

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM**  
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

<b>AGENDA TITLE:</b>	Discussion of City Street Regulatory Options
<b>DEPARTMENT:</b>	City Manager's Office
<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	Alex Herzog, Management Analyst
<b>ACTION:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance <input type="checkbox"/> Resolution <input type="checkbox"/> Motion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discussion <input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing

**PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:**

Recently, a number of questions have been raised about the City's regulatory options in ensuring safe, efficient and fluid traffic flow on its streets. Deputy Mayor Eggen along with Councilmembers McConnell and Salomon have requested that this topic, and specifically tolling of Shoreline streets, be introduced as a discussion item to further understand all available options.

Although the discussion of tolling and other street regulatory authority options apply throughout the City of Shoreline, the desire to have this item on the agenda was spurred by concerns related to the proposed Point Wells development in Snohomish County. Richmond Beach Drive is the only existing ingress and egress point serving vehicular traffic to the Point Wells area. A development company, BSRE, owns approximately 61 acres of property on Point Wells, in unincorporated Snohomish County. BSRE is planning a mixed-use community development for Point Wells and has vested permit applications, through Snohomish County, that would allow for up to 3,081 units plus approximately 100,000 square feet of commercial/retail space to be developed.

To date, policy direction has been to negotiate a development agreement with BSRE that addresses the principles and interests outlined in the City's 2011 Letter of Intent (Attachment A). Although the City's regulatory authority in managing traffic flow is not exclusive to the negotiation of an agreement, the implementation of measures, such as tolling, may or may not affect the outcomes of such an agreement.

**RESOURCE/FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

A number of City street regulatory options are available to the City, each carrying their own cost. Given that this item has been scheduled for introductory discussion, the financial analysis for any specific regulatory option has not been conducted. Attachment B, a report on Tolling and the Shoreline Transportation Benefit District, does include a range of cost for various methods of toll collection.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that Council discuss the various regulatory options available to the City and determine if there is additional information needed for any potential policy recommendations that Council would like staff to bring back for consideration. Council's current direction to staff on city street regulations as they relate to the Point Wells development and the developer, BSRE, is to continue negotiating with the developer to secure appropriate and necessary mitigations for potential traffic impacts, along with addressing the other principles and interests in the City's 2011 Letter of Intent.

Approved By:           City Manager **DT**   City Attorney **MK**

## **BACKGROUND**

Recently, a number of questions have been raised about the City's various regulatory options in ensuring safe, efficient and fluid traffic flow on its streets. Deputy Mayor Eggen and Councilmembers McConnell and Salomon have requested that this topic, and specifically tolling of Shoreline streets, be introduced as a discussion item to further understand all available options.

Although the discussion of tolling and other street regulatory authority apply throughout the City of Shoreline, the desire to have this item on the agenda was spurred by concerns related to the proposed Point Wells development in Snohomish County. Richmond Beach Drive is the only existing ingress and egress point serving vehicular traffic to the Point Wells area. A development company, BSRE, owns approximately 61 acres of property on Point Wells, in unincorporated Snohomish County. BSRE is planning a mixed-use community development for Point Wells and has vested permit applications, through Snohomish County, that would allow for up to 3,081 units to be developed along with approximately 100,000 square feet of retail and commercial space.

In relation to the development, the City's primary concerns are safe, efficient and fluid traffic flow that includes motorized and non-motorized access and freight movement. In its current configuration, Richmond Beach Drive/Road will not safely and efficiently accommodate the anticipated increase in number of trips to/from the proposed Point Wells development. Anticipated increases in traffic volume may require various transportation capital improvements.

As the Point Wells property is in unincorporated Snohomish County, the project approvals and permitting are under the control of Snohomish County. Without annexation or another binding financial agreement, future tax revenue will be collected by, and solely benefit, Snohomish County. However, the development's traffic impacts on Richmond Beach Drive and other Shoreline streets along with their potential related costs will be borne by the City of Shoreline.

Several traffic regulation methods, including setting and enforcing speed limits, lane reconfiguration, installing signals to regulate traffic flow (similar to freeway on-ramp metering) and speed humps to name a few, may meet the City's traffic flow goals on Richmond Beach Drive. Further, tolling on Richmond Beach Drive via the Shoreline Transportation Benefit District (TBD) has been suggested as a method by which a dedicated revenue stream to fund improvements and maintenance could be created. Tolling may ensure that the City's transportation goals are met and the ensuing revenues may be used for transportation improvements needed to mitigate potential maintenance impacts of redevelopment.

Although this is the case, there could be legal risk on whether the implementation of tolling or other street regulatory methods could be construed as arbitrary and capricious if the actions are determined to merely be a means to stop or limit development.

To date, policy direction has been to negotiate a development agreement with BSRE that addresses the principles and interests outlined in the City's 2011 Letter of Intent (Attachment A). Although the City's regulatory authority in managing traffic flow is not exclusive to the negotiation of such an agreement, the implementation of measures, such as tolling, may or may not affect the outcomes of such an agreement.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Road Classification**

Federal and State guidelines require that streets be classified based on function. Generally, streets are classified as either arterial streets or non-arterial streets. Local jurisdictions can also use the designations to guide the nature of improvements allowed and/or desired on certain roadways, such as sidewalks or street calming devices. Road classifications are considered guidelines for how the road is intended to function as opposed to being a standard or policy used as an enforcement mechanism. Unlike "Level of Service," road classifications, and their related characteristics, are not included in the City's development regulations or the City's Comprehensive Plan as a standard that must be met by development. The street classification map is adopted as part of the Transportation Master Plan via Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC) Section 20.70.220.

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

- **Principal Arterials** have regional significance as major vehicular travel routes that connect between cities within a metropolitan area. The abutting property and land uses on that property generally have a minimum of direct service to the Principal Arterial, such as limited driveway access. (*Examples: Aurora Avenue, NE 175th Street and 15th Avenue NE*)
- **Minor Arterials** are generally designed to provide a high degree of intra-community connections and are less significant from a perspective of regional mobility. (*Examples: Meridian Avenue N, N/NE 185th Street and NW Richmond Beach Road*)
- **Collector Arterials** assemble traffic from the interior of an area/community and deliver it to the closest Minor or Principal Arterial. Collector Arterials provide for both mobility and access to property and are designed to fulfill both functions. (*Examples: Greenwood Avenue N, Fremont Avenue N and NW Innis Arden Way*)

The classification of a roadway often determines eligibility for grant funding. Typically, granting agencies fund projects on arterials and will not provide funds for projects on non-arterial streets. Similarly, roadway classification influences the types of traffic improvements the City will construct on a street. For example, arterials are not typically eligible for traffic calming features and generally are not considered for improvement

through the City’s Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program. Shoreline typically does not stripe centerlines on non-arterial streets.

