

From: [Tom McCormick](#)
To: [Doris McConnell](#); [Will Hall](#); [Shari Winstead](#); [Chris Eggen](#); [Keith McGlashan](#); [Jesse Salomon](#); [Chris Roberts](#)
Cc: [Debbie Tarry](#)
Subject: Docket for 2015 Comprehensive Plan Amendments
Date: Friday, June 12, 2015 1:50:32 PM

Council Members:

I proposed an item for inclusion on the 2015 docket. My proposal, as published on the draft docket, reads: "Consider amendments to the TMP that would set limits for ADT on Local Streets and Collector Arterial Streets. (Private)."

You will be voting this coming Monday (June 15) on the docket. As you know, approving an item for inclusion on the docket results in the item being added to the work plan for further study and analysis in 2015.

Details of my proposal included a default ADT limit for local streets of 1,500 ADTs and a default ADT limit for collector arterials of 3,000 ADTs.

In March, the Planning Commission considered whether to recommend that my proposal be included on the 2015 docket; they focussed on whether "hard cap" ADT limits should be put on the docket. Before they voted, Steve Szafran, a Senior Planner with the City, and Mark Relph, the City's former Transportation Planning Manager, both expressed concern with the "hard cap" ADT limits in my proposal. Despite their concerns, three Commissioners voted to recommend that my proposal be included on the 2015 docket.

Since the March meeting, in an effort to address the concerns of Mr. Szafran, Mr. Relph, and Debbie Tarry, I have downsized my proposal. I am no longer asking for "hard cap" ADT limits for local streets and collector arterials. I am confident that the Planning Commission would have voted unanimously to include my downsized proposal on the 2015 docket.

My proposal has been downsized in these two respects:

- (1) instead of applying to both local (residential) streets and collector arterials as originally proposed, my downsized proposal only applies to collector arterials; and
- (2) instead of employing hard cap ADT limits, my downsized proposal consists solely of a type of limit that the City now uses for its principal and minor arterials — a Volume/Capacity (V/C) ratio.

For collector arterials, my downsized proposal would have the City adopt a V/C ratio of 0.40, or 0.60 (which is 2/3 of the City's current 0.90 V/C ratio for the City's principal and minor arterials). It is significant that collector arterials already are subject to the City's basic LOS standard: LOS D at the signalized intersections on arterials and unsignalized intersecting arterials within the City. Why stop there? There is no solid policy reason for singling out collector arterials, and refusing to adopt a V/C ratio for them.

My downsized proposal does not add a new type of LOS standard. It merely extends to collector arterials a V/C standard that the City already employs. My downsized proposal completely avoids all the objections raised previously regarding my prior hard cap ADT proposal. My downsized proposal is a subset of the published draft docket item ("Consider

amendments to the TMP that would set limits for ADT on Local Streets and Collector Arterial Streets”) because V/C ratios limit traffic volume, so my downsized proposal is appropriate for inclusion as part of this year’s docket.

For consideration at Monday’s Council meeting, I am requesting that you adopt a Council amendment to my original docket proposal, replacing it with my downsized proposal discussed above. Before voting to include my downsized proposal on the docket, you could of course amend it further. For example, You could choose a V/C ratio greater than 0.60, if that is what you prefer for the docket. In my opinion, however, a V/C ratio for collector arterials should always be lower than the 0.90 V/C ratio that applies to principal and minor arterials, because collector arterials run through our residential neighborhoods.

I would appreciate your support. Residents in neighborhoods throughout Shoreline would appreciate your support.

Thank you for considering my request.

Tom McCormick