



# MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 4, 2007

TO: Transportation Commission

FROM: Kristi L. Oosterveen, Capital Programming Coordinator

SUBJECT: Preliminary Transportation Facilities Plan Update Process

On September 13, staff introduced the Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP) update process by providing an overview of the plan and presenting a timeline for the TFP project list development that outlined key process elements including Commission decision points. The process outline included Commission review and approval of two important components at the October 11 meeting. Staff will present and respond to Commission feedback on the following items:

- 1) Preliminary Public Involvement Strategy  
*Intended Outcome: Commission Approval*

Attachment 1 entails a one-page outline of staff's proposed strategy to inform and involve the community in the development of the 2009-2020 TFP project list. At the meeting, the Commission will be asked to approve, or revise and approve, the proposed public involvement strategy.

- 2) Roadway/Intersection Project Scoring Criteria and Weighting  
*Intended Outcome: Commission Approval*

In the fall of 2005, for the 2006-2017 TFP update process, the Commission approved a set of Comprehensive Plan-based project "need and benefit" scoring criteria with the following weighting:

• Safety	25%
• Level of Service	25%
• Transit	10%
• Non-motorized	15%
• Regional System Consistency	10%
• <u>Leveraging of Outside Funds</u>	15%
	100%

Attachment 2 includes the policy basis and a brief descriptor of how each criterion is used to measure the need and/or benefit of candidate projects. Attachment 2 also includes each of the six detailed scoring matrices staff used in the last TFP process to develop each project's score.

We believe it is important to explicitly point out to the Commission that the candidate project scoring, and the preliminary project ranking based on those scores, is intended to serve only as a starting point for the more subjective candidate project prioritization process that will take place in late 2007/early 2008.

For this process staff does recommend one change to the criteria array which the Commission approved in 2005. Due to their close inter-relationship, we suggest a combination of the “Regional System Consistency” and “Leveraging of Outside Funds” criteria into a single criterion and scoring matrix (See Attachment 3). Our primary rationale behind the proposed change is to eliminate a redundancy factor between the two former criteria. We also suggest that while a project’s competitiveness for grant funding is a valuable aid to implementation, it does not necessarily reflect on the project’s relative priority to the community.

Associated with the proposed combination of the criteria, we proposed the following adjusted criteria weighting scheme for your consideration:

- Safety 25%
  - Level of Service 25%
  - Transit 15% (+5%)
  - Non-motorized 20% (+5%)
  - Regional Benefit & Outside Funding 15% (New)
- 100%

At the meeting, the Commission will be asked to approve, or revise and approve, the criteria and weighting. As discussed at the last meeting, the pedestrian/bicycle project identification and prioritization will take place on a separate but parallel course through the Commission’s work on the Ped/Bike Plan Update process.

Prior to the meeting on the 11<sup>th</sup>, please take the time to review the attachments and come prepared to the meeting with your comments, issues and questions. It is the intent of staff to finalize both discussion items at the meeting. If you have questions or need additional information prior to the meeting, please contact me at (425) 452-4496 or email [koosterveen@bellevuewa.gov](mailto:koosterveen@bellevuewa.gov).

Attachments

## 2009-2020 Transportation Facilities Plan Update Process Proposed Public Involvement Strategy

### A. Transportation Commission Meeting

- At least 6 meetings between September 2007 and March 2008

### B. Webpage

**Location:** On the Transportation Department internet page under Projects, Plans and Studies at [www.bellevuewa.gov/5602.htm](http://www.bellevuewa.gov/5602.htm)

**Currently Active Components:**

- TFP background information
- Current 2006-2017 TFP
- Current 2006-2017 TFP Final EIS
- Contact information for questions and comments

**Additional components:**

- List of candidate projects
- Candidate project map
- Open House and Commission meeting information

### C. Community Outreach Efforts

- Citywide outreach efforts coordinated with the Ped/Bike Plan Update Process throughout the fall.
  - North Bellevue Senior Center, 10/08/2007
  - Crossroads Bellevue mini-City Hall Open House, 10/16/2007
  - Marketplace at Factoria Mall Open House, 10/17/2007
- 1 or more Open Houses
  - Early 2008, prior to final project prioritization
  - "Drop-in" set-up
  - Candidate project list and maps
  - Comment forms

### D. Other Public Involvement Plan Components

- City Council Outreach Report - notification to Council members of open house(s)
- It's Your City article - background information on TFP, webpage for info.
  - December edition for early 2008 open house(s)
- Neighborhood News (E-newsletter)
- Ad in Bellevue Reporter
- Flyers at City Hall Service First, libraries, community centers, mini-City Halls
- E-Gov delivery email

## Transportation Department Comprehensive Plan-Based Project Prioritization Criteria

Comprehensive Plan-based project prioritization links the vision of the citizen to capital budget funding decisions. As applied to the Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP) and the Capital Investment Program (CIP) Plan, criteria derived from the City's Comprehensive Plan policies are used to help prioritize transportation-focused capital projects.

