

# Sidewalk Advisory Committee

## Meeting 6 Summary

January 25, 2018, 6:00 pm – 8:30 pm  
Shoreline City Hall – Council Chambers



### Meeting Purpose

The sixth Sidewalk Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting was held on January 25, 2018 after a break in December. The overall scope of work for the SAC will focus on analyzing how to prioritize and fund pedestrian needs for both repair of existing sidewalks and installation of new sidewalks and alternative pedestrian treatments. Items for this meeting included:

- Report back on December 11 Council meeting with decision on sidewalk maintenance funding of an additional Vehicle License Fee (VLF).
- Presentation on projects in the pipeline.
- Rehearsal by teams presenting at the January 29 Council dinner meeting.
- Review of draft sidewalk prioritization scorecard.

### Introduction / Housekeeping

Facilitator Marcia Wagoner welcomed the group and amended the agenda to allow SAC member Robin McClelland to address the group.

Robin described a Shoreline property owner that was intending to subdivide a property they own. When working with Shoreline permitting, they were told that there was no “in lieu” of program for sidewalks and that they would need to build sidewalk along this property as part of the City’s requirements. This property is in a cul-de-sac, not a priority area for a sidewalk and one that would receive very little usage. Verification as to whether the information of no “in lieu” program for building sidewalks is correct. This seems to go against common sense for funding sources to build sidewalks where most needed, and will reflect the future funding discussion.

City Engineer Tricia Juhnke responded that she is aware of the project in question. Subdivision (either creating a new lot from a short plat or building multiple single family units on one lot) triggers frontage improvements. In the past, the City did have an “in lieu” program where rather than building sidewalk at the property, a fee was collected and placed in the sidewalk program where sidewalks were constructed in areas with high priority. The fee was triggered by any remodel that was more than 50% of the home’s value (adding a larger kitchen or second floor would often trigger this). The home improvement trigger was eventually removed which mostly eliminated the “in lieu” program. To re-instate, there would need to be a change in the City code.

**Question:** The current system explains why there are some odd/sporadic short sections of sidewalk throughout Shoreline. This seems in contradiction to what the City needs. Is there any exception to the rule or any remedy?

**Answer:** There is an element to understanding the code on when and how improvements are triggered. There may be means to bring back an “in lieu” program but currently it is only available to fund Capital Improvement Projects (funded within the next five years). There are pros and cons in a fee in-lieu program. The code would need to be re-evaluated and discussed in the Planning Commission before it would go before Council. In order to move on with agenda items, this topic can be re-visited during one of the upcoming funding discussion.

Marcia finished reviewing the agenda, and pointed out that due to the value and level of discussion, additional SAC meetings have been added to the schedule and the team hopes that as many SAC members as possible will be able to attend as the conversation will continue in each meeting. The SAC will be invited to a second Council dinner meeting in April when two more SAC groups will present.

## Report Back on 12/11/2017 Council Meeting

Tricia reported back on the December 11, 2017 Council meeting where Councilmembers voted on an action item to implement an additional VLF for funding sidewalk repairs. This measure was narrowly defeated. All Councilmembers realize the need for sidewalk maintenance but several felt the timing was not right. There was a desire to hear more about how the SAC work continues and the possibility for a combined funding effort that would include both new sidewalk and sidewalk repair. A VLF is not off of the table, but on hold to compare it with other types of funding including a possible sales tax increase.

## Projects in the Pipeline

Tricia conducted a quick review of projects that are currently in the works that will address pedestrian and bicycle elements (refer to map). With a few exceptions, these projects have current funding available and/or the City will be actively pursuing funding.

1. **Richmond Beach Road Re-Channelization** - This project modifies the roadway configuration by converting it from a four lane roadway to a 3-lane roadway with bike lanes. There are some minor pedestrian improvements primarily at crossings. This project does not re-build or replace existing sidewalk.
2. **195<sup>th</sup> Street Pedestrian / Bicycle Gap Filler** - The City has completed several projects along 195<sup>th</sup> and this project will complete small gaps at the two ends. On the west end connecting the Interurban Trail and on the east end connecting from 5<sup>th</sup> Ave NE to the pedestrian bridge. This project received a grant in support of the City's Complete Streets program.
3. **185<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor** - There will be increasing density around the 185<sup>th</sup> Street light rail station. The City has funding for an initial corridor study. There is no funding for any construction along the 185<sup>th</sup> corridor at this time. Some improvements will be constructed through developers.
4. **5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Realignment** - Sound Transit needs to re-align this roadway as part of light rail construction. Improvements will be a non-motorized path stopping short of 180<sup>th</sup>.
5. **175<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor** – This project has grant funding for design and utilizes Transportation Impact Fees (TIF). The project will address traffic flow, pedestrians, and bicycles. These improvements need to be tackled as a larger Capital Improvement Project due to large retaining walls that will be required in areas to address the current topography.
6. **175<sup>th</sup> Street Pavement Preservation** – Pavement improvements will trigger ADA compliance. Additional funding will be required.
7. **Trail Along the Rail** - Sound Transit (ST) will be building some segments as part of their mitigation/requirements. A study has concluded and there is some City funding for design. Construction will require outside funding and will likely be completed in segments. Some segments will be on surface streets in the short term. More info is on the project webpage.
8. **Westminster Way N to N 155<sup>th</sup> Street** – This is near Central Market. Re-alignment of roadway here will help support Shoreline Place redevelopment and tie into the trail.
9. **Green Network** - A network of pedestrian and bicycle route improvements to move people to the light rail station near 145<sup>th</sup> Street. Elements are kept in mind with other projects in the area. There is no funding at this time.
10. **148<sup>th</sup> Street Non-Motorized Bridge** – Will help non-motorized users on the west side of I-5 access the 145<sup>th</sup> Street light rail station.

