



AGENDA

PLANNING COMMISSION

VIRTUAL/ELECTRONIC REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, March 17, 2022

Held Remotely on Zoom

7:00 p.m. <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81198862922?pwd=aTlpTDIzNldkZnhZWwtwTDBSaVA1dz09>

Passcode: 766755

In an effort to curtail the spread of the COVID-19 virus, the Planning Commission meeting will take place online using the Zoom platform and the public will not be allowed to attend in-person. You may watch a live feed of the meeting online; join the meeting via Zoom Webinar; or listen to the meeting over the telephone.

The Planning Commission is providing opportunities for public comment by submitting written comment or calling into the meeting to provide oral public comment. To provide oral public comment you must sign-up by 6:30 p.m. the night of the meeting.

Please see the information listed below to access all of these options:



[Click here to watch live streaming video of the Meeting on shorelinewa.gov](#)



Attend the Meeting via Zoom Webinar:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81198862922?pwd=aTlpTDIzNldkZnhZWwtwTDBSaVA1dz09>

Passcode: 766755



Call into the Live Meeting: (253) 215-8782 - Webinar ID: 811 9886 2922



[Click Here to Sign-Up to Provide Oral Testimony](#)

Pre-registration is required by 6:30 p.m. the night of the meeting.



[Click Here to Submit Written Public Comment](#)

Written comments will be presented to Council and posted to the website if received by 4:00 p.m. the night of the meeting; otherwise they will be sent and posted the next day.

	<u>Estimated Time</u>
1. CALL TO ORDER	7:00
2. ROLL CALL	7:01
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA	7:02
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM:	7:03
a. February 17, 2022 - Draft Minutes	

Public Comment and Testimony at Planning Commission

During General Public Comment, the Planning Commission will take public comment on any subject which is not specifically scheduled later on the agenda. During Public Hearings and Study Sessions, public testimony/comment occurs after initial questions by the Commission which follows the presentation of each staff report. Please be advised that each speaker's testimony is being recorded. Speakers are asked to sign-up by 6:30 p.m. the night of the meeting. Individuals wishing to speak to agenda items will be called to speak first, generally in the order in which they have signed. In all cases, speakers are asked to state their first and last

name, and city of residence. The Chair has discretion to limit or extend time limitations and the number of people permitted to speak. Generally, individuals may speak for three minutes or less, depending on the number of people wishing to speak. When representing the official position of an agency or City-recognized organization, a speaker will be given 5 minutes. Questions for staff will be directed to staff through the Commission.

- | | |
|--|------|
| 5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT | 7:04 |
| 6. STUDY ITEMS | |
| a. <u>TMP Update: Draft Prioritization Metrics, Draft Performance Measures, and Upcoming Outreach Series 3</u> | 7:05 |
| 7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS | 8:05 |
| 8. NEW BUSINESS | 8:06 |
| 9. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES & COMMISSIONERS/ANNOUNCEMENTS | 8:07 |
| 10. AGENDA FOR Next meeting – April 7, 2022 | 8:08 |
| 11. ADJOURNMENT | 8:10 |

The Planning Commission meeting is wheelchair accessible. Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact the City Clerk's Office at 801-2230 in advance for more information. For TTY telephone service call 546-0457.

DRAFT
CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
(Via Zoom)

February 17, 2022
7:00 P.M.

Commissioners Present

Chair Pam Sager
Vice Chair Julius Rwamashongye
Commissioner Jack Malek
Commissioner Janelle Callahan
Commissioner Andy Galuska
Commissioner Mei-shiou Lin

Staff Present

Nora Daley-Peng, Sr. Transportation Planner
Kendra Dedinsky, Traffic Engineer
Rachael Markle, Planning Director
Andrew Bauer, Planning Manager
Nytasha Walters, Transportation Services Manager
Julie Ainsworth-Taylor, Assistant City Attorney
Carla Hoekzema, Planning Commission Clerk

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sager 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 February 3, 2022 were accepted as presented.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

STUDY ITEM: TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN UPDATE: AUTO LEVEL OF SERVICE APPROACH

Senior Transportation Planner Nora Daley-Peng introduced this item regarding Auto Level of Service options that define the adequacy of general-purpose vehicles' capacity and flow on the city's arterials. She briefly discussed the purpose of the Transportation Master Plan (TMP), the project timeline, the City's multimodal approach, and Multi Modal Level of Service (MMLOS) policy considerations. Traffic Engineer Kendra Dedinsky continued the presentation, which was staff's third presentation regarding the Transportation Master Plan (TMP). She discussed what Level of Service (LOS) is, how it is measured, the existing auto policy, and menu of intersection LOS options.