Virtually all of the projects included in the TFP are drawn from the formal long-range transportation plans that have been adopted by the City Council. This ensures that the TFP is responsive to the stated direction of the City Council as contained in the Comprehensive Plan and supporting documents.

### BELLEVUE'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN - TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

#### GOAL OF THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

*To maintain and enhance mobility for residents and businesses through the creation and maintenance of a balanced system of transportation alternatives that:*

- *Provides a wide range of travel choices;*
- *Supports the land use vision of the city;*
- *Protects our neighborhoods from adverse transportation impacts;*
- *Reflects the regional role of the city in transportation issues; and*
- *Reduces the overall dependency on automobiles throughout the city.*

#### OVERARCHING POLICY JUSTIFICATION FOR OUTCOMES-BASED PRIORITIZATION

*POLICY TR-22. Implement the level of service standards and other mobility targets for major transportation modes within each Mobility Management Area, as shown in Table TR.1, recognizing each area's needs as well as its relationship with other areas. Monitor the adopted mobility targets and adjust programs and resources as necessary to achieve scheduled progress on all modes.*

## POLICY BASIS - ROADWAY/INTERSECTION PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA

Roadway/Intersection prioritization criteria are reviewed for a policy basis.

### 1. Safety Criterion

- **Policy Basis:**

*POLICY TR-46. Maintain and enhance safety for all users of the roadway network using measures such as the following:*

- 1. Maintain an accident reduction program to identify high accident locations in the city, evaluate potential alternative solutions and implement recommended changes;*
  - 2. Increase enforcement of traffic laws, particularly speeding, and failing to make a full stop at red lights and stop signs;*
  - 3. Expand the use of traffic calming measures to slow vehicular travel speed along residential streets and to reduce cut-through traffic;*
  - 4. Improve the opportunities for pedestrians to safely cross streets at intersection and mid-block locations;*
  - 5. Increase street lighting where needed to improve visibility and safety while minimizing light/glare spillover onto adjacent parcels; and*
  - 6. Minimize the number of driveways on all arterials to reduce the potential for pedestrian and vehicle collisions.*
- **2005 Commission-approved criterion weighting percentage - 25%**
  - **Project Need and Benefit:** Is there a vehicular and or non-motorized safety issue? To what extent will the project address the safety issue?
  - See Safety Matrix (Attachment 2.1)

### 2. Level of Service Criterion

- **Policy Basis:**

*POLICY TR-6. Establish arterial level of service standards and other mobility targets in each area of the city in light of area-by-area development patterns and growth management objectives.*

*POLICY TR-35. Evaluate the adequacy of the arterial street system by calculating the level of service of those intersections within each Mobility Management Area that contribute to system function.*

- **2005 Commission-approved criterion weighting percentage - 25%**
- **Project Need and Benefit:** Is there an issue at a specific intersection that affects the area-wide average? How can it be improved?
- See Level of Service Matrix (Attachment 2.2)

### 3. Transit Criterion

- **Policy Basis:**

*POLICY TR-50. Work with transit providers to implement the Bellevue Transit Plan as an attractive travel option for local residents, employees, students, visitors, businesses and other users of regional facilities.*

*POLICY TR-54. Work with transit providers to create, maintain, and enhance a system of supportive facilities and systems such as:*

*4. Dedicated bus lanes, bus layovers, bus queue by-pass lanes, bus signal priorities;*

*5. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities*

- 2005 Commission-approved criterion weighting percentage - 15%
- **Project Need and Benefit:** Is the project on a major or minor transit route? A major or minor route is based on frequency of service. Does the project provide a direct (HOV lanes) vs. indirect (improved traffic flow, pedestrian access) benefit?
- See Transit Matrix (Attachment 2.3)

#### 4. Non-Motorized Criterion

- **Policy Basis:**

*POLICY TR-76. Promote and facilitate the effective use of non-motorized transportation.*

*POLICY TR-77. Consider pedestrians and bicycles along with other travel modes in all aspects of developing the transportation system.*

*POLICY TR-78. Implement the Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan by designing and constructing a safe and connective non-motorized transportation system.*

