

Attachment B Issues Identified By Planning Commission Liaisons for Draft Redmond Transportation Master Plan

ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY PLANNING COMMISSIONER ROBERT O'HARA

- Page 4 For #4, how are the 2030 levels of congestion estimated?
- Page 5 Connectivity and network completion need a scale.
- Page 31 Missing scale, fig 19
- Page 40 I don't understand the connectivity calculation for Overlake: 5% currently. It seems very low.
- Page 42 Targets to be added...
- Page 43 Targets to be added...
- Page 45 2010 baseline of non SOV trips seems very high, disagrees with the text above.
- Page 47 Transit ridership projection looks unrealistic.
- Page 50 Traffic injuries projection looks unrealistic.
- Page 61 Duplicate figure.
- Page 77 Very good!
- Page 87 c.f. p 276: very few neighborhood connections are likely to be made.

ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY PLANNING COMMISSIONER PHIL MILLER

General Comments & Observations

Document

1. Presentation – the document does not follow a familiar format as set n the Comprehensive Plan. Please designate policy in style of the Comprehensive Plan. It was my understanding that a major source of the fourteen month delay was to review for consistency with the Comp Plan – this should include style as well as content.
2. It is very difficult to discern the difference between background discussion and formal policy
3. Style can be very breezy, sweeping n assumptions and conclusions with very little anootations, citations and other footnoting to substantiate findings.
4. Enormous need of editing for both style and grammatical errors
5. Major elements of the “review draft” are missing. I cannot vote to approve a document for which neither the Planning Commission or the public have had an opportunity to see the entire body of work.

Content

1. The pedestrian section is incomplete, including measureable targets for Plan implementation.
2. The plan over-emphasizes the development of the two urban centers – as critical as this may be, the plan (at best) glosses over neighborhood transportation issues.
3. The plan is missing any substantive or consolidated discussion on the transportation needs of:
 - a. Youth
 - b. Seniors
 - c. Schools (especially Safe Routes to Schools)
 - d. Single Family Neighborhoods
4. The transit section is very good – am not convinced it is entirely current after the hiatus.
5. The Bicycle Chapter remains oddly disconnected from a discussion or analysis of those factors which encourage or constrain bicycle use in Redmond, as opposed to Portland, New York City or Boulder.
 - a. Development of the primary Bicycle Corridors was seemingly done without consideration of topography (see comments)
 - b. Cycletrack discussion needs considerable development on a policy basis. Proposed plans for limited cycletrack development are likely not effective means of implementing the (implied) policy of separating bicycle traffic in primary multi-modal corridors. (see comments)

Specific Sections

Overview and Introduction

1. **5 key strategies** – add “Insure compatibility of LRT to areas adjacent to corridor” – these strategies while they should support transit, must also support the legitimate interests of Redmond residents and institutions who may be impacted by LRT development, particularly n the planned extension to downtown.

Also, I’m not seeing target densities and land uses defined as being compatible or supportive of transit use. While the plan presumes the development or transit, it still needs to inform the Comp Plan of future targets...

2. **Dashboard** – The measurement for network completion of bicycle network is tricky – as seen in Seattle, it is relatively easy to boost measurement of accomplishment by counting a lot of low cost striping and sharrow projects which have less of a functional impact on (terms of the plan) separation of bicycles from traffic. Suggest that measurement includes breakout by three tiers of bike projects as defined in the TFP and include progress in terms of 5 of anticipated or programmed investment (dollars obligated) to system completion so as not to over-estimate functional aspects defining system completion.
3. (Page 6-7) Discussion of two “vibrant urban centers” – is this a discussion of vision or current conditions? Not clear.
4. The discussion about Millenials is interesting, but I have concerns that it is overwhelming both the needs of existing residential neighborhoods and somewhat ignores the expectations of what will occur as these individuals age, have families and settle in Redmond – a trend Microsoft claims to already be seeing with their own employees.
5. (Page 8) Reference to parking pricing – we need a discussion (in the interests of balance and fairness) to the application of these principles to not only public and on-street parking, but also to the impact of private subsidization on travel demand in Redmond. 54,000 Redmond employees at ONE place of business receive free parking as a “benefit” of employment – this overwhelms any and all efforts to manage travel demand at the public level. At the very least we need to be clear that the discussion relating to parking pricing is applied only to public and commercial parking resources. It strikes me as unfair to our commercial sector that they are being asked to absorb costs of eliminating subsidies, sharing parking, etc while the single largest generator of SOV trips is exempt from these specific policies and actions.
6. Connected Neighborhoods – this discussion would be better served n several ways by:
 - a. Addressing the edge of Urban Centers – the Downtown discussion very conveniently ignores a significant supply of high density, multi-family housing on the other side of an arbitrary line. The apartments and condos on Old Redmond Road are more a part of