The table below, titled Typical Shoreline Street Characteristics, describes the different characteristics of classified streets in Shoreline. The characteristics identified are meant as descriptors, not as standards or policies.

### Typical Shoreline Street Characteristics

	Arterial Streets			Non-Arterial Streets	
	Principal Arterial	Minor Arterial	Collector Arterial	Local Primary Street	Local Secondary Street
<b>Function</b>	- Connect cities and urban centers with minimum delay - Connect traffic to Interstate system - Accommodate long and through trips	- Connect activity centers within the City - Connect traffic to Principal Arterials and Interstate - Accommodate some long trips	- Provide access to community services and businesses - Connect traffic from Non Arterial Streets to Minor or Principal Arterials - Accommodate medium length trips	- Connect traffic from local secondary streets to Arterials - Accommodate short trips to neighborhood destinations - Provide local accesses	- Provide local accesses
<b>Speed Limits</b>	30-40 mph	30-35 mph	25-30 mph	25 mph	25 mph
<b>Daily Volume (vehicles per day)</b>	More than 15,000	7,000 – 20,000	2,000 – 8,000	less than 3,000	less than 3,000
<b>Number of Lanes</b>	Three or more lanes	Two or more lanes	Two or more lanes	One or two lanes	One or two lanes
<b>Lane Striping</b>	Pavement markings used to delineate travel lanes.	Pavement markings used to delineate travel lanes.	Pavement markings used to delineate travel lanes.	No centerline striping	No centerline striping
<b>Transit</b>	Buses/transit stops allowed	Buses/transit stops allowed	Buses/transit stops allowed	Buses/transit stops not generally allowed except for short segments	Buses/transit stops not allowed
<b>Bicycle Facilities</b>	May contain bicycle lanes, shared lanes or signage	May contain bicycle lanes, shared lanes or signage	May contain bicycle lanes, shared lanes or signage	- Shared lanes can be provided - Signs may be included	Bike facilities not specifically provided; may include signed bike routes
<b>Pedestrian Facilities</b>	- Sidewalks on both sides - Amenity zones	- Sidewalks on both sides - Amenity zones	- Sidewalks on both sides - Amenity zones	Pedestrian access through the use of sidewalks, trails, or other means	Safe pedestrian access through the use of sidewalks, trails, or other means.

Prior to February 2011, Richmond Beach Drive was classified as a Collector Arterial. In February 2011, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 596 which amended the Point Wells Subarea Plan, a component of the City's Comprehensive Plan, to add Policy PW-12. This policy classified a portion of Richmond Beach Drive as a "local street" with a maximum capacity of 4,000 vehicle trips per day (it should be noted that while the Typical Shoreline Street Characteristics table above shows local streets having a volume of less than 3,000 vehicles per day, the previous version of this table indicated a 4,000 vehicle daily volume for local streets). This policy also states that the City should not consider reclassifying the road until a Transportation Corridor Study is complete and sources of financing necessary for mitigation are committed.

Attachment C to this staff report is a map of the current Street Classifications from the City's adopted Transportation Master Plan.

### **Level of Service**

The Growth Management Act (GMA) allows each local jurisdiction to choose a Level of Service (LOS) methodology and standards for transportation. LOS is a qualitative measure used to denote roadway or intersection operating conditions. It generally describes levels of traffic congestion along a roadway segment or at signalized and unsignalized intersections in an urban area. The Highway Capacity Manual 2010 (HCM 2010) defines LOS at signalized intersections based on the average delay experienced per vehicle traveling through the intersection. LOS is typically represented as a "report card" grading system ranging from A at the highest level to F at the lowest level.

The Volume to Capacity (V/C) ratio is a common LOS metric for evaluating traffic operations on roadway segments. The V/C ratio compares the volume of traffic traveling over a section of roadway against the theoretical capacity of that roadway segment. Low V/C ratios indicate low levels of congestion, while V/C ratios of 1.0 or greater indicate high levels of congestion.

Individual jurisdictions have flexibility regarding how to apply concurrency (capacity of the transportation system to meet any increased demand from development) within their plans, regulations, and permit systems. SMC Section 20.60.140 contains the City's adopted LOS (SMC 20.60.140.A). The LOS standard that the City has selected as the basis for measuring concurrency is basically as follows:

1. **LOS D** at signalized intersections on arterial streets and at unsignalized intersecting arterials. LOS D represents an increasing amount of delay where vehicle movements become more limited based on the density of surrounding vehicles; speeds begin to reduce on roadway segments and an increasing number of vehicles are stopped at intersections.
2. A **volume to capacity (V/C) ratio of 0.90** or lower for principal and minor arterials.

These level of service standards apply throughout the City unless an alternative level of service for particular streets has been adopted in the Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element.

Prior to 2011 the City's adopted transportation LOS was E at intersections only, with no adopted volume to capacity (V/C) ratio standard on street segments. In 2011, through the update of the City's Transportation Master Plan, the City adopted a new LOS and a V/C ratio standard.

The City's adopted LOS standards are enforceable on new development within Shoreline as it is adopted in the City's Municipal Code. In other words, a proposed development will not be approved if it exceeds a LOS standard. This is in contrast to "road classifications" that are based on network needs and guidelines as presented in the Typical Shoreline Street Characteristics table (above). In cases where the adopted LOS is projected to be exceeded by development, a developer must either agree to provide mitigation so that traffic flows meet the City's adopted LOS or amend the development proposal so that traffic flows are within the adopted LOS. If neither of these options can be addressed by a developer, then the City would deny the proposed development. Of course when development is outside of the City, then the City is no longer the permitting agency and does not have the authority to deny or approve a development permit.

### **Street Regulatory Powers**

The City has a great deal of control over its streets and has the authority to implement a number of regulatory controls. The primary statutes that govern the City's rights with respect to regulating city streets are RCW 46.08.020, RCW 47.48.010, and RCW 35.22.280. Under Washington law, it appears the City can regulate and restrict traffic on its streets if, for any reason, unrestricted use or continued use by vehicles will damage city streets, be dangerous to traffic, impede street maintenance and in some cases affect the quality of life in the area. The City may only adopt vehicle and traffic regulations in addition to state statutes as long as they are not in conflict with state statutes regarding a municipality's regulatory authority over city streets (RCW 46.08.020). Prohibiting a particular class of vehicles (i.e. trucks) from using its streets would conflict with Title 46 and therefore be invalid.

