

## SPAB minutes Feb 2016

- Attendance:
  - Jeffrey Linn
  - David Amiton
  - David Goldberg
  - Joanne Donohue
  - Gordon Padelford
  - Lydia Heard
  - Paul Muldoon
  - Angela Davis
  - Cameron Zapata
  - Howard Wu (SDOT Liaison to the Board)
  - Public: Julie Casada, Sue Byers (SDOT), Peter Katz (visiting planner), Jaqueline Sorkin (Phinneywood), Ian Macek (SDOT), Michelle Marx (SDOT), Kevin Oneal (SDOT), Bryce Maryman (SvR), David Suter, Pamela Evanson, Mike Shaw (SDOT ADA), Chad Lynch (SDOT GIS), Jacob Struksma
- Introductions: completed
- January Minutes Approval: minutes approved (David G motions, Paul M seconds)
- Public Comment: No comments
- PMP Update – Draft prioritization scheme (Michelle, Ian, and Chad):
  - Compiled and distributed survey and obtained results
  - 2016 Update:
    - Safety, Equity & Health, and Vibrancy categories
  - Key public outreach question was how to weight the various factors, so turned to the public survey results:
    - #1 thing that makes it difficult or unpleasant to walk was BUSY STREETS WITH NO SIDEWALKS (46%)
    - #2: Residential streets without sidewalks (28%)
    - What types of pedestrian improvements should we build first?
      - #1: Build sidewalks where they're missing, #2: provide more safe ways to cross busy arterials, #3: provide safe walking paths where they are missing on residential streets:
    - Where should the city prioritize walking improvements first?
      - Where most pedestrians are injured (51%)
      - On streets connecting families and children to schools (48%)
      - On streets connecting people to transit stops and to serve people who rely on walking the most (both 38%).
    - Overall, no big surprises, more just confirmation of what SDOT was already thinking.
    - What did the public think of lower cost sidewalks?

- 90% comfortable with stamped asphalt, 81% comfortable with stained asphalt. These alternatives can cost as much as half the amount of a traditional curb and gutter sidewalks. Curb-separated at same level of cars: 57% comfortable. Shared street: 25% comfortable. The shared street result was a surprise...It's hard to find an example with the appropriate land use context, with slow-moving vehicles...there aren't any good examples in Seattle to point to. Traditional curb & gutter on one side only: 94% comfortable. Walking path at same level as cars, set behind landscape: 94%.
- How does the survey feedback inform prioritization?
  - 2009: looked at pedestrian generators, and it was land use heavy (universities, Pike Place Market, convention center, multi-family residential, condos and apartments, major and minor retail, hospitals/community service, parks/open space, population forecast, employment forecast, light rail, major bus, minor bus, trails, bridges), but it didn't necessarily look at where the greatest need was.
  - 2016: rather than focusing on lots of different generators, focus on just the most important: access to schools and access to transit. This gets a broader distribution of priorities and also focuses on KEY generators.
    - Starting point: focus on frequent transit arterials...this creates the spine.
    - Next: focus on the stops along the frequent transit corridors.
    - Next: focus on the schools
    - Next: create walksheds around schools and transit stops. For LRT ½-mile, RapidRide/BRT ¼-mile, frequent bus 1/8-mile, for transit hubs ½-mile. COMMENT: it would be easier to interpret if it were in # of blocks. RESPONSE: This is difficult because block lengths vary. The walksheds are actual network distances (exclusively distance). QUESTION: is this integrated with city construction projects? ANSWER: that step will happen when we develop the projects, but right now we're just prioritizing areas.
    - School walksheds: looked at existing and future public schools (1/4-mile walksheds). Initially started with 1-mile walkshed, but it's not fine-grain enough...ends up being the whole city.
    - Used the frequent transit corridors and walksheds to create a demand network.
    - Discussion about whether or not to include private schools in the walksheds and demand network.
    - How will the PMP reflect/inform/be consistent with the 2035 Comp Plan? Both plans are using similar walksheds. There is

potential for the Comp Plan to expand Urban Village boundaries (based on 10-min walksheds).

