26	
<b>13</b> Cost Benefit 15 Points Maximum	Subtotal Score / Grant Application Amount	0 to 15	
Total Score			



**Table 36: City of San Diego Suggested Prioritization Criteria Point System**

Suggested Criteria	Consideration		Points (100 Max)
Health & Safety	<i>Safety, accessibility, connectivity &amp; walkability</i>		
	Provides pedestrian safety, universal accessibility, connectivity, and walkability improvements.	High	20
	Provides universal accessibility, connectivity and walkability improvements for pedestrians.	Medium	15
	Provides walkability improvements for pedestrians.	Low	10
Capacity & Service	<i>Proximity to a pedestrian destination point</i>		
	Within ¼ mi of school or 1/8 mi of transit stop	High	20
	Within ½ mi of school, ¼ mi of transit stop, ¼ mi of neighborhood or community retail, 1/8 mi of park, 1/8 mi of library, or 1/8 mi of post office	Medium	15
	Farther than ½ mi of school, ¼ mi of transit stop, ¼ mi of neighborhood or community retail, 1/8 mi of park, 1/8 mi of library, or 1/8 mi of post office	Low	10
Maintenance	<i>Maintenance Assessment District Funded</i>		
	Has MAD or MAD is not required.	High	5
	Requires existing MAD to be expanded.	Medium	3
	Requires establishment of a new MAD	Low	1
Public Interest & Community	<i>Supported by Council or CPG</i>		
	Provides critical link. Included in a community plan or a council approved document.	High	15
	Provides for part of pedestrian circulation needed. Supported by Community Planning Group.	Medium	10
	Alternative facilities exist. Not included in a community plan or a council approved document.	Low	5
Readiness & Deliverability	<i>Funding for planning, design or implementation</i>		
	Full funding and R.O.W. available. Final plans ready to start or already completed.	High	10
	Partial funding available. Final plans ready to start or already completed.	Medium	7
	Feasibility study only.	Low	3
Multi-Benefit	<i>Serves multiple pedestrian destinations</i>		
	Provides pedestrian facilities that serve three or more destinations including schools, transit stops, parks, neighborhood or community retail, libraries or post office.	High	15
	Provides pedestrian facilities that serve two destinations including schools, transit stops, parks, neighborhood or community retail, libraries or post office.	Medium	10
	Provides pedestrian facilities that serve only one destination including schools, transit stops, parks, neighborhood or community retail, libraries or post office.	Low	5
Misc.	<i>Smart growth, population &amp; employment density</i>		
	Within area with population density > 100 people per acre or employment density > 300 employees per acre.	High	15
	Within area with population density between 50 and 100 people per acre or employment density between 100 and 300 employees per acre.	Medium	10
	Within area with population density < 50 people per acre or employment density < 100 employees per acre.	Low	5