

SIDEWALKS – PRIORITY ROUTES

City of Shoreline Capital Improvement Project

PROBLEM SOLVING/DECISION MAKING PROCESS

The City of Shoreline's Transportation Management Plan is the long-range blue print for travel and mobility, describing a vision for transportation that supports the City's adopted land use plan.

The TMP reflects policy directions from City Council, Planning Commission, public comments, and technical analysis of existing conditions and external requirements (such as federal and state mandates).

The TMP focuses on satisfying travel demand and making efficient use of the existing infrastructure and providing the facilities and services to encourage walking, cycling and transit as priority modes.

State and regional policy and requirements included within:

- The 1990 State Growth Management Act
- The City's adopted Land Use Plan
- The Comprehensive Plan objectives
- King County's County wide planning policies

PLANNING PROCESS

The review and adoption process for the TMP, as well as the Comprehensive Plan and other Master Plans, included:

- Public open house and presentation of the Draft Comprehensive Plan and Master Plans
- Planning Commission Public Hearings and Plan Reviews
- Planning Commission Recommended Draft Comprehensive Plan and Master Plans
- City Council Public Hearings and Plan Reviews
- City Council Adoption of Comprehensive Plan and Master Plans

August 2002 – Bond Advisory Committee develops sidewalk project list around schools

September 2003 – City held public meetings early in the planning stage for public input on the plan

2003-2005 – City of Shoreline Planning Commission (Transportation Work Group) held a series of open meetings with the consultant team and city staff. Emphasis was put on pedestrian systems.

April 2005 – Staff report by the City Engineer, “Sidewalk Comprehensive Study Interim Report.

June 2005 – City Council adopts the city’s comprehensive plan and adds \$5 million to the pedestrian program.

July 11, 2005 – Draft Transportation Master Plan (TMP) adopted by Council (Resolution No. 234)

February 8, 2006 – Meeting with School District Superintendent, Principals, and PTA Representatives of Ridgecrest, Einstein, and Shorewood schools

PEDESTRIAN GOALS AND POLICIES (taken from the TMP)

Transportation Goals

- T.I.: Provide safe and friendly streets for Shoreline citizens.
- T.IV: Provide a pedestrian system that is safe, connects to destinations, accesses transit, and is accessible by all.

Transportation Policies for Safe and Friendly Streets

- T1: Make safety the first priority of citywide transportation planning and traffic management. Place a higher priority on pedestrian, bicycle, and automobile safety over vehicle capacity improvements at intersections.

Transportation Policies for Pedestrian System

- T26: Provide adequate, predictable, and dedicated funding to construct pedestrian projects.
- T27: Place high priority on sidewalk projects that abut or provide connections to schools, parks, transit, shopping, or large places of employment.
- T29: Provide sidewalks on arterial streets and neighborhood collectors.
- T30: Develop flexible sidewalk standards to fit a range of locations, needs and costs.
- T31: Work with the School District to determine and construct high priority safe school walk routes. The City should partner with the School District to achieve these goals.

EVALUATION PROCESS

In the sidewalk section of the TMP, this process considered all arterials in the City and combined quantitative project scoring and qualitative policy linked reviews. It used the weighted evaluation criteria below in a two-step ranking process of priority pedestrian routes.

The weighted criteria included school access issues, connections to parks, connections to existing sidewalks, linking 3 or more major destinations and connections to bus lines. It also addressed whether it was part of the 2002 Bond

Committee recommendation to the City Council. From this weighted criteria a list of priorities was created and Priority 1, 2 and 3 sidewalk lists were developed (see [Sidewalks Priority Map](#)).

Table 5-1. Pedestrian Project Evaluation Criteria (from the TMP)

Criteria	1 st Screen	2 nd Screen
School Access. Will sidewalk be within 10 blocks of a school?	60 points	Yes
Located on an Arterial. Will sidewalk be located on an arterial?	30-40 points	Yes
Connects to Park. Will sidewalk connect to a Park?	40 points	
Connect to Existing Sidewalk. Will sidewalk connect to an existing sidewalk?	30-40 points	
Completes Shoreline Loop. Will sidewalk help complete a "loop" around the City?	35 points	
Connects to Bus Line. Will sidewalk provide access to a bus line?	30 points	
Links 3 Major Destinations. Will sidewalk connect homes to neighborhood businesses, schools, and other recreation facilities?	20 points	
Bond Advisory Committee Priority #1 and #2. Was the sidewalk a highest priority of the Bond Advisory Committee?		Yes

PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES ANALYSIS

In the traditional method of public works construction, citizens are familiar with concrete curb, gutter and sidewalk providing an area for pedestrians to be and remain separated from vehicular traffic. This project investigated alternative treatments for pedestrian facilities that were possible beyond the traditional sidewalk. Not all treatments are possible in all locations without considerable cost and, in trying to extend the impact of limited funding, it was important be creative in the solutions for every street.

The [Pathway Concepts](#) provides a visual presentation of the alternative treatments analyzed for pedestrian facilities. For each route we will gather information to determine which of the alternative would be most effective for each segment to create a range of possible solutions and costs. Widened shoulders are not a strong recommendation and are only to be applied when no other solution can be built or financed.