### **Speed Limits**

State law states that the minimum speed limit on city streets is 25 miles per hour. However, a speed limit may be increased (to a maximum of 60 miles per hour) if conditions to do so are reasonable and safe. Alternatively, a City may decrease the limit to a minimum of 20 miles per hour (Chapter 46.61 RCW) if, based on an engineering and traffic investigation, it is determined that the decrease is reasonable and safe.

Further, the City may "declare a lower maximum speed for any class of vehicles, for such a definite period as it shall determine" if doing so will reduce damage to those streets (RCW 47.48.010). The city may limit the speed for different types of vehicles, such as trucks, or for certain times of the day (RCW 46.61.415(5)).

### Noise

The city may also be able to control traffic with noise regulations. A city may regulate noise generated by traffic if the noise debases the quality of life in that community. A court decision in 1978 held that a residential community may “restrict the flow of traffic in residential areas in order to reduce noise...” when the development of an industrial zone substantially impacted the residential zone through “the increase of truck traffic to and from the industrial zone, and the speed, noise and dust...debased the quality of living in the residential neighborhood” (*Mackie v. Seattle, 1978*). For example, if traffic to/from the Point Wells area debases the quality of life for those living along Richmond Beach Drive, the City may enact noise regulations on trucks. Otherwise, RCW 70.107.060 authorizes the City to impose its own noise regulation on trucks if the regulations are first approved by the Department of Ecology.

### Street Closure

The City may restrict or close its streets to any class of vehicles if use of the street by that class of vehicle (trucks, for example) will greatly damage those streets, be a danger to traffic, or impede street maintenance (RCW 47.48.010).

### Traffic Calming

Traffic calming includes a number of techniques, education efforts, and devices to manage the speed, flow or behavior of traffic on the street system – with the purpose of improving safety, reducing speed, or shifting traffic from non-arterial streets onto nearby arterial streets. Different strategies are appropriate in different locations.

For example, an arterial street generally provides a higher degree of vehicular mobility than non-arterial roads. High vehicular mobility not only improves economic vitality but also provides emergency vehicle access and ensures adequate response times in an area. Historically, the City has elected to not implement traffic calming devices on arterial streets and the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program, adopted by Council, includes a policy not to use speed humps, traffic circles, or chicanes on such streets. The City uses traffic calming tools on non-arterial streets after an engineering review of their need, safety, and efficacy deems them appropriate.

Richmond Beach Drive presents a unique situation. Richmond Beach Drive is currently classified as a non-arterial street north of NW 199<sup>th</sup> Street (it is a Collector Arterial between NW 196<sup>th</sup> Street and NW 199<sup>th</sup> Street). However, the Point Wells Subarea Plan has several policies that may affect this classification. Should the developer of Point Wells complete a Transportation Corridor Study (TCS) and ensure that mitigation projects are funded, the City Council may consider reclassifying the northern segment of Richmond Beach Drive to an arterial classification. If the TCS is not completed and mitigation measures not funded, Council may keep the roadway as a non-arterial and traffic calming devices such as circles, speed humps, etc. may be considered.

### Signalized Traffic Flow Regulation (Metering)

Metering in its typical application regulates the flow of traffic entering freeways according to current traffic conditions. Traffic merging onto a freeway can be a major

cause of slowdowns, and ramp metering can be utilized to set the pace of merging traffic to maintain traffic speeds. Many typical metering applications include bypass lanes for carpools and buses and the current right-of-way on Richmond Beach Drive may not allow for bypass lanes. Overall, metering on non-arterial or arterial streets is not a typical application.

In implementing metering, the City would have to follow warrants included in the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). The MUTCD is adopted by WAC 468-95-010. Cities are required to follow the MUTCD per RCW 47.36.030 and RCW 47.36.060. As a “meter” on city streets would be considered a signal, signals are to be installed per MUTCD guidelines, which this scenario would most likely not meet.

### Tolling

Staff has conducted a very high-level analysis of potential tolling systems, their implementation and possible impacts of tolls in a report titled Tolling and the Shoreline Transportation Benefit District (Attachment B).

State law provides that the Shoreline Transportation Benefit District (TBD) may implement tolls on a city street such as Richmond Beach Drive if there is no ‘significant impact’ to a state facility as determined by the Washington State Transportation Commission (RCW 47.56.078). Current traffic flow analysis of Richmond Beach Drive indicate that tolling of Richmond Beach Drive would most likely not have a significant impact on a state facility. A simple majority of voters within the TBD would have to approve the toll by proposition at a general or special election before a toll may be implemented.

If tolling is approved by voters, the TBD Board must develop a material change policy to the TBD’s current plans to address major plan changes that affect project delivery or the ability to finance the plan - adding a new stream of revenue in the form of tolls and detailing how the revenue will be spent meets this criteria. The material change policy must at least address material changes to the plan involving costs for improvements, the scope of those improvements, and the schedule for making the improvements, the level of change that will require the Board’s involvement, and how the Board will address those changes (RCW 36.73.160). As well, as has been practice since Shoreline’s TBD was created, the district must continue to issue an annual report, indicating the status of transportation improvement costs, transportation improvement expenditures, revenues, and construction schedules (RCW 36.73.160).

There are a number of tolling systems and methods for collecting tolls. These systems can be broken into two categories: ‘open-road’ and staffed toll booths. In open-road tolling, vehicles do not stop to pay a toll; their movements are tracked electronically, and an invoice is sent to the registered owner of the vehicle, or the owner pre-purchases/loads their toll account beforehand (like the “good to go” pass already in place at various Washington State toll locations). ‘Open-road’ toll systems rely on photographic capture or transponders in a vehicle to identify an account holder and

assess the toll rate based on location of the toll. Alternatively, staffed toll booths are standing structures that house an employee who handles a cash transaction for the toll. Regardless, of the type of system, there are a number of risks associated with tolling, including public acceptance and approval and the potential for litigation.

To date, tolling in Washington State has been implemented as a revenue-generating tool to fund capital projects and maintenance of existing transportation infrastructure. There have been no TBDs in the State of Washington that have implemented tolling. Implementing tolling primarily as a method to control and regulate traffic may well require a different approach to implementation than establishing tolling as a revenue generating tool.