- 2005 Commission-approved criterion weighting percentage - 15%
- **Project Need and Benefit:** Need is not scored; it is assumed there is a uniform need for SOV reduction. Does the project construct/improve sidewalks and/or bicycle facilities?
- See Non-Motorized Matrix (Attachment 2.4)

#### 5. Regional Systems Criterion

- **Policy Basis:**

*POLICY TR-2. Work actively and cooperatively with other Eastside jurisdictions and regional and state agencies to plan, design, fund and construct regional transportation projects that carry out the city's transportation and land use goals.*

*POLICY TR-30. Work with other Eastside Transportation Partnership (ETP) participants to identify and implement high priority transportation investments*

*POLICY TR-110. Support joint projects, including the contribution of city matching funds, with adjoining cities, unincorporated King County, the transit providers, or the state, where such partnerships may help establish or accelerate a project beneficial to the city.*

- 2005 Commission-approved criterion weighting percentage - 10%
- **Project Need and Benefit:** Based on a high, medium, low priority basis of whether or not the project is identified by a cooperative interjurisdictional transportation forum (e.g., ETP and BROTS plans)
- See Regional Systems Matrix (Attachment 2.5)

## 6. Leveraging of Funds Criterion

- **Policy Basis:**  
*POLICY TR-105. Aggressively seek state and federal funds for transportation capital, maintenance, operational, service, and demand-oriented improvements.*
- **2005 Commission-approved criterion weighting percentage - 15%**
- **Project Need and Benefit:** Based on a high, medium, low priority basis of the likeliness of receiving outside funding (grants, etc.)
- See Leveraging of Funds Matrix (Attachment 2.6)

**1. SAFETY MATRIX**  
(MAXIMUM POTENTIAL SCORE = 100)

	HIGH	MEDIUM HIGH	MEDIUM	MEDIUM LOW	LOW	NO NEED
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Significant concern for auto or ped/bike accidents</li> <li>- Meets signal warrants and has significant accident occurrence</li> <li>- High need for pedestrian crossing</li> <li>- Significant roadway facilities missing and significant accident concern</li> <li>- Provides alternative to a route with significant auto or ped/bike accidents</li> <li>- Significant ped/bike accident potential</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Previous area of significant auto or ped/bike accident concern with no improvements</li> <li>- Higher than typical accident occurrence</li> <li>- Meets signal warrants and had moderate accident occurrence</li> <li>- Significant roadway facilities missing and moderate accident concern or high accident potential</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Typical accident occurrence</li> <li>- Meets signal warrants and has lower accident occurrence</li> <li>- Signal warrant not met and significant accident occurrence</li> <li>- Significant roadway facilities missing and low accident concern or moderate accident potential</li> <li>- Provides alternative to a route with moderate auto or ped/bike accidents</li> <li>- Lack of ped/bike facilities and high ped/bike demand</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lower than typical accident occurrence</li> <li>- Signal warrant not met and moderate accident occurrence</li> <li>- Lack of ped.bike facilities and moderate ped/bike demand/concern</li> <li>- Moderate congestion related traffic accidents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Low accident occurrence</li> <li>- Lack of ped/bike facilities and low ped/bike demand/concern</li> </ul>	
- Improvement completely addresses a primary safety concern	100	80	60	40	20	0
- Improvement significantly addresses a primary safety concern	80	64	48	32	16	0
- Improvement addresses a primary safety concern	80	64	48	32	16	0
- Improvement addresses a primary safety concern - Improvement completely addresses a secondary safety concern	70	56	42	28	14	0
- Improvement slightly addresses a primary safety concern - Improvement significantly addresses a secondary safety concern	60	48	36	24	12	0
- Improvement addresses secondary a safety concern	50	40	30	20	10	0
- Improvement marginally addresses a secondary safety concern	40	32	24	16	8	0
- Only small or no safety benefits accomplished with project	40	32	24	16	8	0

**2. LEVEL OF SERVICE MATRIX**  
(MAXIMUM POTENTIAL SCORE = 100)

**NEEDS:** Future Needs were evaluated on a "No Action" Scenario: 2015 Land Use on the Committed CIP Concurrency Funded Network

