

PHB Presentation – Comments/Responses

1. **Comment:** Are neighborhood associations notified when a PHB is requested in their neighborhood?

Response: Neighborhood Associations, HOAs and other community organizations are not specifically notified when a citizen requests a PHB within their geographic boundaries. It is the goal of the PHB program to post accepted locations on the City of Austin website so this information will be publicly available. Once this information is posted online, notices will be sent out through the Community Registry (for more information on the Community Registry, please go to <http://www.austintexas.gov/cr>). “Accepted” locations are those locations which meet the initial eligibility criteria, which include these requirements:

- located within the city limits,
- not within 300 feet of an existing signalized or stop controlled crossing,
- not a 2 lane or residential roadway,
- has not been studied/evaluated within the past 2 years unless significant changes to the traffic patterns are anticipated.

2. Median Space

Comment: Are raised or unpaved medians that are not accessible by wheelchair scored differently when evaluating the median condition of an existing roadway?

Response: Initially the wheelchair accessibility of medians was not considered in the median scoring. Based on the PAC’s feedback, the following scoring changes are proposed:

0	points if	Accessible, raised median over 6’ wide or greater
50	points if	2-way turn lane, accessible median less than 6’ wide or inaccessible median
100	points if	No median or center turn lane

* for these purposes, median breaks are considered accessible.

3. Pedestrian Crash data discussion

Comment: It was confirmed that DWI/DUI crashes are not included in the pedestrian crash history consideration. It was also confirmed that only the pedestrian crashes that are counted are those that may have been avoided if a PHB were installed. Pedestrian crashes that are likely to have happened even if a PHB were installed, are not included.

Comments: There was a concern expressed that the proposed 100 point limit on the pedestrian crash history does not capture the magnitude of locations with multiple crashes. Another concern was that a location with a random crash, which may not indicate a high desire for a pedestrian crossing, will get more points than a location with a higher need but has not had a pedestrian crash.

Response: Some pedestrian crashes are the result of a pedestrian or driver mistake and are not indicative of a high pedestrian demand for a crossing. Other times, crashes can indicate a number of pedestrian/vehicular conflicts in an area. In an effort to balance these factors, the 100 point maximum allows for acknowledgement of multiple crashes, but does not give unlimited points for crash history. We plan to keep the 100 point maximum at this time, but can revisit this limit as necessary.

Comment: It was asked if “near misses” should be included. It was also asked if video or neighborhood monitoring could help with the identification and tracking of near misses.

Response: It was agreed that near misses are very difficult to quantify. Use of the existing camera network could be used to gather this type of data, however this network mostly covers existing signalized intersections and approaches and does not provide comprehensive coverage of the street system. Given the gaps in the existing network, it would be difficult to consistently capture this data. Neighborhood monitoring of near misses would not provide consistent data across various neighborhoods (neighborhoods with more resources could potentially capture more data than neighborhoods without similar resources). At this time, we do not recommend including near misses in the PHB evaluation criteria.

4. Pedestrian Generators

Comment: Is there a number of units that defines a “major” multifamily pedestrian generator?

Response: At this point, there is no specific number of units that defines a “major” multifamily development. With so many variables at each location and so many different types of developments, at this time the definition is left open. This can be revisited periodically throughout the process and changed as necessary.

Comment: There was a comment that the magnitude of bus ridership should be considered as a pedestrian generator.

Response: Bus stops are considered pedestrian generators. 10 points are awarded for every 100 daily boardings (on and off) for all bus stops within a 300 ft. radius of the requested PHB location. Cap Metro provides the boarding information.

5. Small Area Plans

Comment: It was suggested that the Imagine Austin Activity Corridor and Centers be included.

Response: The Imagine Austin identified Activity Corridors and Centers will be included in the small area plan scoring.

6. **Comment:** Is there an opportunity for public/private partnership with PHBs?

Response: Yes, there are public/private funding opportunities for PHBs. For a location to be eligible for public/private funding, it must meet the initial evaluation criteria and have an engineering study supporting the installation of a PHB. The private funding contribution must cover at least 50% of the design and construction costs. Construction of any location with public/private funding is subject to the availability of public funding. Locations that are 100% privately funded will be designed and constructed.

7. **Comment:** Major developments should be required to conduct a pedestrian/multi-modal impact study, similar to the requirement to conduct a Traffic Impact Analysis study now.

Response: Since a major revision of the Land Development Code (LDC) is currently in process, this suggestion was sent to city staff responsible for this revision. We were advised that this requirement has been discussed but no specific language has been developed at this time. They did confirm that this recommendation will be included in the suggested revisions.