

Sidewalk Advisory Committee

Meeting #2 Summary

July 27, 2017, 6:00 pm – 8:30 pm
Shoreline City Hall Council Chamber



Meeting Purpose

This was the second of nine meetings for the Sidewalk Advisory Committee (SAC). The scope of work for the SAC will focus on analyzing how to prioritize and fund pedestrian needs for both repair of existing sidewalks and installation of new sidewalks and alternative pedestrian treatments. At this meeting, staff reported back on feedback received at the prior meeting. SAC members reviewed draft safety, accessibility, and walkability criteria for prioritizing sidewalk projects and provided feedback.

Introduction / Housekeeping

Nora Daley-Peng (Project Manager, City of Shoreline) reviewed new materials. An updated prioritization framework was provided including some updates as a result of the prior meeting's discussions. An updated schedule was provided which moved some of the initial study items for tonight (trees/sidewalks discussion) to the September meeting. An agenda and copy of the night's presentation were also included.

A new member, Julie Miller, appointed by the City Manager was introduced to the committee. Julie walks Shoreline with the aid of a guide dog and will help bring a vital perspective to sidewalk discussions for the visually impaired.

Presentation – Project Team Report Back on Comments from Meeting No. 1

At the prior meeting, there were several suggestions for new or amended sidewalk project prioritization criteria. Following is a re-cap along with some of the changes made.

Safety Criteria Feedback

- The committee discussed adding criteria for all types of collisions. A criteria was added for all injury collisions (pedestrian, bike, and vehicle).
- Some committee members believed there should be more "points" for pedestrian collisions. A criteria was added for multiple pedestrian collisions.
- The idea of adding criteria for streets with a speed limit of 25 mph was discussed. It was determined by staff not to add this criteria at this time because it would include almost all streets in the City as a minimum and would not help to differentiate. Later in the meeting, a committee member suggested handling this with a "0 point" for 25 mph streets, so the public knows that it was considered rather than overlooked.
- It was discussed that instead of using posted speed limit, to set the criteria for actual speed on a particular street. This has not been changed at this time because, although the City has this data for some streets, it does not have it for all, and so would not be an equal criteria throughout the City.
- It was also mentioned at the prior meeting to use street illumination as a factor. This would require further development to be incorporated into the criteria as there are still some gaps in this discussion. Would it be the use of existing or absence of street lighting as the criteria? How

could it be determined if street lighting alone would improve the safety and a sidewalk was not needed?

- Criteria for limited sight lines has not been added because the available date the City has was not created for this type of application. Staff still need to determine what data could be used to identify this criteria.
- Staff is still working to clarify the criteria for “alternative to travel” and ask that the committee discuss this further in the evening’s breakout groups.

Accessibility Criteria Feedback

- Staff is still looking for a more inclusive term for “pedestrian.” Will use “non-motorized user” as a placeholder for now.
- Staff is working to clarify “accessibility.” When are ADA requirements as opposed to a broader sense of general access being implied?

Walkability Criteria Feedback

- There was much discussion at the last meeting regarding criteria for trips to schools. City staff could probably get school bus stop data and crosswalk metrics.
- Density/housing type was discussed as a metric at the first meeting, and a criteria for zoning density for mixed use has been added.
- There was prior discussion on ¼ mile radius vs ½ mile radius proximity to various facilities. It was determined by staff to leave at ¼ mile for now as the criteria should provide some granularity. For instance, looking at a map of the lesser ¼ mile radius to a park shows that the greater percentage of the City already falls within this criteria.
- The comment to use walksheds vs. pure radii was brought up at the prior meeting. This would involve a lot of work, so is still under consideration.

Equity Criteria Feedback

Equity is important to the City Council. Council Goal #4: Expand the City’s focus on equity and inclusion to enhance opportunities for community engagement.

- Per the “children in strollers” prior discussion, staff has added a metric for Young Children (0-4 years old).
- At the prior meeting, there was discussion as to whether some of the equity metrics overlapped. For instance, should “community of color” be combined with “limited English speakers.” City staff spoke with City of Seattle staff who have been working with the complex issue of equity. A lot of factors are involved, and the project team would like to continue looking at and exploring these many facets before merging any criteria in this category.
- Staff will try to look at the walkshed around facilities that serve people with disabilities and provide this data.

