From:	Dave Lange
To:	City Council
Cc:	John Norris
Subject:	Council Retreat 2016 and the 145th subarea upzone process
Date:	Thursday, February 18, 2016 9:46:58 AM
Attachments:	Council Retreat 2016.pdf

Attached is a paper discussing issues with the proposed schedule and details of the delayed 145 upzone process (after a draft EIS was accepted, future decisions are waiting for the conclusion of the 145th corridor study). We have a better understanding of the political process to reach a corridor alternative which has highlighted some oversights in the draft EIS study, some interesting design and some funding levels to fix the corridor. While choices for the 145th light rail station have shown the intent of Sound Transit to build a dogleg serving the Northshore while ignoring most of Shoreline, the intent of Public Works to change 5th Avenue into a bus mall keeping 145th as an arterial and the intent of Planning to build density inventory around the upzone area while adding congestion for someone else to solve. A lack of communication between Sound Transit and two Shoreline departments has pushed us toward my complaint of everything everywhere, again.

This also paper also discusses shortcomings and poor analysis in a draft for a proposed upzone that is largely behind a transit station. If a contractor provided a significant portion of the analysis or results in the Draft EIS for the 145th station subarea, I hope the city considers legal action to recover part of our payments in this contract, since the city could have a legal suit with Sound Transit or Metro if this project continues. I will apologize in advance for my recipe based analysis, but I am using it to hide my frustration with apparently wasted city resources on a goal/project that should have been stopped long before. I ask the council to vote to cancel this project during their 2016 Council Retreat shifting development to an Urban Village model where businesses exist first and consider the changes necessary to fix the 185th street station area in the light of new information. The city needs a parking enforcement unit and needs to make walkable transit as approachable and useful as possible.

Literature used:

Robert **Cervero**, Arlie Adkins, and Cathleen Sullivan (2010), "Are Suburban TODs Over-Parked?" *Journal of Public Transportation*, Vol. 13, No. 2; at www.nctr.usf.edu/jpt/pdf/JPT13-2.pdf.

Robert Cervero, TCRP Report 128 Effects of TOD on Housing, Parking, and Travel

http://www.citylab.com/housing/2013/06/transit-might-not-be-essential-transit-oriented-development/5851/

Victoria Transport Policy Institute: Transit Demand Management Encyclopedia http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm45.htm

Thank you for your careful consideration,

Dave Lange

Shoreline

I invite you into the kitchen, It is time to cook a goose; start by preheating the oven to 350 degrees, but let's look at the 145 street upzone draft EIS. It fails to include traffic from the 145th corridor, the I5 on ramp and the 145th street station with Sound Transit's idea they have to turn around at the station. There are potential traffic problems with increased density in north Seattle and the Northshore tricities. The corridor is counting on money from the ST3 initiative and verbal commitments from Wash DOT which are far from certain (as the Secretary of Transportation found out in Feb 2016). The ST3 initiative also includes a cheap option (minimum 4 lanes) and a full price 6 lane option (to be decided by July and sent to voters in November) that translates to significant risk that 145th won't even be fully fixed from 522 to I5 while Shoreline is identifying money to fix I5 to Greenwood.

We need to add ST3 benefits for Shoreline after decimating a major area of trees in ST2. We are going through a lot of effort, resources and costs to build a station and HCT for 3 bus stops in Shoreline. Before June we need to ask ST to continue through 145th to Aurora's BRT. Linking Metro Rapid Ride, Shoreline Place and Aurora Corridor with Light Rail helps our city, provides more riders and adds to the benefits of ST3 for our voters.

Grease the goose and get the butter under the skin with our preferred aromatics, resting the bird for 3 hours in a cool place. We have had delays in station reviews and changing goals for the station design. The original design supported the 522 corridor bus routes (with little else) and kept the station traffic on 5th, leaving 145th as an arterial. A current design is forming to minimize the unprotected turns across traffic and buses making lane changes in the short segment of 5th along the station. It also protects pedestrians in the station areas and requires less effort making transfers between buses and light rail, while increasing the capacity for buses, car shares and drop offs. Some congestion is eliminated and some congestion shifts from 5th onto 145th.