### Policy, Engineering, and Fiscal Questions

If the Council were interested in considering the implementation of tolling or the installation of additional traffic calming devices on City streets, a number of policy questions would need to be answered. Below are just a few questions that Council would likely want to consider:

- What would the proposed toll rate be? What policy issues should be considered when determining a recommended toll rate (i.e., 100% recovery of cost to implement and collect tolls, over what period of time, collect for specific projects and over what time period, etc.)?
- Should toll rates be variable? Should toll rates be higher during peak travel hours than non-peak hours? Do large/oversized vehicles pay a higher toll rate or should a flat toll rate for all vehicles be implemented?
- Should any group or population receive a discounted toll rate or pay no toll? Does equity and fairness have a role in tolling? What are the definitions of each in this case?
- Should a “non-toll” route be provided or required if tolling is to be considered?
- What sort of physical space is required for tolling? Will the TBD need to acquire land to accommodate infrastructure or additional traffic revisions? Is there adequate right-of-way?
- Should the City change its policies concerning implementing traffic calming devices on non-arterial streets?
- Specific to Richmond Beach Drive:
  - Are there other options to tolling that might generate funds for transportation improvements on Richmond Beach Drive?
  - How might construction of a second in/egress route for vehicular traffic affect traffic flow and any traffic control devices if constructed after their implementation?
  - Which direction of Richmond Beach Drive should be tolled if the Council were interested in tolling this corridor? Both northbound and southbound?

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

A number of City street regulatory options are available to the City, each carrying their own cost. Given that this item has been scheduled for introductory discussion the

financial analysis for any specific regulatory option has not been conducted. Attachment B, Tolling, does include a range of cost for various methods of toll collection.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that Council discuss the various regulatory options available to the City and determine if there is additional information needed for any potential policy recommendations that Council would like staff to bring back for consideration. Council's current direction to staff on city street regulations as they relate to the Point Wells development and the developer, BSRE, is to continue negotiating with the developer to secure appropriate and necessary mitigations for potential traffic impacts, along with addressing the other principles and interests in the City's 2011 Letter of Intent.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A: 2011 Letter of Intent

Attachment B: Tolling and the Shoreline Transportation Benefit District: Systems, Implementation and Financial Impacts

Attachment C: Shoreline Street Classifications Map



SHORELINE  
CITY COUNCIL

Keith A. McGlashan  
Mayor

Will Hall  
Deputy Mayor

Chris Eggen

Doris McConnell

Christopher Roberts

Terry Scott

Shari Winstead

August 24, 2011

BSRE Point Wells, LP  
c/o Gary Huff  
1201 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, Suite 2900  
Seattle, WA 98101

Re: Letter of Intent to Negotiate an Agreement with BSRE Pt. Wells, LP

Dear Mr. Huff:

The City of Shoreline (City) has an interest in reaching agreement regarding the Point Wells Urban Center permit(s) currently pending before Snohomish County. While the City is prepared to pursue litigation to protect the interests of Shoreline citizens and taxpayers, we believe that by negotiating a mutually satisfactory agreement(s), all parties can avoid the cost, uncertainty, and risk inherent in litigation.

This Letter of Intent (LOI) outlines the principles and interests that will guide the City's good faith negotiations with BSRE Point Wells, LP (BSRE) and others regarding development of the Point Wells Project.

1. The City proposes that the traffic model for completing the Richmond Beach Road corridor study by BSRE be agreed to by the parties with a detailed mitigation project list, funding responsibility, and schedule as determined by that study. The approach and studies performed to date by DEA (BSRE's Traffic Consultant) continue to make positive progress in ultimately reaching agreement with the future traffic analysis. We anticipate that these studies shall serve as the basis for the future agreement contemplated herein. We also anticipate that the final agreement and supporting studies will be submitted to Snohomish County to assist in the preparation of the project Environmental Impact Statement and the City would accept the adequacy of the EIS regarding project traffic impacts if the EIS substantially adopts this study.
2. In measuring impacts on affected City intersections and road segments, the City agrees to utilize a combination of level of service standards for City intersections and a fixed number of trips to be allowed on Richmond Beach Drive NW.

The City believes that the City's interests will best be served by a phased development where actual traffic counts associated with the Point Wells project are measured against a verifiable cap of trips for the project. This project trip cap would be mutually agreed upon by the City and BSRE. The City will negotiate a formula to allow future project building permit applications by BSRE based on the measurement of actual trips and peer-reviewed internal capture rates generated by prior occupancies and anticipated for future development phases.

Under this approach, a projection of actual traffic counts and updated analyses based on this formula would predict how traffic associated with each phase of development would measure against the project trip cap and level of service standard. The level of service (LOS) standard would be D (LOS D) for the average of each designated intersection and with the intent of no arterial through movement less than LOS E. The intersections affected by this standard shall be mutually agreed to by the City and BSRE. All segments between the designated intersections shall conform to mitigation recommended by the corridor study.

Using this approach, if the prediction of traffic is within the project trip cap and within the LOS standard, then future project building permit applications may be submitted for each analyzed phase of development.

In the event this approach predicts that such additional development either would exceed the project traffic cap or the LOS standard, then the application for permits shall not be submitted. BSRE may propose changes to the project and/or mutually acceptable additional mitigating measures (e.g., accommodating all modes of transportation) that 1) result in a predicted compliance with both measures; or 2) predict a shorter delay within the LOS standard for the designated intersections and include mitigation for road segments recommended in the initial or supplemental environmental review of the excess trips. The City will consider such changes only after soliciting and receiving public comment.

3. The City will participate in jointly designing and administering a public process to engage the affected community in helping identify and evaluate mitigation alternatives for Richmond Beach Drive NW, Richmond Beach Road, and N. 185<sup>th</sup> Street to Aurora Ave. N.
4. As stated in its comprehensive plan for over a decade, the City believes it is the most logical long term provider of municipal services to Point Wells, and that annexation to the City is the best way for BSRE to meet its financial obligation to fund ongoing operation and maintenance costs as direct impacts of the Point Wells development. In lieu of ongoing payments to address ongoing maintenance and operation costs of City infrastructure, including but not limited to, its road network and parks system, BSRE will

be expected to assign to the City an exclusive limited power of attorney, as owner. This limited power may be used by the City to file an annexation notice of intent and petition at a future date to be negotiated (but in any event no sooner than the issuance by Snohomish County of certificates of occupancy for at least 1,000 units). The City anticipates that Snohomish County shall retain responsibility to process all permits and conduct all inspections for the project. The City proposes to enter into an interlocal agreement with Snohomish County to formalize the expectations for local government service delivery, annexation, and the county's continued role in processing, issuing, and inspecting and collecting fees for development permits for the project, notwithstanding any future annexation of the property into Shoreline.

