Neighborhood Complete Streets Program Guide Draft Criteria

Community Feedback – Summary of Survey Results

Executive Summary

June 2015

ARLINGTON VIRGINIA | DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Executive Summary

Background & Introduction

Arlington's Neighborhood Complete Streets (NCS) Commission, along with County staff, has worked to develop a new Neighborhood Complete Streets program. The NCS program will be administered by the Division of Transportation. The new NCS program is intended to complement current complete street projects that are occurring on non-commercial arterial streets as well as the Neighborhood Conservation program.

In the fall of 2014, the NCS Commission produced a Draft Program Guide (see Appendix A) to address the application of these policies to neighborhood streets. The Commission and staff conducted focused community engagement to solicit feedback. The process included presentations to transportation related commissions and committees and an online survey. The online survey provided a vehicle to solicit feedback from a broad cross-section of the community on the criteria that will be used to rank potential NCS projects.

Guided by the community feedback, the NCS Commission intends to update the NCS Draft Program Guide and present it to the County Board for adoption in 2015.

Online Survey

As part of the new NCS program, proposed projects would be ranked in order to objectively prioritize them. Gaining feedback from the community on the program goals and potential ranking criteria was the primary focus of the online survey. The survey was conducted for six weeks in January-February 2015. A copy of the survey questions can be found in Appendix B.

A total of 974 online surveys were completed. Overall, 85% of respondents either fully support or somewhat support the Neighborhood Complete Streets Program Goals as drafted. Within the survey results specifically addressing the ranking criteria, point allocations and weight for criteria, there also emerged prominent themes from the more than 1,800 write-in comments. Generally, respondents agreed with the criteria that would be used for ranking potential projects as outlined in the NCS Draft Program Guide, as well as the weight (point allocations) for the individual criteria.

Below is a list that summarizes the results for both the criteria rankings and the write-in comments. The full report provides a more detailed summary of the feedback received through the survey.

NCS Program Goals Support - 1,330 Respondents
1.41* (67% Fully Support + 18% Somewhat Support)

Ranking	Weighted Average**	ALL RESPONDENTS (974-1,115 Respondents)
1	3.55	No sidewalks on either side of street
2	3.36	Street paving in disrepair
3	3.26	Reported preventable crashe(es) within the past 48 months
4	3.24	Daily vehicle volume above 1,000
5	3.22	Existence of a speeding problem as defined by the NTC Program Guide
6	3.18	Necessity for upgrade to water or sewer lines in street
7	3.13	Within 1/2 mile of elementary school, and 3/4 mile of secondary schools
8	3.09	Street drainage/flooding problems
9	3.02	Inadequate street lighting
10	2.95	37-72 dwelling units per acre
11	2.92	Within 3/4 mile of Metrorail station
12	2.90	Commercial/mixed use GLUP designation
13	2.85	Incomplete sidewalk on one side of street
14	2.73	School bus stop on the street
15	2.65	Street designated as an official or unofficial bicycle route on AC Bikeway Map
15	2.65	Daily vehicle volume between 500-1000
16	2.64	16-36 dwelling units per acre
17	2.62	Sparse street tree canopy
17	2.62	Street section intersects with or connects to a multi-use trail
18	2.59	Within 1/4 mile of transit bus stop
19	2.43	Street section intersects with a bicycle route, official or unofficial, on the AC Bikeway Map
20	2.38	Within 1 mile of shopping/office center, a hospital or an urgent care facility
	2.38	Complete sidewalk on one side of street, but too narrow or obstructed
22	2.37	Within 1/2 mile of a park or athletic field
23	2.28	11-15 dwelling units per acre
24	2.24	1-10 dwelling units per acre
25	2.13	Unobstructed sidewalk on one side of street, but no curb ramp(s)

Color Legend:
Sidewalk Conditions
Traffic Hazards & Safety
Infrastructure Conditions
Pedestrian Attractors/Generators and Connectivity
Mapped Bicycle Route
Street Traffic Volumes
Land Use/GLUP Designation
Other Street Improvement Opportunities

* NCS Program Goals Weighted Average Scale = 0-2.0

** Priority Scale for Ranking of Criteria = 0-4.0

Write-in Comments Summary - Common Themes Overall

Ranking criteria should also:

- Consider the street context
- Consider the actual pedestrian and bicyclist use of a street not surrogate metrics
- Consider the aesthetics and character of a street
- Consider the cost effectiveness of projects
- Consider the connectivity of projects. Greater support for projects that link to other sidewalks, trails and streets
- Consider street problems such as poor sightlines and visibility
- Consider "near misses" when counting crashes
- Pay more attention to environmental issues

Strong support for:

- Sidewalk projects that link to schools
- Safety improvements
- Bike lanes
- Wider sidewalks
- Accessibility improvements, such as curb ramps
- Projects in areas with high traffic volumes
- Projects in areas with higher densities
- Street paving
- Increased enforcement to address problems

Other ideas:

- Use a sliding scale regarding distance when assigning points
- On-street parking impacts should be rated

Comments Summary - Suggestions for Additional Criteria

Sidewalk Condition:
- ┼ Sidewalk usability
- ┼ Sidewalk in disrepair
  - ▪ Drainage on sidewalks leading to ice
- ┼ Sidewalk obstructed or narrow

Traffic Hazards
- ┼ Reckless driving (not stopping at stop signs)
- ┼ Sightlines and visibility

Traffic Hazards - Crashes:
- ▪ Define "preventable"
- ┼ Include near misses, unreported incidents, pedestrian incidents
- ┼ Areas where school buses experience traffic danger
- ┼ Areas where parking patterns create safety hazards
- ┼ Areas that are in close proximity to high-speed roadways

Infrastructure – Inadequate Street Lighting
- ▪ Define "inadequate"
- ▪ Add "at intersection or commercial driveway"
- ▪ Add "near Metro or major bus stops"
- ┼ Amount of light pollution from existing lights

Infrastructure – Drainage/Flooding Problems
- ▪ Define "problem"

Pedestrian Attractors
- ┼ Amount of pedestrian traffic
- ┼ Inadequate parking

Pedestrian Attractors: ½ mile of elementary or ¾ mile of secondary
- ▪ Use APS' definition of "Walk Zone"
- ▪ Include community centers, other community services
- ▪ Define: use "as the child walks" not "as the crow flies"

Pedestrian Attractors: School bus stop on the street
- ▪ Add set distance
- ▪ Amend to "within ¼ mile, including cross streets"
- ▪ Include ART or Metro bus stops

Pedestrian Attractors: ¼ mile of Transit bus stop
- ▪ Define transit bus stop
- ▪ Breakup by frequency – more points for greater frequency
- ▪ Include all bus stops

Pedestrian Attractors: Shopping/hospital
- Separate shopping from hospital and urgent care
- Add Post Office
- Hospital distance should be ½ mile

Pedestrian Attractors: Park/field
- Include bars as recreation areas for adults
- Increase to 1 or 1.5 miles

Bicycle Route
+ Separate official and unofficial

Street Traffic Volumes – 1,000+vpd
+ Transit route
+ Pedestrian vpd
+ Bicycle vpd
+ School bus trips vpd

Other Improvement Opportunities
+ Add Power Undergrounding or Above Ground Power Lines

Other Comments
+ "Walkability" or "low walkability index"
+ Number and quality of crosswalks
+ Distance between existing crosswalks
+ Pedestrian connectivity should be more emphasized than pedestrian "density" which is what many of these criteria amount to
+ Proximity of alternative routes to the same destination
+ Ability to cross roads safely (Presence of crosswalks & pedestrian signals), esp on busy roads
+ Proximity to Bike share (Capital Bikeshare) stations and/or shared vehicle (Zipcar) locations
+ High bike/ped demand areas
+ Grade of the street (i.e. hills)
+ Topography - Potholes and on-and-off bike lanes are more worrisome on steep hills (e,g, Military Road) than on flats.
+ Aesthetics of streets
+ Cost-benefit analysis
+ Corner Intersections
+ Lack of stop signs
+ Number of traffic lights or how significant the intersections
+ Lack of turn lanes and turn lights at intersections, either onto or off of major roads.
+ Street parking – support preservation of on-street parking
+ Opportunities for cleaner streets, reducing run-off from streets
+ Likelihood of pollutants entering the waterways
+ Improvements History – prioritize little to none
+ % of households with children
+ neighborhood demographics-singles, families, elderly
+ Number of students living a certain distance to a school or park