Options:

1. Individual Intersection Approach (status quo) – Continue measuring delay at individual intersections on arterials with universal LOS D standard.

Pros: Simple to oversee and consistent across City; ensures relatively low vehicle delay across the City.

Cons: Requires the highest number of mitigation projects resulting in high costs to developers and the City; conflicts with other modal goals/priority networks.

- 2a. District Approach by Zoning Designation – Continue measuring delay at individual intersections on arterials but vary allowable LOS by area type: Commercial/High Density Zoning and Residential Zoning.

Pros: maintains simplicity in development reviews; more context sensitive: helps avoid building infrastructure that is inappropriate in a denser land use setting; lower cost than the current status quo.

Cons: Must be carefully crafted to avoid feeling arbitrary; can potentially lead to “edge issues”; zoning may change, causing inconsistencies or the need to update LOS standards and associated growth projects; could provide for less mitigation in commercial pockets that lack robust transportation options such as Richmond Beach.

- 2b. Revised District Approach by Centers (preferred) – Continue measuring delay at individual intersections on arterials but vary allowable LOS by area type: Candidate Countywide Centers (148th Station area, 185th Station area, Shoreline Place and Town Center) and state routes; and the rest of the city.

Pros: Maintains simplicity in development reviews as the measure applies to individual intersections; most context sensitive option – lower cost, helps avoid building infrastructure that is inappropriate in denser settings, but still requires mitigations in areas with less robust transportation choices.

Cons: Can potentially lead to “edge issues” but fewer than with option 2a.

3. Districts & Corridors Averaging Approach – Continue measuring delay at intersections on arterials but vary allowable LOS by area type: Residential and Commercial/High Density. Measure volume-weighted average along corridors which would allow for a higher level of delay. This is a more complex option. Kent is an example of a city that does this.

Pros: Provides flexibility in siting intersection capacity improvements; helps avoid building infrastructure that is inappropriate in denser settings. Potentially matches the “driver experience” – it’s a delay along a route, not at a single location.

Cons: Adds complexity to development analysis and review; must be carefully crafted to avoid feeling arbitrary; can potentially lead to “edge issues”, allows significantly more vehicle delay than current standard.

She reviewed a chart showing a comparison of intersection LOS options. Staff and the consultant believe that Option 2b rises to the top in terms of balancing competing citywide needs. This is the preferred option. Option 1 promotes vehicle capacity but that is at a high cost to growth, development, walkability and bikeability. Option 2a strikes a better balance but has some concerns. Option 3 frees up capital for walkability and bikeability but could be perceived as a poor fit for some areas of the City that lack transportation options.

Questions/Comments:

Commissioner Galuska asked for clarification about where the impacts would be measured for a project – would they look at impacts in the Candidate Countywide Centers or projects within the Centers? Ms. Dedinsky replied that it would be both. Developers in any part of the city pay per-trip fees to mitigate failures wherever they occur. At a localized level staff also reviews a project’s impact on a specific intersection surrounding a project. The project’s impact would be reviewed against whatever level of service has been set around an area. Staff would look both at systemic and localized impacts. This is how the City currently approaches this and most likely how they will continue to approach it. Commissioner Galuska asked: If there is a proposed project in the Richmond Beach area, and it had a traffic impact at the intersection of 104 and 99, under 2B would they look at the intersection under Level E because it’s in the Countywide Center or does the project have to be in the Countywide Center? Ms. Dedinsky replied that all projects would have to meet the Countywide Center intent. She commented that this would help somewhat to incentivize growth in the Countywide Centers as opposed to outside the Centers.

Modeling: Ms. Dedinsky continued the presentation and reviewed models of existing and projected PM levels of service around the City. She summarized the modeling results and impacts based on the various options.