The City intends to negotiate with BSRE a maintenance and operation payment agreement that would not be activated unless and until the City exercises its right to use the limited power of attorney and such annexation effort proves unsuccessful for any reason. The annexation power of attorney and maintenance and operation agreement under this paragraph would be recorded as a covenant running with the land and obligate future owners of BSRE's Point Wells property.

5. Upon the successful execution of a Municipal Agreement pursuant to SCC 30.34A.180, and/or an alternative form of Agreement with BSRE with covenants under paragraph 4 which satisfactorily addresses these City interests, the City will simultaneously stipulate to the validity of the current BSRE permit applications with Snohomish County, stipulate to dismissal of any pending litigation, and covenant not to pursue further litigation other than provisions that may be reserved to enforce to the terms of a Municipal or alternative Agreement. In addition, the City will use its best efforts to urge its public safety partners, Shoreline Fire Department and King County Sheriff, to provide immediate and ongoing services to Point Wells.

The City Council supports moving forward on this process and has directed City staff to commence a public process to inform the City's negotiations with BSRE. The City will negotiate in good faith with BSRE to reach mutually satisfactory agreement(s).

Sincerely,



Julie T. Underwood  
City Manager

**Tolling and the Shoreline Transportation**  
**Benefit District:**  
**Systems, Implementation and Potential Financial**  
**Impacts**

**January 2015**

## **Executive Summary**

RCW 35.74 authorizes a Transportation Benefit District (TBD), with voter approval, to implement tolling on city streets. Several Shoreline community members and some Councilmembers have raised questions about the ability to toll Richmond Beach Drive, where there is only one current ingress and egress to the Point Wells area where a mixed-use community development is planned for the area in the coming years.

Before implementing tolls on any road, there are a number of policy, engineering, and fiscal questions to be considered and answered (see Attachment A). Once these questions are answered, an in-depth analysis may be conducted to determine the full range of potential costs, the impacts on traffic, and the general public acceptance of tolling.

Additionally, implementing tolling through a TBD and establishing a toll on a city street would be the first of its kind in the State and perhaps nationally, and would likely face many practical and legal challenges.

## Background

Several Shoreline community members and some Councilmembers have raised questions about the ability to have the Shoreline Transportation Benefit District toll Richmond Beach Drive, where there is only one current ingress and egress to the Point Wells area where a mixed-use community development is planned for the area in the coming years. In its current configuration, the road will not accommodate the anticipated increase in number of trips to/from the proposed Point Wells development without breaking the City's adopted transportation level of service.

A transportation benefit district (TBD) is a quasi-municipal corporation and independent taxing district created for the sole purpose of acquiring, constructing, improving, providing, and funding transportation improvements within the district.

Consistent with RCW 36.73, the Shoreline City Council created a TBD in June 2009 with approval of Ordinance No. 550. With this ordinance, the Shoreline TBD was formed and a new chapter to the Shoreline Municipal Code, entitled "Transportation Benefit District" was adopted (SMC 3.60). The ordinance specifies that the boundaries for the TBD be coextensive with the City limits. In July 2009, the Shoreline TBD Board passed Ordinance No. 1, authorizing a vehicle license fee of \$20 for all vehicles whose tabs expire on or after February 1, 2010.

Funds used to operate the TBD must make transportation improvements that are consistent with existing regional, state, and local transportation plans and necessitated by existing and reasonably foreseeable congestion levels as provided in Chapter 36.73 RCW. The Shoreline City Council further determined that it is in the public interest to provide for transportation improvements that specifically focus on reducing the risk of transportation facility failure and improving safety, decreasing travel time, increasing daily and peak period trip capacity, improving modal connectivity, and preserving and maintaining optimal performance of transportation infrastructure (SMC 3.60.020).

Under State statutes, TBDs are allowed a variety of methods to fund transportation improvements, including:

- Single-year, voter-approved excess property tax levies
- Multi-year, voter-approved excess property tax levies for bond redemption
- General obligation bonds and revenue bonds
- A voter-approved sales tax of up to 0.2%, which may not exceed a ten-year period without voter reauthorization (unless the revenues are dedicated to the repayment of debt, such as general obligation bonds, in which case the sales tax may exceed a ten-year period)
- <sup>1</sup>A voter-approved motor vehicle license renewal fee of a maximum of \$100. Up to \$20 may be imposed without voter approval if imposed in a jurisdiction-wide TBD.
- <sup>2</sup>With voter and State Transportation Commission approval, vehicle tolling

---

<sup>1</sup> To impose either fee, the TBD's boundaries must be countywide or citywide, or if applicable, in the unincorporated county.

<sup>2</sup> Tolls on state routes must be administered by WSDOT. All tolls potentially impacting state facilities must be approved by the State Transportation Commission. Staff has determined that the Shoreline TBD may implement tolls on a city street such as Richmond Beach Drive if there is no 'significant impact' to a state facility as determined by the Washington State Transportation Commission (RCW 47.56.078). Current traffic flow analysis of Richmond Beach Drive would most likely indicate that tolling of Richmond Beach Drive would not have a significant impact on a state facility.

- LID formation
- Border area motor fuel/special fuel excise tax (only for a district that has an international border crossing within its boundaries)
- <sup>1</sup>Commercial and industrial development fees related to transportation projects
- Acceptance of gifts, grants, and donations

### **Implementation of Tolling**

Tolling a city street through a TBD requires a number of processes and steps. Various statutes govern how and when a TBD may implement tolling.

Tolls may be established and collected by a TBD if there is no 'significant impact' to a state facility and if the road on which the toll is collected is a city street (RCW 47.56.078). The Washington State Transportation Commission as the 'tolling authority' would make the final determination on a toll's potential impact on a state facility (RCW 36.73.040). With regard to the BSRE development at Point Wells, current traffic flow analysis of Richmond Beach Drive would most likely indicate that the tolling of that street would not have a significant impact on a state facility.

A simple majority of voters within the TBD would have to approve the toll by proposition at a general or special election before a toll may be implemented. The proposition must include a specific description of the transportation improvement(s) proposed by the district and the range of tolls to raise revenue to fund the improvement(s) (RCW 36.73.065).

If tolling is approved by voters, the TBD Board must develop a material change policy to address major plan changes that affect project delivery or the ability to finance the plan - adding a new stream of revenue in the form of tolls and detailing how the revenue will be spent meets this criteria. The material change policy must at least address material changes to the plan involving costs for improvements, the scope of those improvements, and the schedule for making the improvements, the level of change that will require the Board's involvement, and how the Board will address those changes (RCW 36.73.160). As well, as has been the practice since Shoreline's TBD was created, the district must continue to issue an annual report, indicating the status of transportation improvement costs, transportation improvement expenditures, revenues, and construction schedules (RCW 36.73.160).

