



City Council Study Session

AGENDA

November 6, 2017

5:30 pm – 8:00 pm

Call to Order

Estimate time

Topics

- Erosion Hazard Near Sensitive Water Bodies Pilot Program – Permanent Regulations 5:30 pm
- Transportation Planning – Review of Transportation Concurrency Options 6:00 pm

Executive Session – If Necessary

8:00 pm

Adjournment

City Council meetings are wheelchair accessible. American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation is available upon request. Please phone (425) 295-0500 at least 48 hours in advance. Assisted Listening Devices are also available upon request.



801 228th Avenue SE, Sammamish, WA 98075-9509
Phone: 425-295-0500 • Fax: 425-295-0600 • www.sammamish.us

Date: November 6, 2017

To: Sammamish City Council

From: Jeff Thomas, Community Development Director
David Pyle, Deputy Community Development Director

RE: Code Amendments to Sammamish Municipal Code 21A.50.225 Erosion Hazard Near Sensitive Waterbodies No Disturbance Areas Pilot Program

Summary Statement:

The Planning Commission is recommending to the City Council that the City's Erosion Hazard Near Sensitive Waterbodies Overlay (EHNSWB) No Disturbance Areas (NDA) Pilot Program be permanently eliminated from Sammamish Municipal Code (SMC) Environmentally Critical Areas (ECA) regulations section 21A.50.225.

Background:

Citing concerns that the requirements and development regulations of the Pilot Program are inadequate to protect against potentially significant adverse impacts within the NDA, the City Council requested staff prepare interim development regulations removing the Pilot Program from the SMC and evaluate the content of the Program. On May 22, 2017, the City Council declared an emergency and adopted interim regulations under Ordinance O2017-438. Shortly thereafter, during the required (RCW 35A.63.220) July 18, 2017 Public Hearing on the interim development regulations the City Council directed staff to evaluate the components of the EHNSWB NDA Pilot Program [SMC 21A.50.225(5)] and to engage the Planning Commission in consideration of potential permanent changes to this specific section of the City's environmentally critical areas regulations.

During their October 5, 2017 meeting, the Planning Commission was presented with a recommendation by staff to permanently eliminate the City's EHNSWB NDA Pilot Program. Staff presented this recommendation after making a finding that the Pilot Program artificially increases risk of erosion and degraded water quality within the EHNSWB NDA by indirectly promoting larger subdivision projects contradicting the intent of the EHNSWB NDA overlay. Subdivision within the EHNSWB NDA is and has been prohibited. The EHNSWB NDA Pilot Program was a limited program and only allowed four (4) projects. The Pilot Program did not provide for an appropriate method to facilitate subdivision and should be discontinued. Following an October 19, 2017 Public Hearing, the Planning Commission unanimously recommend to the City Council the permanent removal of the Pilot Program from the City's ECA EHNSWB NDA regulations.

Exhibits supporting discussion on the proposed permanent changes to the ECA EHNSWB NDA Pilot Program [SMC 21A.50.225(5)] are included in the November 7, 2017 Council Agenda packet.

Financial Impact:

N/A

Necessary Action:

During the November 6, 2017 meeting, the City Council is scheduled to begin discussion on the proposed permanent code amendments to Sammamish Municipal Code section 21A.50.225(5) (Erosion Hazard Near Sensitive Waterbodies No Disturbance Areas Pilot Program). The City Council is scheduled to hold a Public Hearing on the proposed permanent code amendments and draft adopting Ordinance during the November 7, 2017 meeting. A second reading of the proposed permanent code amendments and draft adopting Ordinance is scheduled for November 21, 2017.



MEMORANDUM

Date: November 2, 2017

To: Jessi Bon, Steve Leniszewski, and Cheryl Paston, City of Sammamish

From: Kendra Breiland, Fehr & Peers

Subject: Concurrency and Level of Service Options

SE17-0536

On November 6th, Fehr & Peers and Transportation Solutions Inc. will report back to Council regarding potential options for updating the City's approach to measuring level of service (LOS) and transportation concurrency. The presentation will cover the following topics:

- Council and community priorities for a new program
- Three potential options for updating the current program
- Inclusion of innovative data into planning process
- Capital project solutions
- Soliciting Council feedback on desired next steps

PRIORITIES FOR A NEW PROGRAM

In July, City Council directed staff to begin development of a new LOS and Concurrency Program for transportation. Through further discussions over the past three months, the City Council has identified the following priorities:

- **Driver experience should be a key measure of system performance** – while the intersection LOS standard measures driver experience during the PM peak hour, the corridor LOS considers daily volumes averaged along segments, which is too far removed from driver experience;
- Concurrency and LOS should **focus on both the AM and PM peak hours** since peaking occurs during both times in Sammamish;
- The City's concurrency program is **complex and difficult to understand** for the lay person – Council would like to see **a more intuitive program** to build community trust;
- With innovative, real-time travel data available (INRIX, cellphone and GPS sources as a few examples), Council wants to ensure that Sammamish's transportation program is **leveraging the best available data and allows for timely response to issues**;
- A real success of the current program has been its ability to make growth pay for growth – any new program must **maintain our ability to charge high impact fees**.