Vice Chair Rwamashongye asked: When you changed the LOS from D to E, did you also do a study to see what benefits or changes in the pedestrian crossing time would be at those intersections? Ms. Dedinsky replied there are not any high-level modeling tools to do that in the engineering industry. She agrees that this is incredibly important to consider. Widening intersections results in a tradeoff in pedestrians and bicyclists travel time in addition to safety. She noted that improving vehicle capacity is

always at the expense of pedestrians. She commented they could include a high-level table of what this might look like.

Vice Chair Rwamashongye asked: Since this is a 20-year plan and climate change is very important, did you consider idle times and emissions at the intersections? Ms. Dedinsky acknowledged that idle times do increase emissions, but she has seen that increasing vehicle capacity ultimately invites more people to drive which clogs up the intersections. Ms. Daley-Peng added that staff is planning on coming back to the Commission in March to talk about the prioritization and performance process for these projects. They are measuring what they want to prioritize the projects that will help the City get to a better future. She commented that the City is doing a Climate Action Plan update in tandem with the TMP update. They are aware that approximately 56% of the City's greenhouse gas emissions come from transportation emissions. She will be coming back to the Commission with a more in-depth conversation about this.

Vice Chair Rwamashongye commented that the impacts to freight transport also need to be considered. The cost of goods and services might go up because of delays in transportation, and that cost gets transferred to the consumer. Ms. Dedinsky agreed that this is a factor, but it is not particularly significant from an economic perspective. She did not think it would be noticeable enough to be passed on to the consumer. She spoke to the importance of juggling competing priorities. She acknowledged that staff is focusing on the walkability part of the equation because most of the feedback they have received from the public has to do the high priority on sidewalks, walkability, etc. This is one reason that staff prefers Option 2b because it balances vehicle mobility with pedestrian access.

Supplementing Intersection LOS: Volume/Capacity The calculation of the (V/C) Ratio = Peak hour traffic volume in peak direction/theoretical capacity in peak hour direction. The current standard is V/C of .90 or lower on principal and minor arterials. Three options are being considered.

Options:

1. Continue using V/C Ratio of .90 or lower for principal/minor arterials (Status Quo).

Pros: Provides a non-intersection-based metric for principal and minor arterials

Cons: Simplistic methodology prescribes one solution to mitigate impacts (typically roadway widening) which conflicts with modal priorities in growth areas. Adhering to .9 standard in areas of growth may be cost prohibitive given necessary ROW acquisition to accomplish widening. This would add complexity to development review and is not an industry standard.

2. No supplemental measure, remove V/C measure altogether.

Pros: This option removes a metric that is not routinely applied as an industry standard. Simplifies development review. Does not force a solution of widening corridors to achieve the standard. Avoids building infrastructure that is inappropriate in a setting.

Cons: Removes a non-intersection-based metric for principal and minor arterials.

3. Refined V/C ratio for principal/minor arterials – district approach by Centers (Preferred). This would have a V/C ratio of 1.1 or lower for principal/minor arterials in Candidate Countywide Centers and along state routes. There would be a V/C ratio of .90 or lower for principal/minor arterials everywhere else. This option consistently relates to intersection LOS.

Pros: Provides non-intersection-based metric for principal and minor arterials. More context sensitive: helps avoid building infrastructure that is inappropriate in a setting. Consistent with intersection LOS standard.

Cons: Prescribes one solution to mitigate impacts (typically roadway widening). Adds complexity to development review and is not an industry standard.

Ms. Dedinsky reviewed 2044 intersection project impacts of each option. She summarized that staff believes the district approach by Centers appears to be the best balance for the City. It maintains a fairly good level of delay but provides a level of context sensitivity that is absent today. It puts areas in the Centers as LOS E or a V/C ratio of 1.1 for segments. Everywhere else maintains the same standards. Ms. Daley-Peng reviewed next steps. Staff will be returning to the Planning Commission in March to share the TMP's process for prioritizing process and performance measures. They will be coming again in April to review the draft modal plans and share an overview of activities and events planned for Outreach Series 3. Outreach Series 3 is planned to launch in mid-April. Staff will be sharing the results with the public of what they have learned so far in the outreach efforts. They will also be reviewing draft modal plans and the draft prioritization process and asking for feedback from the public.

