

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 16, 2001 FILE: 8330-20
TO: City Manager
FROM: Transportation Manager
RE: PEDESTRIAN MASTER PLAN
REPORT PREPARED BY SIGNE K. BAGH

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Pedestrian Master Plan Map 3.1 be renamed "Assessed Arterial and Collector Sidewalk Projects" and references to "priorities" be removed (with text references also adjusted as necessary to reflect this change);

AND THAT the Pedestrian Master Plan (with revised Map 3.1/text) be received for information;

AND THAT staff be directed to use the prioritization method noted in the February 16, 2001 report from the Works & Utilities Department as a guideline for recommending future sidewalk construction projects;

AND THAT the recommendations of the Pedestrian Master Plan be given consideration in the drafting of the Official Community Plan;

AND THAT future review of the Subdivision & Development Servicing Bylaw take into consideration the recommendations of the Pedestrian Master Plan and give high priority to improving pedestrian facilities;

AND FURTHER THAT future review of the 10-Year Capital Plan give consideration to increasing the annual budget for pedestrian facilities to \$750,000.

DISCUSSION:

On January 29, 2001 Council received a report with a number of recommendations concerning the Pedestrian Master Plan. After discussing the plan, Council deferred decision on the recommendations. In response to input received at the earlier Council meeting, staff are forwarding the above revised recommendations.

One of the purposes of the Pedestrian Master Plan is to provide guidance for the prioritization of taxpayer-funded sidewalk projects. The Pedestrian Master Plan recommends that, in addition to the analysis of pedestrian "potential and deficiencies" as submitted by the consultant, the following factors be considered in prioritizing sidewalk projects:

- DCC funding status;
- Right-of-way availability;
- Relationship to other civic infrastructure projects;
- Relationship to City initiatives and objectives;
- Availability of developer contributions;
- Existence of an alternate route; and
- Community input.

The Pedestrian Master Plan does not provide clear guidance on the *relative* importance of each of the above criteria. To reduce ambiguity, it is proposed that a formal evaluation framework be adopted. The framework could assign points according to the extent to which each project fulfills each of the relevant criteria. It is proposed that this be done in the following manner:

Criteria	Max. Points	Point Details
Pedestrian Master Plan potential/deficiency score	50	Import points as assigned in Pedestrian Master Plan
Relationship to civic initiatives and objectives	20	20 points if within Urban Centre boundaries, 10 points if in area connecting Urban Centres or if fulfilling other civic objectives/school needs, 0 points if none of the above
Availability of developer contributions	10	10 points if there is a developer contribution for a portion of the sidewalk block, otherwise 0 points
Existence of an alternate route	10	10 points if there is no sidewalk or pathway on other side of road, 0 points if there is
Community input	10	10 points if specific need noted through City initiative such as a Sector Plan or Transportation Plan, otherwise 1 point per request received for a particular sidewalk project (to a max. of 5 points per year)
Total Maximum Points	100	

The above point method can provide guidance to the prioritization of Pedestrian Master Plan-ranked sidewalk projects. In order to proceed to construction, it would be necessary to also:

Identify DCC funding status

- ▶ Unless there is a pressing need, sidewalks along DCC roads should not be funded with general revenue sources.

Assess right-of-way availability

- ▶ Projects should focus on areas where right-of-ways exist or where they can be obtained other than by funding through the sidewalk network budget.

Determine relationship to civic infrastructure projects

- ▶ Projects should be timed so as to minimize disruption and maximize cost efficiencies. This may in some cases require that a project otherwise highest on the priority list be delayed a few years to coincide with other work.

In some cases, it may be necessary to construct interim sidewalks. Such projects would be considered when a sidewalk ranks very highly on the above scoring system. The sidewalk would be considered “interim” because right-of-way restrictions prevent the sidewalk from being constructed at its ultimate location and, at some future point, it might be necessary to move the sidewalk in order to accommodate a road widening. “Interim” projects would ideally only be undertaken if the sidewalk construction would otherwise be delayed by more than ten years.

Once a prioritization methodology is adopted, it will be possible for staff to prepare multi-year project lists on the basis of that methodology. Any preliminary project lists will, however, need to be reviewed on annual basis to respond to evolving priorities. Projects such as the relocation of Rutland Elementary may require the installation of sidewalks that would not otherwise rank highly. Such projects could have significant budgetary impacts. (As an example, constructing sidewalks along Hartman Road would consume almost the entire annual sidewalk network budget as well as requiring significant land acquisition).

SUMMARY

The recommendations of the February 16, 2001 report from the Works and Utilities Department provide a method for clarifying the means by which tax-funded sidewalk projects can be prioritized.

Ron Westlake, P. Eng.
Transportation Manager

John Vos, P. Eng.
Director, Works and Utilities

SB/sb