11. **145<sup>th</sup> Street (SR 523) Corridor** – There is currently federal grant funding for design of a segment between I-5 and Aurora Avenue. There is some additional state funding along this corridor. Construction would occur in phases. ST3 will address improvements east of I-5.
12. **145<sup>th</sup> / I-5 Interchange** – Pedestrians and bicycles will be moved to a new separate non-motorized bridge over I-5 and the current bridge deck will be reconfigured to allow another vehicle lane. There is federal funding for design. The City has some state funding and will seek additional federal funding for construction.

Sound Transit also has an agreement with Shoreline to provide some funding for projects that will help get people to the stations. The funding is \$2 million per station. This will go toward projects such as:

**185<sup>th</sup> Station:**

- 5<sup>th</sup> Ave NE (185<sup>th</sup> – 190<sup>th</sup>)
- 5<sup>th</sup> Ave NE (190<sup>th</sup> – 195<sup>th</sup>)
- 5<sup>th</sup> Ave NE (180<sup>th</sup> – 185<sup>th</sup>)
- 1<sup>st</sup> Ave NE (190<sup>th</sup> – 195<sup>th</sup>)
- 10<sup>th</sup> Ave NE (180<sup>th</sup> – 185<sup>th</sup>)

*Will not fund all of these projects.*

**145<sup>th</sup> Station:**

- 1<sup>st</sup> Ave NE, 145<sup>th</sup> – 155<sup>th</sup> (Twin Ponds)
- 148<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge
- 148<sup>th</sup> Street, Meridian to 1<sup>st</sup> Ave NE

*Will not fund all of these projects.*

Even with no additional funding, some sidewalks will be built. If the City has success in securing outside funding, all of the 12 projects on the pipeline list would be completed in about 15-20 years.

**Question:** Shouldn't the developer at the old Denny's site have to construct or pay for sidewalk?

**Answer:** The developer is paying their share for sidewalk. They were not responsible for all of the improvements to that intersection. It was the City's desire and responsibility to take lead on those improvements.

The sidewalk network and prioritization will be in line with the community's Vision 2029, with routes coming from the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan).

## Rehearsal for January 29 Council Dinner Meeting with SAC

The SAC was invited to join Council at its January 29 dinner meeting. Two SAC groups will make short presentations and there will be time for questions, answers, and conversation. Project Manager Nora Daley-Peng provided Council with a Memo (similar to a staff report) required for the dinner meeting (memo is in the meeting packet). Nora will give a brief introduction at the dinner meeting, talking about the prioritization process and sharing how the SAC is helping to shape the process and provide recommendations.

Dustin McIntyre and Andrew Hellman each gave their group presentations to the SAC for feedback.

Dustin represented his group talking about efforts to date toward developing prioritization criteria and the scorecard. Other than logistics for how the set-up should be for presenting, the only comment was in

regard to one of three questions that may be posed to Council. The question was whether Council considers neighboring cities' projects for opportunities to improve connectivity at the city limits. It was mentioned that this was not really discussed by the SAC. Dustin stated it was a question his group had. A connective system would hopefully link across borders. Dustin agreed this had not been discussed with the larger group and said that this would be the question they would eliminate if pressed for time.

Andrew represented his group with a focus on communication. Information to be shared with Council included:

- Message to Council to elicit and demonstrate participatory interests (talk to Council of Neighborhoods, walk the neighborhoods, and share their experiences).
- Better understand who uses sidewalks and how to reach them; need good two-way communication, with clear communication in and out of city hall.
- Getting information out early and often, being very clear and differentiating the types of funding requirements (new facilities, repair, maintenance-which is an ongoing expense) will be crucial in a successful campaign for funding.

Comments for this group included:

- Need to know how to communicate with voters in addressing the question, "When is the street in front of my house getting fixed?"
- Having a list of site walks will be helpful for Council.

Nora said that Council would not only find a list of site walks helpful, but any video that could be taken of certain areas of concern that illustrate the challenges. Example would be showing Tana having to move her wheelchair into the street due to impassable sidewalk. Videos could include pushing children in strollers (e.g. shoulder of a road with no sidewalk and oncoming traffic), etc. The SAC members may wish to work on videos individually or are encouraged to contact others and work together on projects.