Comments and Questions:

Commissioner Malek asked for clarification about the V/C results (2044) map. Ms. Dedinsky explained it was the PM peak traffic count divided by the theoretical capacity for that road. Commissioner Malek asked if ADT threshold was an alternative to V/C. Ms. Dedinsky replied that it could be; it is used in Snohomish County. V/C is quite similar and is consistent with past practices in the City. Commissioner Malek explained that using ADT over V/C was quite contentious in the Richmond Beach/Point Wells area.

Commissioner Galuska commented that WSDOT has adopted a threshold standard of .9 V/C for their rights of way. He asked if the State would enforce that in the WSDOT jurisdictions in the City. Ms. Dedinsky replied they don't enforce it on state highways in cities of a certain size.

Commissioner Callahan asked about the problem of cut-through traffic to avoid congestion and delays. Ms. Dedinsky explained that the modeling does not do a good job of trying to gauge these impacts. She also noted that if they try to anticipate how much traffic might be diverted onto local streets, it waters down the numbers for the intersections. This is problematic because they are trying to get a picture of how the intersections would function if all the trips went there. Staff wants to use the numbers for the total number of trips to get appropriate mitigation. She explained that to some degree the volume on local streets can be self-limiting because of factors such as narrow lanes, narrow streets, and on-street-parking. Also, there is not clear data that shows increasing traffic on a local street by 10 or 15% makes it

inherently less safe. Commissioner Callahan asked about the process available if people are concerned about the traffic on their streets. Ms. Dedinsky replied that residents can always come to the City if they have concerns about anything. When that happens, the City looks at collision and safety data in that area to determine if any changes are warranted.

Vice Chair Rwamashongye thanked staff for the excellent presentation. He stated that he likes to walk so this impacts his perspective of the options.

Commissioner Lin also complimented staff on the presentation. She commented on the positive financial impact of reducing the number of intersections that need to be addressed as a result of modifying the LOS standards. She then asked if the edge effect is calculated where there are boundaries with other jurisdictions. Ms. Dedinsky replied that the model used generally takes that into account as well as all the large regional projects that are happening; however, a LOS analysis was not done for border intersections that are not the City's.

Commissioner Malek asked how they could learn more about the Evanston school study regarding mobility hubs. He also referred to the bridge going over 185th to the light rail station where they anticipated quite a chokepoint and asked if this would be part of the presentation next time. Ms. Dedinsky replied that they wouldn't get into detail with that, but it is incorporated into the travel demand model in the analysis. It is showing higher delay there, and under the current standard it would fail. Staff is showing preference for exempting that 185th Street area from a V/C ratio of .9 to allow it to go up to 1.1 because in the future they want to discourage growth there from being auto dependent. Ms. Daley-Peng added that there is a link for the shared link mobility study on the City's webpage which she will share with the Commission. She will be discussing this more when she comes back in March for the TMP update.

Chair Sager agreed that this was a great presentation. She is also very happy to hear that they touched a bit about pedestrians and safety. Her main concern is that when traffic increases sometimes people have less patience; this includes not only drivers, but pedestrians, bicyclists, scooters, etc. This can result in an increase in injuries and accidents.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONER ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

The March 3 meeting was cancelled, and the next meeting is March 17.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Pam Sager
Chair, Planning Commission

Carla Hoekzema
Clerk, Planning Commission

Planning Commission Meeting Date: March 17, 2022

Agenda Item 6a.

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Transportation Master Plan Update: Draft Prioritization Metrics, Draft Performance Measures, and Upcoming Outreach Series 3
DEPARTMENT: Public Works
PRESENTED BY: Nora Daley-Peng, Senior Transportation Planner

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing | <input type="checkbox"/> Study Session | <input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation Only |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discussion | <input type="checkbox"/> Update | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

INTRODUCTION

This staff report provides the overview to tonight’s presentation and discussion about the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) draft prioritization metrics, draft performance measures, and the upcoming Outreach Series 3. This is the fourth of a series of briefings to the Planning Commission about the TMP update. No action is required tonight.

