DRAFT

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
(Via Zoom)

June 3, 2021
7:00 P.M.

Commissioners Present
Chair Mork
Commissioner Callahan
Commissioner Galuska
Commissioner Lin
Commissioner Rwamashongye

Commissioners Absent
Vice Chair Sager (excused)
Commissioner Malek (excused)

Staff Present
Rachel Markle, Planning Director
Nora Daley-Peng, Sr. Transportation Planner
Steve Szafran, Senior Planner
Carla Hoekzema, Planning Commission Clerk

Guest Presenters from the UW Evans School of Public Policy & Governance Consulting Labs:
Pascale Chamberland
Dale Markey-Crimp
Dorian Pacheco

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Mork called the regular meeting of the Shoreline Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Ms. Hoekzema called the roll.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of May 20, 2021 were accepted as presented.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no general public comments.

STUDY ITEM: MOBILITY HUB PRESENTATION

Senior Transportation Planner Nora Daley-Peng introduced the presentation regarding shared-use mobility. Dale Markey-Crimp, Pascale Chamberland, and Dorian Pacheco from the UW Evans School of Public Policy and Governance Consulting Lab made the presentation. Ms. Markey-Crimp presented an overview of the team's recently completed Shoreline Shared-Use Mobility Study, "Making Better Connections". The study illustrated the ongoing evolution of shared-use mobility worldwide as well as in this region. They shared their learnings of what it will take to make mobility hubs happen in Shoreline and discussed next steps for realizing this vision.

Ms. Pacheco reviewed the project process and findings. The research focused on the question of what mobility hub infrastructure the City of Shoreline should develop as it seeks to decrease personal vehicle use and connect more residents to shared-use transportation options. They also looked at what criteria should be used to determine the siting of mobility hubs and what criteria should be used to determine the features and amenities of each proposed hub. The focus was on the physical infrastructure necessary to support hubs as opposed to the different modes of transportation that could exist at the hubs. The study included literature review, interviews with cities along the West Coast, reviewing case studies, conducting a community survey, developing criteria, and creating a multi-criteria analysis. Examples of mobility hubs around the world and closer to home were reviewed. The team interviewed and gleaned insights from peer cities (Auburn, WA; Bothell, WA; Kirkland, WA; Redwood City, CA; and Tigard, OR) and innovative cities (Bellevue, WA; Tacoma, WA; and Oakland, CA). They learned that public transit is key and there is an important relationship between land uses, capital infrastructure, and community needs.

Ms. Chamberland reviewed recommendations for making mobility hubs happen in Shoreline. Criteria for siting mobility hubs included proximity to transit, walkability, bikeability, destinations, density, and equitable distribution. Based on these criteria, 12 potential locations were identified as siting recommendations. These included: Aurora Village Transit Center, Shoreline North/185th Station, North City Business District, Ridgecrest Business District, Shoreline South/148th Station, 15th Ave NE and NE 145th Street, 148th Street Non-Motorized Bridge, Shoreline Place, Shoreline Community College, Richmond BeachRoad/4-Corners, Aurora Avenue N & N 185th Street, and Shoreline Park & Ride.

Ms. Markey-Crimp presented three different types of mobility hub design recommendations for potential locations. Neighborhood hubs provide a safe and comfortable place for community members to connect to public transit. Central hubs are larger hubs located at transit stops that serve at least two bus lines and help connect residents and commuters to major points of interest within the city. Regional mobility hubs support everyone traveling to, from and within Shoreline. They have the greatest array of features and amenities to meet the needs of this broad user base.

Next steps include identifying and partnering with community-based organizations to include more diverse perspectives and working proactively with regional transit agencies and private developers to advocate for infrastructure aligned with shared-use mobility goals. Internally, the group recommends developing a land use code for mobility hubs, working on mobility hub siting criteria and prioritizing improving pedestrian and bike infrastructure.

Commissioner Questions:

Commissioner Galuska asked about providing vehicle parking. Ms. Chamberland explained it is a challenge to find the right amount of parking to meet needs without having so much that it discourages other uses. She mentioned that Bellevue has a program where commuters can reserve parking spots which helps with planning.

Commissioner Callahan expressed an interest in car sharing and asked if that had been evaluated for affordability. Ms. Markey-Crimp explained that what they have seen to make it more affordable has to do with offering a subsidy or a low-income option. Accessibility is an important factor for success in car sharing. Users want to know that a car will be available when and where they need it. Some cities are working with car share operators to make sure that cars are always floating throughout the city and predictably located at transit stops. Ms. Chamberland also discussed how a membership model has been used with bikes to improve affordability.

Commissioner Lin asked about strategies to reach some of the harder to serve areas in the City, especially those in the four corners that are adjacent to other cities. She wondered if considering populations in adjacent areas and also available transit options would change the analysis of those areas. She also asked if the team would provide a matrix to help the City continue to use the model to evaluate hub locations. Ms. Pacheco explained that the team created a matrix that could be easily replicated and updated. Ms. Markey-Crimp commented that the twelve suggested locations are definitely not the only ones that should be on the list. They hope that the City continues to use the matrix and other tools to develop and evaluate this list.

Chair Mork asked how the three types of hubs would differ in their offering of kiss-and-ride zones. She also asked their thoughts about design criteria for sidewalks and bike paths. Ms. Markey-Crimp commented that curb space and traffic flow is a complicated issue and really deserves its own study. Regarding kiss-and-ride zones she suggested that an important consideration in addition to how much space is allocated is how the space can be differently used throughout the day. Ms. Pacheco concurred and explained they heard from other cities about using this flexible curb space for things like supporting vendors or food trucks. In some locations there may be an opportunity to be flexible and creative with these spaces. Regarding sidewalks and bike path standards, Senior Transportation Planner Daley-Peng commented that the current standard for sidewalks is 6-feet adjacent to single-family residential, and 8-feet in other zones, with a 5-foot amenity zone. There is a full spectrum of bike facilities. The City is looking at it in terms of a matrix where the type of road is a factor. The higher the speed of vehicles on the road, the more separation is needed of bikes from those vehicles.

Director Markle asked if transit providers can provide a package (similar to the ORCA card) to combine uses of transit and shared mobility options. Ms. Markey-Crimp said they talked with Seattle about this and the answer was no for now. In light of that she recommended working with micro-mobility device providers to determine available trip-planning features and languages available in their app. Senior Transportation Planner Daley-Peng explained how Helsinki has handled this with their integrated app and membership options. There are some challenges in the United States with this due to hesitancy to share user information among providers.

Chair Mork referred to Commission Lin's earlier question about potential mobility hub locations adjacent to other cities and asked if the team had considered relationships with neighboring cities in their evaluation. Ms. Markey-Crimp replied that was outside of their analysis. Chair Mork stated she would be curious to see how factoring that in would change the evaluation of those areas.

The Planning Commission expressed appreciation to the team for their work and for the presentation.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONER ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for June 17, 2021 and will be a public hearing for the subdivision vacation ordinance.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:03 p.m.

_____	_____
Laura Mork	Carla Hoekzema
Chair, Planning Commission	Clerk, Planning Commission