Downtown than they are Grass Lawn, yet pedestrian connectivity to Downtown for these residents is less than optimal, particularly along Redmond Way.

- b. Accordingly, the use of ¼ mile as a pedestrian radius (while typical for transit access) is vastly inadequate to define the potential of pedestrian travel within and ESPECIALLY to adjacent neighborhoods. This is the essence of the (implied) goal of improving neighborhood connectivity for pedestrians
 - c. **MAJOR ISSUE – Why is there no substantive discussion of Safe Routes to Schools or designated school walking routes anywhere in the plan?** This is a huge issue, as budgets and service have been cut back for school bus transportation. The impact is a greater area around schools with no bus service, thus more students are asked to walk or (much more likely) to be driven. This is a significant, non urban center transportation issue that deserves far more attention than it receives in the draft plan.
-
7. (page 16) Complete streets policies are now city law – shouldn't this be a measureable component of the dashboard?
 8. (page 17-20) Discussion of affluence in Redmond makes me uncomfortable, as it isn't clear how this observation informs plan policy and products. We've spent enough time dealing with affordable housing issues on the PC for me to accept that we should have a transportation plan based wholly on the needs of young, affluent (and undefined) GenX and Millennial populations. There is a big difference between trend and trendy... This may define trends in employment in Redmond, but it does not appear to be justified as a means of describing RESIDENTS of the City of Redmond.
 9. (page 20-25) **MAJOR POLICY QUESTION – what is the net impact of employment “immigration” to our existing transportation infrastructure?** We absorb a LOT of travel every day, perhaps more than anyone save Renton and possibly Everett in this region. This comes with a cost to the City that doesn't seem to be addressed in the plan. We all want big, high tech businesses to locate here, to be sure, but we need to know (absent sales tax revenues and incorporating past incentives) what the influx of essentially another Redmond full of SOVs daily mean to the cost of providing city services to meet this demand?
 10. (page 28 and elsewhere) Really, photos of buses full of City employees? ☺
 11. (page 30-31) **Bike and Ped safety** – What is rate of bike and ped injuries as compared to mode split? The plan looks (as most plans traditionally do) at raw numbers, which are chronically underreported compared to auto and truck collisions. If (for example) walking represents 5% of mode split and (as is likely) a much higher percentage of injuries, should this not inform AT LEAST the Dashboard and also funding priorities?