BACKGROUND

The City is currently updating its TMP to better serve the community’s current and future transportation needs. The TMP supports all forms of travel – by foot, bicycle, skateboard, scooter, stroller, wheelchair, transit, motorcycle, automobile, etc. The TMP update will guide local and regional transportation investments and define the City’s future transportation policies, programs, and projects for the next 20 years. With the coming arrival of light rail transit, new and higher frequency bus service, new pedestrian/bicycle connections, land use changes, and anticipated population growth, the TMP update provides an opportunity to better align transportation goals, objectives, and policies with the City’s Comprehensive Plan.

The last update to the TMP was in 2011. The TMP, which serves as the supporting analysis for the City’s Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element (TE), must be updated to align with the City’s Comprehensive Plan 2024 periodic update, meet the Growth Management Act requirements, maintain the City’s eligibility for pursuing future grant funding; and set transportation policies for guiding the development of Shoreline.

Since the TE/TMP update will require an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, the role of the Planning Commission will be to provide feedback on the development of the TE/TMP update and ultimately make a recommendation to City Council to adopt the TE/TMP update through the Comprehensive Plan amendment docket process.

Approved By: _____ **Project Manager** _____ **Planning Director** _____

PROCESS AND SCHEDULE

In fall 2020, the City launched a multi-year process to update the TMP with the goal of adoption by the end of 2022. City staff has and will continue briefing the Planning Commission and City Council throughout the process and seek their feedback on the development of the TMP update.

To date, the project team has assessed existing conditions, conducted two rounds of public outreach, developed the TMP Vision and Goals and draft project evaluation criteria, and developed a future city-wide travel demand model to assist with forecasting the increase in vehicular travel over the next 20 years based on Shoreline’s anticipated growth in population and jobs.

Currently, the team is working on draft modal plans for walking, bicycling, riding transit, driving, and using shared-use mobility devices (e.g., e-bikes, e-scooters, etc.) to complete short trips, a process for prioritizing projects and reporting their performance over time, and getting ready to launch Outreach Series 3 in April. The following overview schedule shows key milestones for the TMP update process.



VISION & GOALS RECAP

On November 4, 2021, City staff briefed the Planning Commission on the Vision and Goals for the TMP update. A vision statement defines a plan's long-term goals and guides decision making. Here's the vision statement for the type of transportation system that the City would like to provide by 2044, the planning horizon year of the update to the TMP.







Shoreline has a well-developed multimodal transportation system that offers safe and easy travel options that are accessible for everyone, builds climate resiliency, and promotes livability. This system has been developed over time, informed by a robust, inclusive dialogue with the community.

The project team developed the Vision and Goals for the TMP based on input received from the public and community groups about their transportation priorities and needs as well as from input received during a TMP Goals Setting Workshop with City staff participants representing most City departments and their unique perspectives.

Having clearly defined goals will help the City accomplish this vision. The TMP Vision has six goals, each with a purpose statement (see Table 1). These goals were

influenced by public input received during Outreach Series 1. On May 24, 2021, City staff presented the TMP Vision and Goals to City Council and they endorsed it.

Table 1: TMP Goals & Purpose







Goal	Purpose
Safety 	Prioritize Safety Make Shoreline’s transportation system safe and comfortable for all users, regardless of mode or ability.
Equity 	Seek Equity Ensure all people, especially those whose needs have been systemically neglected, are well served by making transportation investments through an anti-racist and inclusive process which results in equitable outcomes.
Multimodality 	Provide Multimodal Options Expand and strengthen the multimodal network, specifically walking, biking, and transit, to increase the number of safe, convenient, reliable, and accessible travel options.
Connectivity 	Plan a Connected Community Complete a network of multimodal transportation connections to and from key destinations such as parks, schools, community services, commercial centers, places of employment, and transit.
Climate Resiliency 	Protect the Environment Increase climate resiliency by promoting sustainability, reducing pollution, promoting healthy habitats, and supporting clean air and water.
Community Vibrancy 	Foster a Vibrant Community Support livability by evoking a sense of identity through arts/culture, attracting and sustaining desired economic activity, and accommodating the movement of people and goods.

DRAFT PROJECT EVALUATION RECAP

The TMP update will guide local and regional transportation investments and define the City’s future transportation policies, programs, and projects for the next 20 years. In this way, the TMP update process will help the City assess the relative importance of transportation projects and programs; and schedule their planning, engineering, and construction as Shoreline growth takes place and the need for improved and new facilities is warranted. The TMP update will also establish a methodology for prioritization of a list of projects to be included in the future Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

On November 4, 2021, City staff briefed the Planning Commission on the draft project evaluation criteria (see Table 2) that are tied to the TMP’s Goals. Over the winter of 2022, the project team is using the evaluation criteria to develop a list of potential transportation projects and evaluate how well potential transportation projects achieve the TMP Vision and Goals.