Put the goose in a greased rack and roasting pan and slide onto a rack in the oven and take a look at the draft EIS which includes a key number, 55% of trips will be by car. That has driven the upzone process and the corridor study. This number is the expected trips caused by the upzone and the percentage of those trips expected to be by car versus transit. The draft EIS has some confusing concepts: TOD will require multiple turn lanes, much higher volume of car traffic and recommends fewer parking spaces for the same area. As a digital forensic analyst I have been trained to look beyond the data and interpret the result. The consultant group apparently used an application that asked them to select a nearby geographic location. The number provided to Shoreline matches a recent level for Lloyd Center near Portland, OR. An analysis that fails to separate urban Portland from suburban Shoreline reflects a scriptkiddie analyst or someone providing a final likely outcome without commenting on the operational steps from existing residential to true mixed communities. Shoreline didn't get enough information since Transit Oriented Design uses urban to label both residential and establishments while suburban labels residential only and we haven't understood the significance of the terms.

Listen to the goose fat dripping into the hot pan and please understand I wanted TOD, but the label doesn't match what has happened elsewhere or will physically happen in Shoreline. Technically total trips include commuter and non-commuter trips and transit targets

commuting while cars are the primary trip provider for everything else. What about the resident age? We should expect about as many millennials without cars as workers without transit to their job or workers that carry too many tools. What about financial differences? Is Shoreline looking for residents too poor to own a car? Cars are part of our culture and as a city we need fewer parking spaces on our streets and in parking garages. Our future is with businesses and transit in a walkable community, but that is only achievable with a parking enforcement unit in the city. We will have cars until we see the environment/light by reducing individual car benefits or increasing the cost of ownership. Expecting a tenant or commuter to have the moral fiber to use a paid parking space when they can scamper to free spaces in the next block fails to be reasonable.

Smell the bird cooking and some smoke, if the oven isn't clean, while reading the literature showing suburban trips with 15-20% of trips by transit, leaving 80-85% of total trips by car. According to the Robert **Cervero** paper: P 56):

> What's going on? It is likely that in most suburban TODs, which characterizes the 31 projects in our survey, residents still need access to a car. They just do not use them as much to get to work. But like most suburbanites, they still need a car to get to most non-work destinations, the vast majority of which are away from rail stops. While transit-oriented housing might mean that more trip origins are near rail stops, as long as **most destinations are not**, many TOD residents still will own cars and use them for shopping , going out to eat, and the like. One policy response to this finding, discussed in the conclusion, is to create car-sharing programs in rail-served neighborhoods. Car-sharing would enable residents not only to rail commute but also to shed one or more cars.

VTPI, in the Section on Density

> increasing urban residential population to 40 people per acre increased transit use from 2% to 7%. It is hard to create walkable transit with low participation rates.

Lets talk about urban and suburban as used in the literature. Urban has more density in residences and establishments, while suburbs are rated in terms of residences only. Ridgecrest is not only suburban, but also dates back to unincorporated.

> "Out of 1,473 total transportation analysis zones in the Washington, D.C. and Baltimore metropolitan regions, Jeihani, et al. (2013) classified 107, occupied by approximately 11% of regional residents, as TODs. Their detailed analysis indicates that, all else being equal (accounting for various demographic and geographic factors), transit-oriented neighborhood residents drive about 20% fewer annual miles than residents of non-TOD areas, and rely significantly more on walking, cycling and public transport for both commute and non-commute trips. Dill (2006) found that 30% or more of Portland area Transit Oriented Development residents commuted by MAX (the regional light rail system) at least once a week and 23-33% used transit as their primary **commute** mode. This compares to less than 10% of workers in the automobile-oriented suburbs of Hillsboro and Beaverton, and 15% of Portland workers. Overall, transit

> commuting increased when people moved to TODs. Nearly 20% of the commuters switched from non-transit to transit modes and 4% did the opposite, for a net of **about 16%**."

Would you find that statistically different from the 55% mentioned in the Draft EIS? The author suggests that this reduction results, in part, from the concentration of retail services around transit stations and reductions in per capita vehicle ownership.

Add TOD around business and create transit for commuting trips, property values increase more for business space than residential units. Businesses will have higher transit rates and residential will have more cars.