### Funds for Maintenance

Questions have been raised as to whether funds may be used for maintenance of city streets in general, or only for the maintenance of facilities specifically identified in a state, regional or local plan. A number of local and regional plans contain provisions for maintenance of existing infrastructure. City staff feels confident that a TBD may use funds toward maintenance of existing infrastructure consistent with the City's plans.

Chapter 36.73 RCW states that funds raised by a TBD must be used for transportation improvements that are consistent with existing regional, state, and local transportation plans. RCW 36.73.015 defines "transportation improvement" as "a project contained in the transportation plan of the state, a regional transportation planning organization, city, county... Projects may also include the operation, preservation, and maintenance of these facilities or programs."

Also, the *Washington Transportation Plan 2030*, adopted by the Washington Transportation Commission, includes a policy goal to “maintain, preserve, and extend the life and utility of prior investments in transportation systems and services” (page iv). Also, the Puget Sound Regional Council’s *Transportation 2040* states that “investments must address the urgent task of repairing and maintaining existing transportation assets” (page 52).

Moreover, as of October 2, 2014, a bill in the Washington State House of Representatives, HB 1892, clarifies the types of ‘transportation improvements’ which a TBD may undertake and expend funds. The bill expands the current definition of a transportation improvement eligible to receive the TBD funds from certain transportation projects and programs of regional and statewide significance to also include transportation projects and programs of local significance. The House passed HB 1892 on February 13, 2014 and on March 13, 2014, the bill was returned by the Senate to the House Rules Committee for a third reading. Passage of this bill should solidly clarify any remaining questions on what constitutes a ‘transportation improvement’.

Regardless of HB 1892, *Washington Transportation Plan 2030* and *Transportation 2040* include maintenance of existing transportation assets. Therefore, the TBD is not limited to building, expanding or otherwise improving city streets and may use funds for general transportation maintenance purposes identified in the City’s plan.

### **Tolling Systems**

There are a number of tolling systems and methods for collecting tolls. These systems can be broken into two categories: ‘open-road’ and staffed toll booths.

In open-road tolling, vehicles do not stop to pay a toll; their movements are tracked electronically. ‘Open-road’ toll systems rely on photographic capture or transponders in a vehicle to identify an account holder and assess the toll rate based on location of the toll. In transponder and license-plate systems, each vehicle passes under gantries that are equipped with transponder readers or cameras. If the vehicle has a transponder on its windshield, the tolling equipment automatically deducts the toll from the corresponding driver’s prepaid account. If the vehicle does not have a transponder, the tolling equipment takes a photograph of the vehicle’s license plate, uses optical character recognition software to read the plate, identifies the vehicle’s registered owner, and prepares a bill to be mailed to the owner.

This tolling category is the least invasive for drivers and creates little, if any, congestion because drivers may continue through toll areas with the flow of traffic, often at highway speeds. ‘Open-road’ methods are in use by WSDOT on the Tacoma Narrows Bridge, Highway 520 and on High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes on SR 167.

Staffed toll booths, on the other hand, require drivers to stop at a toll to pay the required rate and may create traffic back-ups. Staffed toll booths are in use by WSDOT on the Tacoma Narrows Bridge alongside ‘open-road’ systems. It should be noted that staffed toll booths and related facilities must accommodate any State required “workplace” requirements.

Regionally, the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) employs several toll assessment and payment methods within these categories:

Good To Go! Pass: is an electronic tolling system. Drivers are assigned a unique transponder. *Good To Go!* customers prepay their tolls into an account; the tolls are then electronically deducted as the customer passes through an electronic toll collection location. Drivers pay the lowest toll rate with a *Good to Go! Pass*.

Pay by Plate: is also an electronic tolling system. This method requires a vehicle's license plate be photographically captured. The vehicle's license plate number is linked to a pre-paid account through which tolling charges are automatically deducted. An additional \$.25 is charged for drivers of two-axle vehicles than the *Good To Go!* pass rate.

Pay by Mail: is also an electronic tolling system in that it too requires a vehicle's license plate to be photographically captured. The license plate is then matched with its corresponding vehicle registration information and a toll bill is mailed to the driver's address within 14 days of crossing. This is the most expensive way to pay. Toll rates are \$1.50 more than the toll rate for drivers of two-axle vehicles with a *Good To Go!* Pass.

Toll booths: Drivers pay with cash or credit at the time of crossing. This method requires drivers to stop to pay the toll.

## **Requirements**

In general, toll collection can be achieved through three possible tolling schemes – staffed or cash toll collection only (toll booths and barriers), all electronic tolling ('open-road') and a mix of cash and all electronic tolling. Each has its own challenges and associated costs.

Staff contacted WSDOT's Toll Division to ascertain rough cost estimates and requirements for different tolling options. The following information is provided for informational purposes only and should not be taken as a representation of actual costs and do not represent an offer of tolling services by WSDOT. Overall, there are a number of factors which should be thoroughly investigated before a preferred solution is selected.

### 'Open-Road' Tolling

The equipment needed for open-road tolling depends on tolling scheme. Depending on the tolling scheme, implementing and operating an open road toll plaza requires:

- Toll Plaza Infrastructure – Gantries and cabinets for toll equipment, and civil infrastructure (roadway improvements for safety, signage, lighting, etc.)
- Toll Collections Systems – Vehicle detection system, vehicle classification system (if necessary), license plate identification equipment, communication equipment, etc.
- Toll Collection Operating Costs – customer service staff, image review staff, toll enforcement staff, administrative staff, third party costs (printing/postage, insurance, bank/credit card fees, audit, etc).
- Toll Plaza Maintenance – maintenance to roadway and toll collection system infrastructure.
- Toll Collection System Maintenance

Open-road tolling also requires a "back office" (customer service center) via WSDOT to house equipment, process transactions and manage accounts. The office houses the central computing system as well as administrative and customer relations personnel.

Designing, constructing, and implementing an open-road tolling system may take approximately two years. If the TBD elected to partner with WSDOT, WSDOT may assist in finding a vendor to install the necessary tolling equipment. For ongoing operations, the Shoreline TBD could choose to establish an agreement with WSDOT for the back-end support mentioned above.