Table 2: TMP Evaluation Criteria

Goal	Purpose	Project Evaluation Criteria
 <p>Safety</p>	<p>Prioritize Safety</p> <p>Make Shoreline’s transportation system safe and comfortable for all users, regardless of mode or ability.</p>	<p>Decrease Injury Collisions</p> <p>Identify locations in need of increased safety measures based on collisions and traffic speed and volume.</p>
 <p>Equity</p>	<p>Seek Equity</p> <p>Ensure all people, especially those whose needs have been systemically neglected, are well served by making transportation investments through an anti-racist and inclusive process which results in equitable outcomes.</p>	<p>Provide Equitable Access</p> <p>Identify areas of populations who have the greatest need (e.g., children, older adults, people with disabilities, lower income communities, communities of color, and limited English speakers).</p>
 <p>Multimodality</p>	<p>Provide Multimodal Options</p> <p>Expand and strengthen the multimodal network, specifically walking, biking, and transit, to increase the number of safe, convenient, reliable, and accessible travel options.</p>	<p>Reduce Auto Dependency</p> <p>Support frequent and reliable transit service (e.g., BAT lanes, queue jumps, etc.). Provide multimodal access to and from shared-use mobility hubs, transit stops, and stations.</p>
 <p>Connectivity</p>	<p>Plan a Connected Community</p> <p>Complete a network of multimodal transportation connections to and from key destinations such as parks, schools, community services, commercial centers, places of employment, and transit.</p>	<p>Build a Connected Network¹</p> <p>Plan a robust network of connected transit, pedestrian, and bicycle routes to key destinations (e.g., parks, schools, libraries, etc.).</p>
 <p>Climate Resiliency</p>	<p>Protect the Environment</p> <p>Increase climate resiliency by promoting sustainability, reducing pollution, promoting healthy habitats, and supporting clean air and water.</p>	<p>Increase Resiliency to Climate Change²</p> <p>Identify ways to reduce flooding vulnerabilities, urban heat island effect, and transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions.</p>
 <p>Community Vibrancy</p>	<p>Foster a Vibrant Community</p> <p>Support livability by evoking a sense of identity through arts/culture, attracting and sustaining desired economic activity, and accommodating the movement of people and goods.</p>	<p>Enhance Quality of Life</p> <p>Promote the movement and delivery of goods; multimodal access to local businesses and community services; connections to nature via trails and paths; and places for public art, culture, and community gathering.</p>

1 Refer to Reduce Auto Dependency for criteria for accessing transit options.

2 Refer to Reduce Auto Dependency for criteria for reducing transportation emissions by encouraging taking other travel modes than driving.

DRAFT PRIORITIZATION METRICS

Since the City needs to operate within a finite set of resources, it is important to develop a transparent, equitable, and data-driven process for prioritizing the implementation of the transportation projects over the next 20 years. Building on the draft project evaluation criteria, the project team developed a companion set of draft prioritization metrics. The prioritization metrics do not have an assigned point system yet. The project team will be seeking feedback from the public about draft prioritization metrics and their weighting during the upcoming Outreach Series 3. Once the prioritization metrics have been fully vetted, staff will use the prioritization metrics to score the potential transportation projects to see if they are a high, medium, or low priority.

See Attachment A to review how the draft prioritization metrics fit within the Draft TMP Vision, Goals, Purpose, Project Evaluation, Prioritization Metrics, and Performance Measures Framework.

DRAFT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

To understand and communicate the City’s progress on implementing priority projects, the project team developed a set of draft performance measures that will quantify the contributions of newly constructed transportation projects towards achieving the TMP’s Vision and Goals.

See Attachment A to review how the performance measures fit within the Draft TMP Vision, Goals, Purpose, Project Evaluation, Prioritization Metrics, and Performance Measures Framework.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS

Public involvement is an essential component of the TMP update process. There will be multiple opportunities throughout the process for the public and stakeholders to learn about future transportation needs, envision improvements, and give feedback.