Putting density around a highway on ramp will self-select those wanting fast access to highways that have been popular for the last 2 generation than our expected transit users. According to the Robert **Cervero** paper P 56):

> A longer list of off-site candidate variables was also considered for model entry, including walking distance, a circuitry index, transit service levels (e.g., headways), road designs (e.g., road widths and presence of nearby **freeway interchange**), and a number of variables denoting neighborhood attributes within ½ mile of stations, including housing density, income levels, and the **presence of retail shops**. This analysis thus draws from a substantial literature that holds that various built-environment factors, such as urban densities and **walking quality**, have a significant bearing on travel behavior (Ewing and Cervero 2001; Handy 2005).

From the same author in TCRP Report 128 Effects of TOD on Housing, Parking, and Travel

> "Another selection criterion was the project not be immediately accessible to a freeway interchange. All of the sampled projects were more than 500 feet from a freeway entrance; five were situated within a quarter mile of a freeway on-ramp."

Apparently being within 500 feet of a freeway on ramp has detrimental effects on TOD usage and statistics. The study looked at 4 **urbanized** projects where transit reduced trips by 44%. A residential area with a highway ramp would be expected to have less transit use.

TOD shifts congestion from a critical area to a less fortunate area. What priority does Shoreline have that we need to reduce congestion somewhere else and add congestion to the highway access at 145th, a gateway to the Northshore and a new hard fought for transit station?

The skin of our goose is looking very brown, but we should review the Shoreline Comprehensive Plan in closing:

Goal LU I: Encourage development that creates a variety of housing, shopping, entertainment, recreation, gathering spaces, employment, and services that are accessible to neighborhoods.

Goal LU II: Establish land use patterns that promote walking, biking and using transit to access goods, services, education, employment, recreation. {cars are not listed here}

Goal LU III: Create plans and strategies that implement the City's Vision 2029 and Light Rail Station Area Planning Framework Goals for transit supportive development to occur within a ½ mile radius of future light rail stations. {sending volumes of cars into a pedestrian area?}

Goal LU IV: Work with regional transportation providers to develop a system that includes two light rail stations in Shoreline, and connects all areas of the city to high capacity transit using a multi-modal approach. {why is Sound Transit turning around when they barely get to Shoreline}

Goal LU V: Enhance the character, quality, and function of existing residential neighborhoods while accommodating anticipated growth. {is that what you call a parking meter}

Goal LU VII: Plan for commercial areas that serve the community, are attractive, and have long-term economic vitality. {until we rob your customers for a new transit station?}

Goal CD I:. Promote community development and redevelopment that is aesthetically pleasing, functional, and consistent with the City's vision.

Goal CD II:. Design streets to create a cohesive image, including continuous pedestrian improvements that connect to the surrounding neighborhoods. {Please tell me that pedestrian ramps aren't the plan here}

Vision 2029 drives our city and quotes Fred Kent, a leading authority on revitalizing city spaces, calls place making the thing that "turns a City from a place you can't wait to get through into a place you never want to leave."

4. Planning light rail station areas to create connectivity for appropriate growth. [anything generating 80% higher car use cannot be considered appropriate}

My vision, I personally use transit when I can. It started when I worked for an employer that promotes buses as the solution for too many parking lots and garages. Promoting transit takes a lot more than just TOD and eliminating parking spots. Eliminating parking spots is the goal; strong enforcement (the stick) is part of it and making transit affordable and usable (the carrot) are two big forces for commuting (job/school).

As a design tool we need useful transit/un-motorized to minimize congestion on our roads, reducing our carbon footprint/global warming and not having a stranger parked in front of your house, which probably doesn't have a streetlight. Sporting events and transit companies have slowly been transitioning people out of their cars using lots of carrots. Driverless cars will not be a solution for any of these problems and millennials don't come with a transporter in terms of trip options to non-existent businesses. Let's throw in an economic concept here. Each additional car ends up increasing the marginal cost of removing a car. Operationally the experience of mixing transit and pedestrians with single occupant cars decreases the un-motorized experience and increases risk. It is also true that too much pedestrian interaction will negatively impact the car trip.

Getting the city to have a level playing field between cars and transit/pedestrian based on ability is step one. Avoiding everything everywhere is step two. Getting economic compliments (business/resident, transit/walking) together and substitutes (single family/multiunit, transit/cars) apart is step three. While negative effects won't be significant in the near future to have a city design project that rates these outcomes as acceptable is wrong. I consider the 145th upzone draft EIS and the upzone project to have had its goose cooked.