12. (page 34) – It s easy for City to “keep pace” with bicycle project implementation goals if the standard is painting sharrows. If the goal is separation from traffic, then this standard is somewhat lacking in describing City progress in implementing the (implied) policy.
13. (page 33) **Sidewalks** – somewhere the discussion of sidewalk maintenance (a good topic!) should address the role of landscaping and design and failure of brick inlays. Huge ADA implications.
14. (page 37, bullet three) Performance Assessment – Staff has become a stakeholder in the planning process?
15. **MAJOR ISSUE – Put Safety, Air Quality, and Street Preservation on the Dashboard.**
16. (page 38) Increasing the speed of travel is a highly debatable indicator of ACCESS as opposed to MOBILITY, especially since it can be shown that a slower but more consistent and predictable speed of travel in an urban environment results improved traffic throughput.
17. Ped route directness discussion needs more documentation of method in an appendix – too much “black box” discussion
18. (page 41) **Connectivity Levels** – higher density housing just west of Downtown really should be ncluded in this calculation if it is to be a meaningful measure of pedestrian connectivity
19. (page 42) Heat mapping exercise is interesting but confusing – why is Microsoft campus so low?
20. (page 43) Network Completion
 - a. Auto – does this mean after the 30 year TFP s complete that there will be no more capacity projects?
 - b. Bicycle – does a bike lane (Tier 2 facility) count as a separated facty? If not, why are cycletrack proposals so limited (Avondale and two blocks of 152nd Ave)?
 - c. ***Why is there no ped methodology? When do we see this?***
 - d. ***When will the vehicle connections methodology be presented?***
21. (page 51) Explain better what “100% of City that requires basic water quality treatment” means.
22. (page 58)
 - a. **Bicycle** – I’m not sure that separation from speed and motorized volumes is a higher priority than network completion and mobility. Based on the limited proposals for cycletracks on primary bike corridors, I’m not the sure the plan believes this either. My recommendation is that cycletracks should be considered as the base facility on principal arterials that are not topographically constrained (i.e.,steep). This would include 148th Ave NE, 156th Ave NE, Redmond Way downtown to ELSP, Red Wood Road, and SR 202 in addition to Avondale and 152nd Ave NE. It is understood that the City has yet to define the specifics of bicycle facility design, but that effort **MUST** be at least informed by the proposed application of the (implied) policy calling for separation.
 - b. **Ped** – Are there assumptions regarding pedestrian trip distances and service area as the pedestrian environment improves in the City?
 - c. **Bike** – the Education Hill Priority Corridor selection was obviously done by someone in Colorado without access to a topographic map! 171st is outrageously steep, is programmed for a non-separated facility type (bike lane) and is inaccessible to all but the most accomplished cyclist, who clearly is not the design model for bike improvements in this plan. The only route accessible to the top of Education Hill for most more casual

bicyclists is up Redwood Road to NE 104th Street. Some form of cycletrack makes more sense for encouraging broad based bicycle use than highlighting a route than can never be improved to a high level of acceptance as a bike corridor.

- d. (page 59) Again, school ped access MUST BE A PROIORITY as school transit programs are cut back.
23. (page 61) Repeat graphic?
24. (page 62) The plan needs a more direct discussion of the vision for the role of Redmond Way post couplet. There are contradictory comments/IMPLIED policies regarding topics such as ped access, vehicle throughput and speed, etc. While Cleveland will be a ped street, Redmond Way as a two way street will not be as much a highway as it will be a commercial corridor, and should be a major improvement as not just part of a pedestrian corridor, but as a key link in a pedestrian DISTRICT... This function and the accompanying vision and assumptions deserves discussion in the plan.
25. (page 64 and elsewhere) We need to discuss the difference between a SHARED STREET (which this plan laudably proposes) and a WOONERF, which is a DISTRICT that consists of shared streets. It is inaccurate to describe a couple of dead end alleys – no matter how desirable or nicely designed – as a woonerf as the concept has been developed and proposed. It is problematic to inflate one to the level of improvement implied by the other.
26. (page 87) Again, I am very surprised that Safe Routes to Schools and Designated School Walking Routes do not appear to be significant factors in the prioritization of transportation initiatives in the plan.
27. (page 90) This section deserves a discussion on the state of bicycling in Redmond as opposed to Portland, New York and Boulder. This is very breezy and does not do a good job of defining the specific actions recommended in the TMP.
 - a. The data regarding the 2.5 mile trip radius is not consistent with the 1.0 mile radius discussed on page 10. 1.0 mile is very constrained as a capture area for trips.
 - b. Cycletrack philosophy and application has advanced quite a bit nationally and regionally n the past 14 months. We need a discussion on what generally defines a good cycletrack before progressing to the development of new design standards.
 - c. The interest of the City in developing bicycle parking needs more detail in the description.
 - d. BikeShare is a real city initiative, as opposed to 14 months ago. Huge potential and key policy questions both need to be demonstrated. Will Microsoft participate in a regional program? Will Redmond fiscally support a downtown program?
28. (page 115) **Streamline Regulation in Support of City Vision** – Most will have no issue supporting the general concept, but the devil is in the details, a commodity in which this section is somewhat wanting. So long as the guidance the city provides in lieu of regulation results in MEASUREABLE RESULTS that support the plan, OK. Don't see that part of the feedback loop described, just a vague discussion of removing a non-existent burden from those entities that generate the most transportation impact on the City and its citizens to rectify.