- Looked at the total locations of missing sidewalks on arterials: 1600 total arterial blockfaces without sidewalks. 550-600 of those blockfaces are on the demand network. But there isn't funding to build that amount, so we have to layer equity and demand on top of that network.
- Next step: Prioritizing arterials based on equity and health (which includes ADA), and an arterial safety analysis (pedestrian collisions, arterial classification (proxy for volume and # of severe injuries), roadway width, speed (85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds and posted speeds), and controlled crossing spacing).
- So then they used the survey to develop weights for Safety (60%) and Equity (40%) and layered on top of the demand network. When you filter that by blockfaces that don't have sidewalks, it gets down to about 141 blockfaces within the Tier 1 & 2 prioritization network, which is a much more manageable number. Did try some sensitivities for the 60/40 split and there wasn't much difference.
- COMMENT: People with greater equity concerns might not feel as comfortable or able providing feedback to the City about their needs.
- NON-ARTERIAL STREETS have a separate prioritization scheme:
  - There is funding set aside for low cost sidewalks on non-arterials.
  - Total # of residential non-arterials missing sidewalks is ~10,000, but when you overlay the walkshed demand network, it goes down to ~2,000. How do you prioritize those streets? It's hard to use safety data (crashes). Could use equity. Could create a separate demand analysis. Could do a connectivity analysis. Could look at streets serving specific destinations. Could leverage existing programs (Greenways, SRTS, etc.) and make sure those programs are focusing on the residential needs.
- NEXT STEPS: Finalize demand+safety+equity approach, then do the infrastructure analysis. Next month we'll discuss performance measures, then a public review draft will be released at start of April. Other SDOT staff will then develop an implementation plan.
- QUESTION/DISCUSSION: How could development impact fees support the build-out of the pedestrian network?

- Curb-cuts lawsuit: (Emily Cooper (DRWA) and Mike Shaw (SDOT))
  - Disability Rights Washington was established by federal law in 1970s. Federal mandate is to provide protection/advocacy. Several years ago their clients were telling them about difficulties getting around Seattle, so they sent a letter to City of Seattle, spent a year and a half having conversations with the City, and ultimately filed a lawsuit in summer 2015. They are now in litigation.
  - SDOT wants to avoid litigation costs and attorney fees. SDOT wants to build a pedestrian network that works for everyone with ADA needs. SDOT is currently conducting a citywide survey that's assessing all of the city's curb ramps (so far they've evaluated ~30,000). About 4,000 curb ramps weren't even in their asset inventory. There are 55,000 potential locations where a curb ramp may or may not be a possibility. Once the inventory is complete, SDOT will evaluate the curb ramps and layer/filter the PMP prioritization network, work with the disability community, and incorporate their curb ramp request system. SDOT is also initiating a sidewalk assessment program to evaluate accessibility and other conditions.
  - With Move Seattle, there's a lot more money for pedestrian improvements...as many as 10,800 curb ramps over the life of the Levy. Seattle has some unique challenges for building curb ramps:
    - Existing built network with utilities, trees, narrow sidewalks, topography, etc. (One example is that some roads are built on existing bridge structures, so to install fully compliant curb ramps would require rebuilding the entire structure or spending hundreds of thousands of dollars). That's why curb bulbs are desirable, because they create more space for compliant curb ramps. QUESTION: Is the City working with Sound Transit and WSDOT (SR 520) to ensure they're building compliant curb ramps?
    - QUESTION: What would an accessible route network include? ANSWER: Anything in the pedestrian network (even stairs!).
    - QUESTION: What does success look like for DRWA? ANSWER: Similar settlements in other cities have included X number of sidewalks and Y number of dollars over a certain number of years.
- 8<sup>th</sup> Ave S Pedestrian Safety Project (Susan Byers (Maintenance and Operations) and Darren Morgan (Urban Forestry section)):
  - Synergies:
    - In September they conducted a Find It Fix It Walk with the Mayor's Office
    - Consulted *Trees and Sidewalks Operations Plan*
    - SPU/King County GSI project is happening in the neighborhood in several years, so there's a longer-term solution in the mix.
  - Existing conditions:
    - Healthy large street trees, low traffic volumes, poor condition asphalt sidewalks
    - The asphalt sidewalks were a retrofit, added about 10 years ago as a "quick fix"
  - Talked to community and they wanted to keep sidewalks, trees, and parking.
  - Preferred Alternative is a buffered pedestrian lane in the existing parking lane.

- SDOT will maintain the path (clean, etc.).
  - Cons: brings peds down to street level and you lose the tree buffer between peds and cars.
- Seattle Children's Research Institute & Terry Ave Green Street (Julien Loh and Emelie East, CBE Strategic)
  - New patient, research, staff, and general public facility ("Building CURE")
  - Supports PMP goals
  - Located along Terry Ave
  - Green street plan entails:
    - Wider sidewalks
    - Open space
    - Trees and vegetation
    - Natural drainage
    - QUESTION: Does the project include curbless streets?
  - Improvements will be on both sides of Terry Ave (code only requires one side of improvements). There are already green street treatments on Terry, so this would build on those existing improvements.
  - Next Steps: Final DRB meeting in early April. Would like to begin construction in the next year, with completion within a year and a half.
- Board Business:
  - QUESTION: What's going on with the Ballard Bridge bike/ped safety improvements project?
  - What do we want to do with the David Sucher high-visibility clothing? Lydia motions not to support. Jeff Linn seconds..
  - What do we want to do about the letter of support for the pedestrian intersection for Safe In Magnolia? Gordon moves that we empower Jeff to finalize the draft. Jeff seconds.
  - Need to get the Annual Report transmitted to Mayor and Council then present it at the Transportation Committee.