

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 Jill Marilley, City Engineer, “Sidewalk Comprehensive Study Interim Report.

June 2005 – City Council adopts the city’s comprehensive plan and adds \$5.4 million to the Sidewalks – Priority Routes CIP 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. Refer to the Priority Pedestrian Projects 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 our standard concrete gutter, curb, amenity zone and sidewalk providing an area for pedestrians to be and remain separated from vehicular traffic. This project investigated alternative economical treatments for pedestrian facilities that were possible beyond the standard sidewalk configuration. 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.

In the 2006-2011 CIP the City Council created a significantly expanded "Sidewalks – Priority Routes" program to invest \$5.4 million over the next six years to construct both our standard sidewalks and alternative "pedestrian facilities". Constructing the entire list of projects identified in the TMP could cost as much as \$67 million for our standard concrete gutter-curb-amenity zone-sidewalk configuration on both sides of the street. Since the standard configuration can be expensive and does not easily work in some areas, the City is considering economical alternatives that will stretch tax dollars and provide more linear feet of pedestrian improvements. Examples of these alternatives

include concrete curbs with asphalt walkways, separated pathways, or widened shoulders. Using the alternative treatments analyzed for pedestrian facilities and the Priority Pedestrian Routes Map we then began a phase of gathering information along each route to determine which of the alternatives 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. Coordination with the City's Traffic Engineer will help determine where this can be done inexpensively in advance of future sidewalks.

PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS SELECTION STRATEGY FOR 2006

The City Council continues to emphasize the importance of sidewalks for safety, enhanced mobility, convenience, and recreation in Shoreline. This new CIP project will serve to enhance pedestrian safety near schools, parks, and bus lines to name a few, and to enhance our program for safe and friendly streets (Council Goal #2).

The City of Shoreline's Transportation Master Plan (TMP) is the long-range blueprint for travel and mobility and provides the guidance and prioritization for this and other projects in the CIP. The TMP project team together with City staff and a subcommittee from the Planning Commission identified potential sidewalk candidate projects and developed an evaluation process to prioritize these projects. This was last presented to Council on April 25, 2005 in a staff report entitled "Pedestrian Facility Comprehensive Study Interim Report"

In an effort to further refine the list of sidewalk projects in the TMP, staff developed a selection strategy for 2006 priority routes, subject to further review with the schools, Parent Teacher Association's, City Council, and citizen input. These routes were selected with the TMP goal and policies in mind and with the intent to:

- Build improvements on one side of the street to increase geographic coverage
- Seek first year sites that have minimal utility conflicts and other construction conflicts
- Focus improvements around schools, parks and community centers, transit, and existing and future trail systems with special emphasis on schools
- Utilize a mix of pedestrian facility types to increase coverage and save cost
- Focus on improvements that have a history of community interest and/or previous drainage improvements
- Focus on improvements where currently none exist or that are marginal

Referring to the 2006 Preliminary Pedestrian Projects Map, the 2006 recommended routes are:

Road	Segment	Criteria
10th Ave NE	NE 167th St - NE 175th St	Priority 2, School, High traffic volume, Community requests for improvements and involvement in the Neighborhood Transportation Action Plan which lists this segment as a high priority
3rd Ave NW	NW Richmond Bch Road - N 193rd St	Priority 1, Schools, Park, Transit, Commercial/Retail, Community requests for improvements
Dayton Ave N	Carlyle Hall Rd N - N 172nd St	Priority 1, Schools, Transit, High traffic volume
8th Ave NW	NW Richmond Bch Road - N 195th St	Priority 2, School, High traffic volume, Commercial/Retail

2006 Potential Additive Routes

Road	Segment	Criteria
N 195th St	Wallingford Ave N - Meridian Ave N	Priority 1, School, Park, City Loop, Trail Connectivity
Fremont Ave N	N 165th St - N 170th St	Priority 1, School, Community Center, Transit

These two priority 1 routes are additive because of the estimated budget and schedule constraints and because of the lower speeds and volumes compared to the other routes. They may be added to the 2006 projects if funding and schedule allow. Otherwise they will be preliminary routes for construction in 2007. Two priority 2 routes are included in the preliminary list due the practicality that many priority 1 routes have long lead times for removal of utilities or construction of storm drainage facilities that preclude them from construction in the first year of this new program.