The project team will conduct Outreach Series 3 in April 2022 to share what the City has heard from the community to date and get feedback on draft modal plans for walking, biking, taking transit, using shared-use mobility vehicles, and driving in Shoreline. The team will also ask for input on the draft prioritization metrics and performance measures.

The TMP will serve the entire community, so it is critical to understand who lives, works, studies, and plays in Shoreline and what their needs are, especially ones who needs have been systemically neglected. For Outreach Series 3, the project team will endeavor to engage with more people who are typically underrepresented like Black Indigenous People of Color (BIPOC), youth, older adults, people with disabilities, people with low incomes, and people with limited English language skills. To engage with underrepresented community members, the team will display “pop-up” outreach materials and comment cards in places where people can encounter them in their daily lives like school cafeterias, gyms, libraries, social service and medical centers, and BIPOC-owned businesses, etc. The team will post multi-lingual yard signs, outreach flyers, and advertisements in ethnic media to encourage community members to provide their input via an online survey. In addition, the team will conduct small group meetings with underrepresented community groups to hear their feedback. Lastly, TMP Update webpage will host pre-recorded presentations that explain the outreach materials and provide a link to the online survey.

NEXT STEPS

Over the winter 2022, the project team will build on the knowledge gained from Outreach Series 1 and 2 and the future travel demand analysis. The project team will use this to develop a draft modal plan for pedestrian, bicycle, transit, shared-use mobility, and auto/freight modes.

The project team is also preparing to conduct Outreach Series 3 in April 2022 to share what the City has heard from the community to date and get feedback on draft modal plans and policies for walking, biking, taking transit, using shared-use mobility vehicles, and driving in Shoreline. The team will also ask for input on the draft prioritization metrics and performance measures.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

For more information about the TMP update, please visit the project webpage <https://www.shorelinewa.gov/tmp> or contact Nora Daley-Peng, Senior Transportation Planner, at ndaleypeng@shorelinewa.gov or (206) 801-2483.

RECOMMENDATION

Tonight's presentation is for discussion only. No recommendation action is required.

ATTACHMENTS



Attachment A – Draft TMP Vision, Goals, Purpose, Project Evaluation, Prioritization Metrics, and Performance Measures Framework

Shoreline TMP Vision, Goals, Purpose, Project Evaluation, Prioritization Metrics, and Performance Measures Framework

Draft Revision Date: 3/04/22

Vision





Shoreline has a well-developed multimodal transportation system that offers safe and easy travel options that are accessible for everyone, builds climate resiliency, and promotes livability. This system has been developed over time, informed by a robust, inclusive dialogue with the community.

Goal	Purpose	Project Evaluation Criteria	Project Prioritization Metrics	Performance Measures <i>Reported every two years unless otherwise noted</i>
Safety 	Prioritize Safety	Decrease Injury Collisions	Safety Metrics	Safety Performance Measures
	<i>Make Shoreline's transportation system safe and comfortable for all users, regardless of mode or ability.</i>	<i>Identify locations in need of increased safety measures based on collisions and traffic speed and volume.</i>	Location of improvement has a collision history (auto and/or pedestrian/bike):	Continue to track injury and fatal collisions citywide through the Annual Traffic Report .
			At least one injury collision within the past five years	
			At least one pedestrian or bike/auto collision within the past five years	
			Two or more pedestrian or bike/auto collisions within the past five years	
			Location of improvement is along a street with speed limit :	
			≤ 25 mph	
			≤ 30 mph	
			≤ 35 mph	
			Location of improvement has a street classification of:	
Collector Arterial				
Minor Arterial				
Principal Arterial				
Equity 	Seek Equity	Provide Equitable Access	Equity Metrics	Equity Performance Measures
	<i>Ensure all people, especially those whose needs have been systemically neglected, are well served by making transportation investments through an anti-racist and inclusive process which results in equitable outcomes.</i>	<i>Identify areas of populations who have the greatest need (e.g., children, older adults, people with disabilities, lower income communities, communities of color, and limited English speakers).</i>	Equity Priority Areas based on the aggregated score of following metrics:	Report number of newly constructed or renovated multimodal projects in Equity Priority Areas and describe the number of public engagement activities for each of the projects.
			Improvement is within an area of concentrated need based on Age : 18 years or younger 60 years or older ¹	
			Improvement is within an area of concentrated need based on income ≤ 80% of median income for a family of two ² .	
			Improvement serves a concentrated community of color Top 20% of population density of households of people of color.	
Improvement serves a concentrated community with disabilities Top 20% of population density of households of people with a disability.				
Improvement serves a concentrated community of limited English speakers Top 20% of population density of households with a limited English speaker.				