Moreover, the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) has conducted substantial outreach to the community, touching 565 people who live, work, or shop in Sammamish, but primarily residents. Major findings from the initial community outreach phase of the TMP found that:

- The **community's transportation desires are diverse** – while congestion is a concern, people are also looking for a transportation program that makes Sammamish more connected and multimodal.
- The community understands that many **major transportation bottlenecks are outside of the City's control**, but anything the City can do to advocate for more transit service and improve intersections like Sahalee Way/SR 202, E Lake Sammamish Parkway/SR202, and E Lake Sammamish Parkway/SE 56th Street are priorities.

While some members of the community are very educated on the topic of LOS and concurrency, most are not. Thus, most of the community focus will be on the projects rather than the analytical process used to identify those projects.

POTENTIAL PROGRAM OPTIONS

We understand that Council desires to revise the current concurrency program to address the priorities listed in the previous sections. Ideally, this program update could be done both quickly and cost effectively. It would also likely retain the City's current PM peak hour intersection LOS standard, as it is viewed as a direct measure of driver experience. Intersection LOS may also be extended to measure AM operations. Below, we describe three program update options, including some thoughts on cost (relative to each other) and timeline.

Option 1: Modify Current System to De-Couple Driver Experience from Other Modes

In simple terms, Option 1 retains both intersection and segment LOS standards, but provides modifications to address a number of policy concerns.

Specifically, the City would replace Table T-8 in the City's Comprehensive Plan (segment performance) with an arterial LOS table that includes vehicle capacity measures only. The table would be revised to correspond with capacity data available in the newest Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), such as number of lanes, presence of turn lanes, medians, and access management.

The use of non-motorized improvements in the current Table T-8 to determine capacity has been controversial. Under this Option, non-motorized improvements could be removed from concurrency altogether (no longer used to determine capacity), but still be included in a broader Multimodal LOS

standard to ensure those improvements remain eligible for impact fees and are required to be constructed as part of new development.

This Option also calls for the use of intersection LOS measures to continue, with the option to incorporate both AM and PM peak hour operations into the standard.

Finally, staff have discussed the option of discontinuing the process of “corridor averaging.” This would essentially mean that each segment would be evaluated individually for concurrency. When a segment fails concurrency, the failure would need to be remedied within a certain timeframe. While this modification would address a number of concerns about the practice of “corridor averaging,” defining the segments could be a challenging policy decision. In addition, there are financial cautions to this approach considering that it could result in a large number of improvement projects with little flexibility as to the timeline for addressing them.

Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be done relatively quickly (if the policy changes noted above are minimal) • Maintains current impact fee program • Grounded in the most recent HCM research • Provides more flexibility in the siting of bike/pedestrian/transit improvements
Cons	Maintains much of the complexity of the current system
Cost	\$\$
Timeline*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6-8 weeks to develop revised arterial LOS table • If AM model is desired, that would take 3-4 months to develop • Policy revisions related to discontinuing segment averaging and identifying new segments would also add time to the process • New Multi-Modal LOS for bike/pedestrian/transit networks (this work would be deferred to the TMP process and incorporated as a subsequent amendment to the Transportation Element.)

*Note: The timeline noted above does not include Planning Commission or Council processes associated with an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, which is a requirement when changes are made to the Transportation Element.

Option 2: Base Concurrency on Intersections Only, with Multimodal LOS Used for Planning Other Modes

Option 2 eliminates the use of corridor and segment LOS entirely. The City would eliminate Table T-8 from the City’s Comprehensive Plan (segment performance) and focus its concurrency program solely on intersection LOS, perhaps incorporating both AM and PM peak hour operations into the standard.

This change recognizes that intersections are the primary factor that affects driver experience and mirrors how many other communities operate their concurrency programs by using intersection LOS only.

Similar to Option 1, the City could implement a Multimodal LOS standard to define needs for walking, biking, and transit users. These multimodal measures could be incorporated into concurrency or not. This is a similar approach to cities like Redmond, Bellevue, and Kenmore. While Redmond and Kirkland incorporate non-motorized modes into concurrency, Bellevue does not.

Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be done quickly and would simplify the City’s concurrency program • Grounded in the most recent HCM research • Provides more flexibility in the siting of bike/pedestrian/transit improvements • A vastly simplified approach making it much easier for the lay person to understand
Cons	May require additional documentation to justify some capacity projects in the impact fee program (although from experience in other communities, this will not be a problem)
Cost	\$
Timeline*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5-6 weeks to rewrite LOS standards • If AM model is desired, that would take 3-4 months to develop • New Multi-Modal LOS for bike/pedestrian/transit networks (this work would be deferred to the TMP process and incorporated as a subsequent amendment to the Transportation Element.)

*Note: The timeline noted above does not include Planning Commission or Council processes associated with an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, which is a requirement when changes are made to the Transportation Element.

Option 3: Base Concurrency on Travel Time and Multimodal LOS Standard

Option 3 introduces a brand new LOS standard, which essentially is a complete replacement of the current program.

Under this option, the City would eliminate Table T-8 from the City’s Comprehensive Plan (segment performance) and focus its concurrency program on corridor travel times, incorporating both AM and PM peak hour conditions into the standard. Depending on the corridors measured, travel times could be collected using INRIX data. This option, as proposed, does not include intersection LOS measurement, since intersection delay is accounted for in overall travel time. However, if the Council wishes to add intersection LOS into this option, that would be possible.

This change recognizes that travel times are a direct measure of driver experience. To implement this system, Council would need to adopt travel time standards for corridors throughout the City. While the consultant could recommend reasonable standards based on HCM research, the ultimate standard would be a policy decision.

Similar to the other Options, the City could move to a Multimodal LOS standard to define needs for walking, biking, and transit users. These multimodal measures could be incorporated into concurrency or not. This is a similar approach to cities like Redmond, Bellevue, and Kenmore. While Redmond and Kirkland incorporate non-motorized modes into concurrency, Bellevue does not.

Pros	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel times are a strong measure of driver experience • Real time data could be used to continuously monitor travel times • Provides more flexibility in the siting of bike/pedestrian/transit improvements
Cons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This approach would take 6-9 months of significant staff and council time plus substantial consulting services to develop • Complexity of development review process would be much greater since future travel time (speed) is difficult to predict • Need to establish corridors or segments
Cost	\$\$\$\$\$
Timeline*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6-9 months to develop a travel time based program • If AM model is desired, that would take 3-4 months to develop • New Multi-Modal LOS for bike/pedestrian/transit networks (this work would be deferred to the TMP process and incorporated as a subsequent amendment to the Transportation Element.)

*Note: The timeline noted above does not include Planning Commission or Council processes associated with an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, which is a requirement when changes are made to the Transportation Element.

INCLUSION OF INNOVATIVE DATA

Regardless of the LOS/concurrency option chosen, staff feels that use of innovative data sources, like INRIX, could play a critical role in monitoring the performance of the transportation system over time and prioritizing near-term projects. This would be an enhancement over the current program of collecting traffic counts, as INRIX data is continuously available – making it useful for evaluating travel conditions during any time period, including by peak hour, day, or season of the year. Data could also be used to evaluate impacts of short-term road closures, something that is difficult to do now. Discussions with INRIX staff also indicate that the data is affordable (approximately \$15,000 annually for the base package). Thus, it is our recommendation that Council direct staff to purchase INRIX data for use in system monitoring.

NEAR-TERM CAPITAL PROJECT OPTIONS

The majority of recent Council discussions have focused on changes to the concurrency program and LOS standards. While the revisions contemplated above will modify one of the policies the City uses to manage growth, none of these will improve traffic conditions or reduce congestion. For this to happen, additional capital improvement projects should be considered.

At the Council meeting on November 6, 2017, staff will provide several recommendations to “do something” to address ongoing traffic issues which are summarized below:

- Revise the Sahalee Way project with a focus on intersection improvements and added capacity.
- Fund the design of the Issaquah-Pine Lake Road Project
- Set aside funding to address minor intersection improvements that could be implemented as an ongoing program (e.g. lengthening turn pockets).
- Set aside funding (seed money) to improve intersections outside of City limits.
 - Prioritize the Highway 202/Sahalee Way intersection improvement to correspond with the Sahalee Way Improvement Project.
 - Participate in the development of the I-90/Front Street Interchange modifications being studied by WSDOT.

These capital project recommendations are still in development, but we'd like to get initial feedback from the City Council to inform future work. It is anticipated that the scopes for the above projects would be brought back for formal review at a council meeting prior to the end of the year.

NEXT STEPS

We recognize that none of these options are likely the "silver bullet" that simultaneously addresses all of the Council and community's desires for an efficient transportation system that consistently maximizes performance. However, we feel that each of these options provide an appreciable benefit over the current system either in terms of tying to the driver's experience, establishing a nexus to common practice and current research, maintaining flexibility in prioritizing capital investments, and/or reducing the complexity of the existing concurrency system. We welcome Council input on next steps to help us prepare for the Council presentation on November 21 and the Technical Meeting on November 28.