#### Staffed Toll Booths (Cash Toll Collection)

Staffed toll booths are standing structures that house an employee who handles a cash transaction. These types of toll booths were the most common way to collect tolls before open-road toll technology existed which conduct transactions automatically. They rely on employees to handle cash transactions. Staffed toll booths tend to be slower, prone to mistakes, and more expensive than electronic collection methods, and they require significant investments in real estate, construction, and maintenance. Staffed toll booth requirements may include:

- Toll Plaza Infrastructure – toll booth, personnel and cash handling facilities, gantries and cabinets for toll equipment, and civil infrastructure (roadway improvements for safety, signage, lighting, etc.)
- Toll Collections Systems – point of sale system (credit card capabilities), vehicle classification system (if necessary), security cameras, etc.
- Staffed Toll Collection Operating Costs – toll collection staff, administrative staff, third party costs (insurance, bank/credit card fees, audit, etc).
- Toll Plaza Maintenance – maintenance to roadway, toll booths, and toll collection system infrastructure.
- Toll Collection System Maintenance

Due to several factors, staffed toll collection systems are falling out of favor. Some of the reasons these types of systems are less favorable are:

- Increased construction and operating costs over an all-electronic solution
- Lower throughput (400/vehicles per hour vs. 1,600/vehicles per hour for open-road systems).
- A higher number of paying motorists are required to pass through the toll to break even due to potentially higher overhead costs compared to open-road tolling. Thus, staffed toll booths may be less suitable for low-traffic roads.
- Decreased safety due to queuing at toll plaza
- Increased greenhouse gas emissions due to queuing at toll plaza

The location of a tolling system also needs to consider adequate right-of-way to construct a toll plaza, and install necessary tolling equipment such as gantries, cash handling facilities, lights, etc. As well, toll booth staff would require restroom facilities, power, water, employee parking, and other typical work place accommodations.

#### Mixed Toll Collection (Cash and Open-Road Tolling)

Open-road tolling systems are often combined with toll booths. This configuration gives users more payment options and offers another way for users to maintain the privacy of their data. However, staffed toll booths are costly, even as a side option, so the general industry trend is toward open-road tolling. Space, facility and staffing costs would be much the same as those identified above.

## Potential Issues

### Public Acceptance

Implementing tolling on a city street would be the first of its kind in Washington State, and because of that, some opposition to tolling may be ideologically based. I.e., tolling on a city street may be perceived as an additional tax; whereas, other opposition may be based upon perceptions regarding implementation (such as variable pricing being too complicated or unfair). The precedence of tolls in an area can be an advantage if the public is familiar with the concept. Shoreline residents may not favor tolling as they may desire to visit businesses and neighbors in a particular location without having to pay a toll to do so. Consideration of these factors when deciding whether to utilize tolling will be critical.

There may also be equity issues surrounding tolling. Equity issues may relate to who pays the toll, at what cost, and how the generated revenues are used. Some may fear that tolling is too restrictive, and having larger impacts on less affluent drivers. Additionally, because there is only one existing route in and out of the Point Wells area (Richmond Beach Drive), there is no 'free' alternative. All drivers using a particular street will potentially pay a toll, though the potential implementation of a discounted toll may benefit some drivers and not others. This may ease anxieties about tolling for some while increasing it for others.

### Legal

Because it will be the first attempt at tolling a street within a city, legal challenges will be likely. Prior to implementing a tolling system, the TBD should receive a thorough legal analysis on potential risks and challenges. Staff can provide this at the request of Council.

## Financial Impact

### 'Open-road' Tolls

Capital and on-going costs for 'open-road' systems vary with the difficulty of the installation and the number of cameras on the gantry.

WSDOT has provided the following cost ranges as a very rough estimate.

Requirement	Potential cost range
Toll Plaza Infrastructure – Gantries and cabinets for toll equipment, and civil infrastructure (roadway improvements for safety, signage, lighting, etc.)	\$1 - \$2 million
Toll Collections Systems – Vehicle detection system, vehicle classification system (if necessary), license plate identification equipment, communication equipment, etc.	\$0.5 - \$1.0 million per lane
Toll Collection Operating Costs – customer service staff, image review staff, toll enforcement staff, administrative staff, third party costs (printing/postage, insurance, bank/credit card fees, audit, etc).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• \$0.08 - \$0.18 per transponder-based toll transaction</li><li>• \$0.35 - \$0.65 per image-based toll transaction</li></ul>
Toll Plaza Maintenance – maintenance to roadway and toll collection system infrastructure.	2% - 5% of construction costs annually
Toll Collection System Maintenance	8% - 12% of system installation costs annually

WSDOT personnel also noted that some of the electronic equipment may have a useful life of seven to ten years and would need replacing within that timeframe due to changes in technology and/or general wear and tear.

Staffed toll booth

Staffed toll booths are costly to build and operate. Manual toll plazas can cost as much as five times the amount of all-electronic toll plazas, depending on the tolling scheme and roadway configuration.

WSDOT has provided the following costs as a very rough estimate.

Requirement	Potential cost range
Toll plaza infrastructure, including a toll booth, personnel and cash handling facilities, gantries and cabinets for toll equipment, and civil infrastructure (roadway improvements for safety, signage, cash handling facilities, restroom facilities, power, water, employee parking, lighting, etc.)	\$1 - \$5 million per lane
Toll collections systems, including a point of sale system (for credit card payment capabilities), vehicle classification system (if necessary), security cameras, etc.	\$0.125 - \$0.350 million per lane
Staffed toll collection operating costs include toll collection staff, administrative staff, third party costs (insurance, bank/credit card fees, audit, etc).	\$0.12 - \$0.35 per toll transaction
Toll plaza maintenance which includes maintenance to the roadway, toll booths, and toll collection system infrastructure.	2% - 5% of construction costs annually
Toll Collection System Maintenance	8% - 12% of system installation costs annually

It is important to note that the capital and on-going costs above may be near the high end of the spectrum due to WSDOT's typical complexity of design and operational requirements. It is possible that the TBD may implement a much smaller scale toll plaza and booth and thus significantly reduce costs. For example, a toll plaza and booth similar to a staffed pay station at a parking garage might be implemented. This sort of design may be less technically complex and require less physical space than the system suggested by WSDOT. To establish an approximate cost, a number of policy questions would need answering and an analysis of necessary operational and design requirements must be conducted.

Reduced Toll Rates

Reduced or discounted toll rates (for example, Shoreline residents might be offered a discounted rate) are possible to implement if the TBD desires to reduce the financial burden on its residents. Both open-road and staffed toll booths allow the opportunity to establish a driver's residency.