¹ Eligibility for the Older Americans Act starts at age 60.

² Eligibility threshold for King County Housing Authority residents is 80% of median income. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines 50%-80% of median income as "Low Income".

Att. A - Draft TMP Vision, Goals, Purpose, Project Evaluation, Prioritization Metrics, and Performance Measures Framework

 Multimodality	Provide Multimodal Options	Reduce Auto Dependency	Multimodality Metrics	Multimodality Performance Measures
 Connectivity	Plan a Connected Community Complete a network of multimodal transportation connections to and from key destinations such as parks, schools, community services, commercial centers, places of employment, and transit.	Build a Connected Network³ Plan a robust network of connected transit, pedestrian, and bicycle routes to key destinations (e.g., parks, schools, etc.).	Connectivity Metrics Improvement is located within a ¼ mile radius of a school. Improvement is located within a ¼ mile radius of a park. Closes gap or extends an existing pedestrian or bicycle facility.	Connectivity Performance Measures Report number of newly constructed pedestrian and/or bicycle projects within a ¼ mile radius of a school. Report number of newly constructed pedestrian and/or bicycle projects within a ¼ mile radius of a park. Report number of newly constructed pedestrian and/or bicycle projects that close a gap or extend an existing pedestrian and/or bicycle facility.
 Climate Resiliency	Protect the Environment Increase climate resiliency by promoting sustainability, reducing pollution, promoting healthy habitats, and supporting clean air and water.	Increase Resiliency to Climate Change⁴ Identify ways to reduce flooding vulnerabilities, urban heat island effect, and transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions.	Climate Resiliency Metrics Improvement is within a Surface Water Vulnerabilities area per the City's Climate Impacts Tool and will include measures to reduce surface water runoff. Improvement is within an Urban Heat Island area per the City's Climate Impacts Tool and will include measures to mitigate urban heat island effect. Refer to Multimodality for metrics for reducing transportation emissions by encouraging taking other travel modes than driving.	Climate Resiliency Performance Measures Report number of newly constructed multimodal projects in Surface Water Vulnerabilities areas and describe measures used to reduce surface water runoff for each project. Report number of newly constructed multimodal projects in Urban Heat Island areas and describe measures used to mitigate urban heat island effect for each project. Report Shoreline Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita. Report number of trees removed and trees planted for all newly constructed multimodal projects .
 Community Vibrancy	Foster a Vibrant Community Support livability by evoking a sense of identity through arts/culture, attracting and sustaining desired economic activity, and accommodating the movement of people and goods.	Enhance Quality of Life Promote the movement and delivery of goods; multimodal access to local businesses and community services; connections to nature via trails and paths; and places for public art, culture, and community gathering.	Community Vibrancy Metrics Improvement adds a multimodal connection to an activity center (within a ¼ mile radius of a retail/business area or civic/community building). Improvement provides an alternative to walking or bicycling along a motorized facility e.g., ped/bike bridge, trail/path through park or unopened right of way, etc. Improvement provides places for public art, culture, and/or community gathering e.g., locations of shared-use mobility hubs, trailheads, gateways, park frontages, mural corridors, sidewalk poetry, etc.	Community Vibrancy Performance Measures Report number of newly constructed multimodal projects within a ¼ mile radius of an activity center. Report number of newly constructed or renovated ped/bike bridges, trails, and paths. Report number of newly constructed or renovated places for public art, culture, and/or community gathering.

³ Refer to Reduce Auto Dependency for criteria for accessing transit options. Refer to Community Vibrancy for accessing business and community services.

⁴ Refer to Reduce Auto Dependency for criteria for reducing transportation emissions by encouraging taking other travel modes than driving and see Climate Action Plan for electric vehicle charging station policies.