Scoring Feedback

- The project team expects conversations to keep touching back on points assigned to metrics. This is an iterative process. There may be reasons to weigh one metric more than others. Current points are a placeholder. The group will continue to look at this moving forward.
- There is a possibility of developing a second tier screening process for the high rating projects to provide better definition. There should also be a way to identify projects that would be suitable for alternative facilities (as opposed to traditional sidewalks) and projects where there is an opportunity to address additional criteria such as found in the ADA Plan (currently being developed), stormwater issues, etc.

The comment was made to include walkways around group homes in the criteria, and the committee was asked to make a note of this in their group discussions.

What's in a Name (Group Discussion)

This discussion was wrapped into the Report Back on What We Heard presentation by Nora Daley-Peng under the Accessibility criteria feedback. Staff received feedback to use a more inclusive term for “pedestrian.” Staff will use “non-motorized user” as a placeholder for now. In addition, a committee member suggested that the City rename the “Accessibility” criteria to “Access” to emphasize a broader sense of general non-motorized access and continue to have a metric dedicated to ADA compliance under the “Access” criteria.

Safety Criteria Exercise and Discussion

For the first group exercise of the night, small groups reviewed the criteria for **Safety** and provided the following feedback.

Safety:

- A metric for collisions may be an ineffective data point as collisions occur mostly where there is existing sidewalks (e.g. major arterials).
- Should map actual speeds where possible.
 - Include criteria for 40+ mph (this is likely an average speed on some streets regardless of a lower posted speed limit).
- Map actual street usage, not just speed and classification (e.g. cut-through traffic occurs on lesser streets). Add density/volume weighting.
 - Criteria for actual traffic volume/throughput (example: 10th and 12th Ave NE in Ridgecrest).
- Street classification seems redundant. Maybe better to use subjective/qualitative analysis of how safe pedestrians feel. Do they feel safe exposed to fast traffic?
- Survey if they prefer to walk minor arterials, etc. Look at pedestrian volume—where are people when they're not in their homes. Look at origin and destination.
 - Provide a pedestrian/non-motor volume data layer.
- Provide a street lighting overlay map with collision and pedestrian accident data to see relationships between lighting and collisions.
- Show 25 mph posted streets and collision data – do slower speeds actually reduce the number of collisions?
- Need better description of “alternative to travel” paths. Are these paths for recreation or to get from point A to point B, and how many of these pathways actually exist? How do these paths effectively contribute to the overall network?
- Appears to be some inaccuracies on the speed limit map.
- Is the collision criteria useful as it is? Would pattern of incidents vs number of collisions be beneficial?
- Need more information when collision point is near an intersection. Is the incident indicating people crossing the main road or crossing a side street?
- Assigning metric to road speeds is reasonable.
- Add criteria for 25 mph posted streets and assign 0 points (this indicates that the speed limit was identified).
- Need more definition of terms for the street classifications (how many lanes, turn pockets, etc.).
- Collect and provide data on streets used to cut-through. Streets used to cut-through also often experience speeds higher than posted.

- Pedestrian collisions should be more points. One conflict is 2 points, two conflicts is 3 points.
- Clarify that the second collision criteria listed (under 1a) is for pedestrians.
- Is the street classification criteria somewhat redundant to the speed limit?
 - Pedestrians may care more about speed of cars than volume of cars.
 - A principal arterial may already be better lit and safer?
- Alternative to travel paths may introduce different types of personal safety issues and may be a walkability issue (especially at night).
- Criteria for lighting: good lighting 0 points, no lighting 1 point.
- Criteria for poor sight distance. Measure the distance for various weighting?
 - Without clear data, have a citizen survey. People have experienced these areas and could provide feedback.
 - Does the City have any signs in place at limited sight distance locations? Map these areas of signage.

Accessibility and Walkability Criteria Exercise and Discussion

For the second group exercise of the night, small groups reviewed the criteria for Accessibility and Walkability and provided the following feedback.