## **Draft Sidewalk Prioritization Scorecard Review and Discussion**

Nora presented the draft sidewalk prioritization scorecard which is the result of prior feedback from the SAC. This is the current draft for testing and fine tuning. Points for Connectivity had not been added to the sample draft scorecards as these metrics still need to have data imported. The scorecards were to be reviewed along with a set of maps including:

- The current Pedestrian System Plan from the 2011 TMP including existing and planned sidewalks.
- The City's current sidewalks and how they would have ranked using draft scorecard.
- Recent survey results showing areas that were listed by residents and the frequency of mention.
- Areas identified in survey as in need of repair with results of current prioritization criteria.
- Areas identified in survey in need of new sidewalk with results of current prioritization criteria.

After small group review, the following questions / comments / observations were made:

- How were the levels of High, Mid, and Low established? Could these be broken down to show a wider spread of scores?
- For existing sidewalks, the map indicates that the current system is fairly well prioritized (majority ranked high and in areas where they should).
- Reported areas of concern and scored areas seem to be consistent.
- Using objective criteria validates the criteria.
- May want to indicate areas of rezoning on the map to better identify where future needs or possible future sidewalk may be addressed by development.

- Provides validity to the 2011 TMP as there appears to be only a small number of areas without sidewalk receiving mention that are not already in the TMP.
  - Should be able to go back and add some that rank higher.
- Why did 183<sup>rd</sup> (near Gateway Center / Thai Bistro) score so high?
  - (will need to go back and look at scores)
  - May need a reality check on a few sites and go back and really look at them.
- Questions about the High – Mid – Low. Not all “High” are equal. Maybe the team should look at different cut points or increase the categories.
- Regarding the Hillwood discussion earlier about the subdivision requiring sidewalk improvements (on a cul-de-sac), nothing appears on the maps indicating need in this area.
  - Maybe need to look at maps through a political view – where are the highest voter return areas? How to launch a smart campaign where people from the east side and all over make it to the ballot box.
- Why do some streets show different classification for each side of the street?
- Equity seems to have almost no bearing on scores. Of the samples, the highest is 2 points, but most sample scorecards show none.
  - Is our scoring reflecting the real need?
  - Does not seem to be picking up multiple criteria. If an area gets points for low income, one might think one of the other criteria may also appear.
- Most points seem to be going to major roads. Equity seems to be dropping off.
- Where did the info come from – US census? Census is often not complete or accurate with immigrants fearful or mistrusting in answering questions truthfully, or unable to complete forms for various reasons.

**Answer:** Yes, Equity data is from the census. Will need an explanation of this at next open house.

- Suggest maybe weighting each Equity question higher, with an overall maximum not to exceed for that category.
- Is there any way to pick up actual speeds as opposed to posted speed limit (some streets have limits notoriously not adhered to)? Can data be downloaded from those mobile speed meters? Or could a presumed actual speed or speed differential be used?

**Answer:** The problem with using anything other than the posted speed is that there is not data for every street, and scoring only those with available data would not be equitable. The annual Traffic Safety Report does list some of this data, but not for every street. This could create gaps in the overall scoring.

- The current sidewalk system map is good proof that the scorecard is working.
- On the current sidewalk system rated map, why is it green (low priority) on the one side of the street right in front of Shorewood High School?

**Answer:** The team will look over some of these anomalies for how they scored.

- Should the scoring be proximity to school, not the suggested school routes provided by schools?
  - Problem is that proximity would score points for areas like cul-de-sacs which would not be a priority.
  - But maybe a street like Fremont in front of the school did not make it on the list because it is not “to school” (it is at the school).
- Area near 175<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> drops from High to Mid – would like to look at scoring for this change.
- Still question what is the right range for the scorecard?
- Express what the actual distance is (on scorecard) for distance to an activity. (i.e. 50 feet from the sidewalk to the front door of the activity center).
- The sample scorecards shown tonight may not be well enough dispersed or representative of areas that would score Equity points. Would suggest picking more samples to see how they score (choose some areas where it is believed more than one metric should appear and check).
- Safety seems to be mirrored by the surveys.

- Is there any way to pull in some type of street lighting geometric for Safety?
- Speed limit and street classification seem to be double dipping. Can more samples be reviewed to see if this is the case? Do almost all areas that get more points for street classification also get the speed limit points as speed tends to coincide with classification?
  - Maybe replace lighting or area with hills or blind curves in place of speed limit.

**Answer:** Will try to provide more information on lighting, etc. at the next meeting.

- How many people responded to the survey? Survey is not balanced or representative as it includes comments from people only interested in what's in it for me.

**Answer:** There will be graphs indicating neighborhoods and number of people who took the survey at the next open house.

## Next Steps

Council dinner meeting is Monday, January 29. The next two SAC meetings are February 8 and 22. At the February 8 meeting there will be a quick Council meeting debrief, return discussion on draft scorecard feedback/info, speaker on the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS Plan) initiative, look at the existing sidewalk network barrier and accessibility ratings, and associated costs for building the new sidewalks (without updated prioritization yet) from the 2011 Pedestrian System Plan

### Project Contact:

Nora Daley-Peng, Senior Transportation Planner

[ndaleypeng@shorelinewa.gov](mailto:ndaleypeng@shorelinewa.gov)

(206) 801-2483

Project webpage: [shorelinewa.gov/sidewalks](http://shorelinewa.gov/sidewalks)