DATE: November 5, 2020

TO: Chair Marciante and Members of the Transportation Commission

- FROM:Michael Ingram, Senior Transportation Planner, 425-452-4166
mingram@bellevuewa.gov
Kristi Oosterveen, Capital Facilities Planning & Programming Administrator,
425-452-4496, koosterveen@bellevuewa.gov
- **SUBJECT:** Transportation Facilities Plan 2022-2033 Update

DIRECTION REQUESTED

Action (Future)

X Discussion/Direction

Information

On November 12, staff will continue discussion with the Transportation Commission on the update of the city's Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP). Staff will offer additional description of the categories of candidate projects, highlight revisions to the preliminary list of candidate projects and describe the project evaluation process. Staff is seeking Commission concurrence regarding,

- Staff recommended revisions to the project list, including projects recommended to not advance in this TFP update process, and
- Staff recommended changes to the five criteria for evaluation of candidate Roadway/Intersection projects, and
- Proceeding with evaluation of candidate Roadway/Intersection projects according to five criteria.

BACKGROUND

The Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP) is required and adopted pursuant to the Bellevue City Code (<u>Title 22, Development Code</u>). The TFP is the City's 12-year, or intermediate-range, transportation capital facility planning document. The <u>current 2019-2030 TFP</u> was adopted by the City Council in July 2019. Staff provided a briefing to the Commission on the 2022-2033 TFP update process in September 2020 and staff presented a preliminary list of candidate projects at the meeting on October 8.

INFORMATION

Project List

Attachment 1 is a revised *preliminary* list of candidate projects for consideration in the 2022-2033 TFP process. Revisions to the list (initially introduced in the packet for the October 8 meeting) are indicated as follows:

- Shaded projects are recommended by staff to not advance further in the current TFP update process most of these are within the Comprehensive Transportation Project List section of the list. For each such project, the reason for this recommendation is described in the Comments column at the right side. The most common reasons for this recommendation are that a project lacks definition (i.e., what is the specific improvement proposed) or that there is no current anticipated need for or interest in a candidate project in the 2023-2033 TFP timeline.
- Changes to project descriptions are shown with strikeout (for deleted text) and underline (for new, added text).
- The Comments column along the right side includes status updates on projects. Staff have updated or revised many of these comments from the list included in the packet for the October 8 meeting.

As discussed at the Commission meeting on October 8, two categories of projects—*Bicycle Network Projects* and *Transit Projects*—describe a broader objective for these modes by network or corridor, rather than identifying specific locations for physical improvements. The framing of projects in these categories meshes with the way that improvements for these modes are identified, scoped and implemented via ongoing city programs (including collaboration with transit agencies). Andreas Piller—a Transportation Department staff member who works on these programs—will attend the meeting on November 12 to describe the ongoing work relating to the Bicycle Network and Transit projects.

Roadway/Intersection Projects Evaluation Criteria

In the TFP development process, Roadway/Intersection projects have typically been evaluated and scored according to the *need* for various improvements at each project location and the *benefit* the project will provide (how well the project addresses the identified needs).

The resulting score-ranking of the candidate project list can provide a "starting point" and will be used along with several other factors that will be considered in the ultimate project prioritization and recommendation phases of the TFP update process. Other prioritizing factors will include public input, equity/environmental justice, extent of project development to date, opportunity to partner with projects led by others (e.g., Sound Transit, WSDOT), project cost, etc. These other, qualitative factors are not so well captured by the numerical scoring/ranking criteria.

Priority projects that do not fare well under the Roadway/Intersection evaluation criteria, such as ped-only, bike-only, transit-only and/or maintenance-focused projects will also be integrated into the overall list. Ultimately, an integrated, prioritized project list will provide the foundation for the Commission to determine which projects to recommend for inclusion in the updated, 2022-2033 TFP.

The following table shows the five roadway/intersection evaluation criteria that have been used for many cycles of the TFP process and the adjustments staff recommends for the 2022-2033 TFP update. The adjustments incorporate elements of the city's <u>Vision Zero Action Plan</u> (recently completed) and <u>Multimodal (MMLOS) Metrics, Standards and Guidelines report</u> (recommended by the Transportation Commission in April, 2017). Weights indicated are those established by the Commission for the most recent, 2019-2030 TFP process; they could be revised for this cycle, if the Commission desires.

Roadway/Intersection Project evaluation criterion	Adjustment recommended for 2022-2033 TFP process	Weight (per 2019- 2030 TFP)
Safety	Remove "congestion" as an indication of a safety need at a project location; incorporate collision history (heat maps developed in conjunction with Vision Zero) as indicator of project need.	30%
Vehicular Level of Service	For corridor-scope roadway projects, use average corridor speed metric (guideline is 40% of speed limit adjusted for each Mobility Management Area, per MMLOS report). [For intersection projects, volume-to-capacity ratio will remain as the metric. Most projects are in the intersection category.]	20%
Transit	Add points for ped, bike access to stops on the priority transit routes, enhancement of conditions at bus stops (guidelines per MMLOS report).	20%

Non-Motorized	Incorporate negative points (deductions) for projects that degrade conditions for people walking and/or biking (supported by Vision Zero Action L4B and consistent with the guidelines in the MMLOS report). [For example, adding a right-turn lane at an intersection may improve vehicular LOS, but increases crossing distance and exposure for pedestrians.]	20%
Plan Consistency & Outside Funding Potential	No adjustments recommended	10%

The project scoring exercise generates a score-ranked list (highest scoring to lowest scoring) that staff will share with the Commission at a future meeting. Staff do not intend to review the details of the evaluation matrix for each criterion at the Commission meeting on November 12. Commission members who wish to review or discuss these should contact staff to receive a briefing before (or after) the November 12 meeting.

NEXT STEPS

TFP project staff will incorporate Commission input and continue to refine the preliminary project list and will, with assistance from staff subject matter experts, initiate the process to score the subset of candidate projects in the Roadway/Intersection category.

If you have questions or need additional information prior to the meeting, please contact Michael Ingram at (425) 452-4166 or email <u>mingram@bellevuewa.gov</u> or Kristi Oosterveen at (425-452-4496) or email <u>koosterveen@bellevuewa.gov</u>.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. 2022-2033 TFP candidate projects—Revised list
- 2. 2022-2033 TFP candidate projects—Map (four pages)
- 3. 2022-2033 TFP Update Timeline—DRAFT