Photographically capturing license plates through an 'open-road' system allows the vehicle to be linked to its registration information and therefore reduced toll rates may be assessed based on vehicle's registered address. If using transponders to assess tolls, and back-end support is provided by WSDOT a discounted toll rate is possible. A 2012 memorandum between City of Kenmore Staff and Lochner, one of the City's consultants on the issue of tolling, states

WSDOT's Good-to-Go system does have the capability to recognize types of users. This is possible based on the type of transponder technology they selected for the system. WSDOT's system does have the capability to provide a discount for residents. This could be achieved two ways: the City could distribute a certain range of transponder numbers to residents and give non-residents other tags; or, residents could set up a certain kind of account that would be given a discount. The back office system, run by their customer service center consultant, could also be set up to charge residents only once per day regardless of the number of trips they took based on their transponder or account type.

At a staffed toll booth, residency could be established by the driver's address printed on their license. Residents with a Shoreline address might be assessed a different toll rate than non-residents.

Toll Rates

A number of policy questions and considerations (Attachment A) must be answered to appropriately analyze potential toll rates. For example, toll rates may be variable based on the time of day and the number of axes on a vehicle. WSDOT has implemented a variety of tolling methodologies:

<b>Tacoma Narrows Bridge Toll Rates</b>			
<b>Number of Axles</b>	<b>Good To Go! Pass</b>	<b>Cash</b>	<b>Pay By Mail</b>
Two (includes motorcycles)	\$4.50	\$5.50	\$6.50
Three	\$6.75	\$8.25	\$9.75
Four	\$9.00	\$11.00	\$13.00
Five	\$11.25	\$13.75	\$16.25
Six or more	\$13.50	\$16.50	\$19.50

<b>SR 520 Bridge Toll Rates</b>		
<b>Monday - Friday</b>	<b>Good To Go! Pass</b>	<b>Pay By Mail</b>
Midnight to 5 a.m.	\$0	\$0
5 a.m. to 6 a.m.	\$1.75	\$3.35
6 a.m. to 7 a.m.	\$3.00	\$4.60
7 a.m. to 9 a.m.	\$3.80	\$5.40
9 a.m. to 10 a.m.	\$3.00	\$4.60
10 a.m. to 2 p.m.	\$2.40	\$4.05
2 p.m. to 3 p.m.	\$3.00	\$4.60
3 p.m. to 6 p.m.	\$3.80	\$5.40
6 p.m. to 7 p.m.	\$3.00	\$4.60
7 p.m. to 9 p.m.	\$2.40	\$4.05
9 p.m. to 11 p.m.	\$1.75	\$3.35
11 p.m. to 11:59 p.m.	\$0	\$0

Presumably, toll rates and the number of average daily trips (ADT) through the tolling area have an impact on one another and both may affect the TBD's ability to collect revenue. As noted above, 'open-road' and staffed tolling booths have different implementation and on-going costs which will also affect the TBD's net revenue.

Average Daily Trips (ADT)

BSRE's Urban Center Development Application submitted to Snohomish County included an ADT cap of 11,587. In short, BSRE believes the maximum combined total of vehicles entering or exiting the development on an average day would not exceed 11,587. This figure is the projected number of trips at full build-out and full occupancy of the development. Full build-out and occupancy may not occur until 20 to 25 years after project start.

The development plan at Point Wells is planned to be constructed in phases. Construction of each phase may be affected by many factors including the ADT resulting from each constructed phase. For example, if the ADT cap is nearly reached before the final phase development may be prohibited or otherwise changed to prevent exceeding the ADT. Revenue generation would also be affected by phasing. Most likely, the TBD would not realize the full capacity of tolling revenue in the initial phases of the project. Revenue would most likely increase with each phase with more traffic and residents visiting and living in the development.

Tolling systems, toll amounts paid by drivers, maintenance costs and other factors may greatly affect the ADT and thus, toll collection.

### Other

The TBD will be billed for the cost of the election in which the ballot measure to approve tolls appears. The final cost for the election is allocated based on the number of eligible voters in the district and other districts or jurisdictions throughout the County that may also have issues on the ballot during that election.

Although the TBD has not had any recent elections from which to draw comparisons, the City (whose boundaries are coextensive with the TBD) has conducted several elections in the past years. All active, registered voters within the City were eligible for the below elections. The election and voters' pamphlet costs below indicate an average cost of \$67,000:

- May 16, 2006 Special Election: Open Space, Parks and Trails Bond
  - Election: \$65,898.16
  - Pamphlet: \$1,126.20
  - **Total: \$67,024.36**
  
- November 2, 2010 General Election: Levy for Public Safety, Park Maintenance and Operations and Community Services
  - Election: \$55,444.09
  - Pamphlet: \$881.18
  - **Total: \$56,325.27**
  
- November 6, 2012 General Election: Acquisition and Local Control of Seattle Water Services in Shoreline
  - Election: \$75,071.82
  - Pamphlet: \$1,966.07
  - **Total: \$77,037.89**

### **Conclusion**

Though the TBD has a legal, presumably defensible path to implementing tolls, further analysis is needed to discern possible toll rates, general public acceptance, system requirements and full financial impacts including revenue generation capabilities, election costs, capital and on-going/maintenance costs.

# **Attachment A**

## **Tolling Policy Questions and Other considerations**

- What is the proposed toll rate? Or what policy issues should be considered when determining a recommended toll rate (i.e., 100% recovery of cost to implement and collect tolls, over what period of time, collect for specific projects and over what time period, etc.)
- Should toll rates be variable? Should toll rates be higher during peak travel hours than non-peak hours? Do large/oversized vehicles pay a higher toll rate or should a flat toll rate for all vehicles be implemented?
- Should any group or population receive a discounted toll rate, or pay no toll?
- Which direction of Richmond Beach Drive should be tolled? Both northbound and southbound?
- What are the political implications of tolling a city street? Would a simple majority of Shoreline TBD voters pass a ballot measure to implement tolls?
- Do equity and fairness have a role in tolling? What are the definitions of each in this case?
- How many days per week should tolls be collected? What hours per day should tolls be collected?
- Which toll collection method is right for the proposed tolling area; 'open-road' or staffed toll booths?
- What sort of physical space is required for tolling? Will the TBD need to acquire land to accommodate infrastructure or additional traffic revisions?
- How might construction of a second in/egress route for vehicular traffic affect traffic flow and any traffic control devices, including tolling, if constructed after their implementation?
- What might be the primary goal of implementing tolling, traffic and street regulation or revenue generation? How might each of those goals affect approach and implementation?

### Street Classification

City of Shoreline  
 Transportation Master Plan  
 with Amendments

-  Interstate
- Arterial Streets:**
-  Principal Arterial
-  Minor Arterial
-  Collector Arterial
- Non-Arterial Streets:**
-  Local Primary Street
-  Local Secondary Street
-  City Limits