Accessibility:

- Propose reversing the order of 2a, 2b, and 2c, prioritizing ADA upgrades and allotting points on the order of 3 for adjacent to facility in need of ADA upgrades, 2 for closing a gap, and 1 for extending an existing non-motorized facility. (Two groups listed this same weighting).
- ADA upgrades would provide a high value and optimizes costs to address both mandates for sidewalk facilities and ADA compliance.
- All of the accessibility criteria should be considered (not as a way to eliminate a project) and weighted appropriately.
- “Non-motorized facility” is still not an ideal term. Path, trail, sidewalk?
- Need more clarity on extending an existing non-motorized facility...what is each extending to?
- Should accessibility be secondary criteria and a way to further define high ranking projects as extending a facility and closing a gap may be a bit subjective?
- Should optimize for extending connections across I-5 since both stations are on the east side of I-5? Will other projects address this?
- Need to differentiate between ADA and accessibility to a certain area or where a person needs to go.
- Reduce “accessibility” to “access” and note where places aren’t meeting ADA standards.
- Need more info on why each gap exists. Is there something to access on the other side of the gap, or is there no need to close it?
- How is accessibility being measured? Would a mobility survey provide better/additional data?

Walkability:

- Need to identify how sidewalk projects may be replicated by other funding sources (e.g. Safe Routes to School projects). How are those other projects prioritized?
- Investments in traffic calming facilities (traffic circles, etc.) for cut-through streets may reduce the need to invest in more expensive pedestrian facilities. Maybe the project scope should be extended to include traffic calming options.
- Criteria for improvements located along a utility corridor or opportunity (drainage, underground powerlines, etc.).
- Is existing development worth more weight than possible future development?

- Why are the higher zoned areas getting any points, if developers will be required to construct sidewalk improvements?
- Should projects in places that are less likely to be developed within a short period of time be the projects prioritized?
- Should criteria be based on current housing density not (just) zoning.
- Should development timelines be used?
- Some of the zoning density criteria is over-weighted. Developers should be responsible for local improvements. Need to clarify their obligations for future private investments.
 - If points are awarded to higher zoning, anything over single-family only gets a point.
- Data seems to show a high overlap among activity centers, zoning density, and transit layers.
 - Having all of this separate criteria may over-weight these projects.
 - Can a map be created overlaying these three criteria?
- Within ¼ mile of park should receive 1 point. Schools/density should receive 2 points. Transit/activity center should receive 3 points. *[Other groups noted schools as highest – see next comment]*
- Proximity to school should be ranked highest with proximity to parks lowest. Transit stops and activity centers in between.
- What about a destination park vs a local park for criteria? Proximity of ¼ mile is too large.
- People that need transit stops also need ways to get there. Maybe lower to ½ mile proximity.
- Do activity centers include places like movie theaters, stadiums, churches, schools that have high “surges” of pedestrian usage at certain times?
- The routes to school provided by the school are not very useful data as every street is shown. What are the actual student routes and how can we get that info? Maybe metric for feeder streets within a ¼ mile radius of the school could work.
- In general, maybe the ¼ mile radii to facilities is still too large. Maybe half of that would provide a better pattern.
- Proximity to activity center should be a high priority criterion.
- Should the zoning density criteria as it is be included if developers will be required to construct sidewalk?

A request was made to use colors that are more easily distinguishable on maps (e.g. Street Classification Map, Safety 1c, Alternate Route to Travel map, etc.).

Independent Study - Sidewalk Mapping Exercise

Committee members were asked to look at a City map and place sticky notes on it (maximum of three each) with areas in the City that show an example of the need for sidewalks that could relate to the criteria being reviewed. Staff will be following up with an electronic copy of a map indicating all of the locations with the description from these notes.

This map is to be used for independent field trips in August/September.

Closing Remarks

The committee will not be meeting in August. **Next meeting is Thursday, September 28, 2017.**

Committee members will have an opportunity to visit some areas that their fellow committee members have identified as locations of interest prior to the next meeting in September. Staff will be sending out a map and fellow committee member contact information as approved and hope that committee members organize among themselves for visits. Photos and feedback are encouraged and any

additional information on proceeding with these visits will be included in the email once the map is available.

Contact:

Nora Daley-Peng, Senior Transportation Planner

ndaleypeng@shorelinewa.gov

(206) 801-2483

Project webpage: shorelinewa.gov/sidewalks