

From: [Plancom](#)
To: [Rachael Markle](#); [Steve Szafran](#); [Easton Craft](#); [David Maul](#); [William Montero](#); [Paul Cohen](#); [Lisa Basher](#); [Jack Malek](#); [Laura Mork](#); [Miranda Redinger](#); [Julie Ainsworth-Taylor](#); [Susan Chang](#); [Donna M. Moss](#)
Subject: FW: Proposed Comp Plan amendment 4
Date: Friday, October 28, 2016 3:41:53 PM

From: tmailhot@frontier.com[SMTP:TMAILHOT@FRONTIER.COM]

Sent: Friday, October 28, 2016 3:40:02 PM

To: Plancom

Cc: Rachael Markle; Steve Szafran; Tom McCormick; Jerry Patterson

Subject: Proposed Comp Plan amendment 4

Auto forwarded by a Rule

I don't understand the reasoning behind the staff's recommendation to deny proposed Comp Plan amendment 4. Amendment 4 calls for extending the current .90 V/C ratio limit placed on principle and minor arterials so that it applies to collector arterials as well.

Shoreline's Transportation Master Plan includes on page 19 this description of the City's street classification system:

The primary function of arterials is to provide a high degree of vehicular mobility through effective street design and by limiting property access. The vehicles on arterials are often through traffic. Arterials in Shoreline are further divided into three classes: Principal, Minor and Collector Arterials. Generally, the higher the classification of a street (Principal being the highest), the greater the volumes, through movements and length of trips, and the fewer the access points.

Clearly, the plan call for principle arterials being the busiest and collector arterials being the least busy, yet by refusing to adapt this amendment, the staff is recommending that there be no limits placed on traffic levels on collector arterials. The example they use, Fremont Ave N., admits as much. They state that upgrading Fremont to meet a .90 V/C ration "would be a high-cost project which would need to be incorporated into the Transportation Impact Fee schedule, increasing costs to developers and to the City. In addition, the project would widen a roadway which may not be consistent with the residents or community's vision for this street." Or to read between the lines: "We'd rather not place any limits on traffic on Fremont Ave because it will be inconvenient to provide mitigation as traffic volumes increase."

Limits on collector arterials will become even more important in the future. The City has rezoned large areas around the 185th St light rail station in anticipation of adding up to 25,000 new housing units in that area. The highest density area closest to the station is bounded on the west by 1st Ave NE, on the east by 10th Ave NE, and north of 185th has 5th Ave NE running right through the middle of it; these three streets will see the greatest increase in traffic yet they are all collector arterials with no restrictions on traffic volume. Of course the EIS for the light rail station area didn't even study traffic volumes on these streets because, I assume, there was no limit they had to worry about - no Comp Plan element that would be violated no matter how much additional traffic was added.

Worse, figure 3.3-7 in the EIS shows that two of these streets (1st NE and 5th NE north of 185th) will have bike lanes while 10th NE will have sharrows (bikes traveling in the vehicle lane). It makes no sense to direct bike traffic to what will become the busiest (and hence most dangerous) streets in the area.

Finally, having no limits on these streets also makes it harder for the City to demand traffic mitigation funds from developers as they build the large projects envisioned in this area.

It just seems wrongheaded to argue, as staff does, that they don't want limits on collector arterials because then the City would just have to enforce them, that they would rather look the other way and allow unlimited traffic on these streets.

Please vote to approve amendment 4 or at least require City staff to explain how leaving these streets unregulated and subject to unlimited traffic will be in the best interest of Shoreline residents who live along those streets.

Tom Mailhot