**BENEFITS:** Level of Service Benefits as determined by Long Range Subarea Transportation Facilities Plans

<b>BENEFITS</b>	Project v/c ratio improves by at least 0.100 Int. improvements w.r.t. crit. movement(s) Alternative routes Profound Network Changes	<b>High</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100</b>
	Project v/c ratio improves btw 0 and 0.100 Int. improvements w.r.t. crit. movement(s) and/or phasing	<b>Medium</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>80</b>
	No proj v/c ratio improvement Int. improvement w.r.t. non-crit movement(s) Operational & Indirect improvements Reduced Delay?	<b>Low</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>40</b>
			<b>Low</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>High</b>
<b>Crit 1: Compare the "No Action" MMA AW LOS to the MMA AWStd</b>	----->	(2 out of 3) More than 15% below MMA AWStd and/or	(2 out of 3) Btw 5% & 15% below MMA AWStd and/or	(2 out of 3) Within 5%, at or exceeds MMA AWStd and/or	
<b>Crit 2: Compare the Int "No Action" LOS to the MMA AWStd</b>	----->	More than 15% below MMA AWStd and/or	Btw 5% & 15% below MMA AWStd and/or	Within 5%, at or exceeds MMA AWStd and/or	
<b>Crit 3: Evaluate Int "No Action" LOS</b>	----->	LOS A,B,C < 0.80	LOS D >=0.80, <0.90	LOS E,F >=0.90	

**Key:**  
MMA = Mobility Management Area  
AW = Areawide  
Std = Standard  
Int. = Intersection  
LOS = Level of Service  
v/c = volume to capacity  
w.r.t. = with respect to  
crit. = critical  
Proj = project

**NEEDS**

### 3. TRANSIT MATRIX (MAXIMUM POTENTIAL SCORE = 100)

	<b>LOCAL</b>	<b>MINOR</b>	<b>PRINCIPAL</b>
	- 1 to 20 transit vehicle trips a day	- 21 to 50 transit vehicle trips a day	- non-highway facilities with 51+ transit vehicle trips a day and/or a Sound Transit route
<b>NO BENEFIT</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>INDIRECT BENEFIT</b> - Pavement overlay - Pedestrian access - Arterial improvements	<b>17</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>DIRECT BENEFIT</b> - Transit Center - Transit Signal Priority - Commuter parking - HOV Arterial improvements - Passenger amenity improvements	<b>33</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>100</b>

**4. NON-MOTORIZED MATRIX**  
 (MAXIMUM POTENTIAL SCORE = 100)

<b>Project includes:</b>	<b>Isolated Non-Motorized Facility</b>	<b>Extends an Existing Non-Motorized Facility</b>	<b>Extends a Pedestrian Facility and Improves an Existing Facility</b>	<b>Improves or Completes a missing link in a Non-Motorized Facility OR Improves Access to Multiple Pedestrian or Bicycle Connections</b>
<b>Points</b>	25	50	75	100

**5. REGIONAL SYSTEM MATRIX**  
(MAXIMUM POTENTIAL SCORE = 100)

<b>Low Priority</b>	<b>Medium Priority</b>	<b>High Priority</b>
Project not included in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), the Eastside Transportation Partnership (ETP) or the Bel-Red/Overlake Transportation Study (BROTS), or any other regional study	Project included in one of the following: MTP, ETP, BROTS or any other regional study	Project is included in two or more of the following: the MTP, ETP, BROTS or any other regional study
0	50	100

**6. LEVERAGING FUNDS MATRIX**  
(MAXIMUM POTENTIAL SCORE = 100)

<b>Category</b>	<b>Low Priority</b>	<b>Medium Priority</b>	<b>High Priority</b>
<b>Grant Eligibility</b>	0	15	30
Description	Not eligible for any grant program	Meets eligibility for small grant programs	Meets eligibility for large grant programs
<b>Grant Funding</b>	10	20	30
Description: Average program grant/project budget	1 – 24%	25 – 49%	50+%
<b>Partnership Opportunities</b>	5	15	30
Description	Unlikely	Yes, w/o partner funding	Yes, with partner funding
<b>Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Status</b>	0	5	10
Description	Not Listed	Listed as Candidate	Listed as Approved or Exempt

**PROPOSED NEW**  
**5. REGIONAL BENEFIT AND OUTSIDE FUNDING MATRIX**  
(MAXIMUM POTENTIAL SCORE = 100)

	<b>Low Priority</b>	<b>Medium Priority</b>	<b>High Priority</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project not included in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), the Eastside Transportation Partnership (ETP) or the Bel-Red/Overlake Transportation Study (BROTS), or any other regional Study</li> <li>- Unlikely to be eligible or competitive for any grant program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project included in one of the following: MTP, ETP, BROTS or any other regional study</li> <li>- Meets eligibility requirements and competitiveness thresholds for small grant programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project is included in two or more of the following: the MTP, ETP, BROTS or any other regional study</li> <li>- Provides a regional connection between corridors</li> <li>- Meets eligibility requirements and competitiveness thresholds for large grant programs</li> </ul>
<b>Regional Benefit</b>	0	35	70
<b>Grant Eligibility</b>	0	15	30