



Advisory Group Meeting #6 Summary (DRAFT)

February 9, 2017

6:00 – 8:00 PM

Seattle City Hall - Bertha Knight Landes Room

Welcome and Introductions:

Penny Mabie, facilitator, welcomed members of the One Center City Advisory Group and led a round of introductions. Penny reviewed the meeting agenda and materials with Advisory Group members and provided attendees with a reminder of the Advisory Group's purpose and meeting ground rules. The Advisory Group (Group) did not have any comments on the summary of the Jan. 26 meeting, and agreed to make it final.

Penny reviewed the results of the online survey regarding internal online Group communication platforms. The Group agreed to use Google Groups for internal Group communications, which will be set up by the project team.

Transportation Demand Management Presentation:

Jonathan Hopkins, Commute Seattle, and Tom Brennan, Nelson/Nygaard, gave a presentation on transportation demand management and other potential management strategies. They explained that in 2016, the city reached a goal of only having 30% of downtown commuters drive alone as their main form of commuting. Tom went on to explain transportation demand management strategies, including encouragement and education, transit services and pass programs, shared mobility, and parking management, pricing, and regulations.

Group members shared the following questions and comments about the transportation demand management presentation:

Question: How is telecommuting still considered "commuting"?

Response: *Telecommuting is still considered to be a mode of commuting because it's a method of being "at work" in center city. If that person did not telecommute, they would potentially be adding a car to the road during peak traffic hours.*

Question: Is data available from major employers?

Response: *The Commute Trip Reduction law requires employers to report their survey results regarding their employee's commutes, so that data is available. It's shown, for example, that businesses with high rates of bike commuting employees tend to be along great bike routes, like the Westlake cycle track. The data will help determine the level and types of outreach that should be conducted with different businesses.*

Question: What category do Transportation Network Companies (TNC) trips, like Uber and Lyft, fit into?

Response: *The state survey was created before those companies existed, so that information is not requested by the current version of the survey.*

Scott Kubly, Seattle Department of Transportation, thanked the Group for their attendance and participation in this process. He encouraged Group members to reach out to the project team if they need assistance with any of the information presented so far.

Large Group Discussion:

Penny led the Group members in a round table discussion about the potential near-term mobility strategies, focusing on their thoughts thus far and what they have heard from their communities. Group members shared the following comments:

- A lot of information has been presented to the Advisory Group. It would be helpful to divide the Group into special interest groups, which could then discuss interests like biking or walking in more detail.
- Some community members are afraid of change, but are more receptive to changes that they understand. This is a lot of information. It would be great to have these materials condensed into key information that could be shared with community members.
- Community members are concerned with safety - that must be maintained as a priority. There needs to be an emphasis on the most vulnerable modes of transportation and ways to measure safety.
- The past few presentations seem to focus on peak traffic hours, although per the Guiding Principles, the focus should be on "all people, all modes, all times". Also, these solutions are Seattle focused. Areas surrounding Seattle must also be considered.
- It seems like the Guiding Principles were applied to the solutions after the solutions were created. The solutions should have been created based off of the Guiding Principles.
- There is concern over who would pay for the solutions, and who would benefit after implementation.
- There need to be metrics that match the guiding principles.
- There is interest in being bold. Option D is preferred assuming it includes the full bike network and improvements to the pedestrian realm and delivery zones. Route truncations must be

strategized more clearly. Also, a solution must be created for transit riders who will now have to transfer to ensure they won't have to pay more.

- There has only been discussion about shared mobility within Center City - shared mobility hubs on the periphery must also be included. This hasn't yet been discussed.
- As the population increases, more public spaces are needed, yet it is difficult to acquire new land. SDOT should convert pavement to parks.
- Safety is embedded throughout the guiding principles, yet the One Center City process is being criticized in the media because it is not specifically called out. How could the importance of safety be better identified moving forward?
- There is concern with Option D because of 5th Ave as transit-only due to what has happened to 3rd Avenue's street vitality after making it transit-only. What would option D do to retail and how would it affect street level concerns on 5th Avenue. Option C is preferred.
- Communities are concerned with safety issues and disconnect between bike thoroughfares, as well as the need for multimodal access coming into the city.
- People who live on the periphery of Seattle must be considered. People with mobility needs and sight impairment must be able to transfer easily at the periphery.
- The amount of information about the strategies is overwhelming. Advisory group members need to be able to share it. In its current form, it is hard to do with seniors, immigrants, and refugees. It is also hard for people with walkers and canes to navigate downtown.
- There are many commuters from suburban communities who must be considered. The project team needs to think holistically about the region.
- Don't make 5th Ave transit-only. It is the only good avenue left. Transit-only will negatively impact street life. Other alternatives should be considered. The hub idea seems interesting, but do we need new hubs? Emphasis should be placed on pedestrians and encouraging more walking and for farther distances. There is so much delivery that taking away loading zones is concerning.
- There are concerns over potential changes in bus routes on the east side. East side commuters who currently take one trip might have to start taking two or three. Some east side transit riders may switch to driving if they find it easier. People outside of Seattle must be considered. This is not the right venue or forum for a conversation about east side transit riders.
- There are concerns over pedestrian and bike safety. Option B is preferred for return on investment, followed by Option D. On Pike/Pine, Option C is preferred for bike facilities because of smaller impact to cars and loading zones.
- It is critical to accommodate the basic bike network and several of the options do have that component. Option D is preferred for a north/south option. No preference between B and C for east/west options. Safety and the user experience are important, yet the options focus on how we move more vehicles quickly through the city. It's important to increase the number of

people walking as their main form of transportation, since they take up the least amount of space.

- Office buildings are seeing an increase in bike commuting from employers and an interest in ways to connect bike riders to their employment. More protected bike lanes are needed in Seattle and on the east side. Also, making 5th Ave transit-only will negatively impact the pedestrian experience. Third Avenue is an unfinished project – it is good for transit, for not for pedestrians.
- The International District hub could become congested. Could SODO station or Stadium station be included in these plans? Bike connections on Pike and Pine streets are important. Where are the options for connecting the 2nd Avenue protected bike lane to Dearborn? There is also concern over where the 600 buses a day will go during the demolition of the Alaskan Way Viaduct.
- Transportation-focused entities like food businesses and construction companies need inclusion in these options. The focus seems to be on people going to jobs in offices, although work related transportation and the transportation of goods are important as well.
- The information is difficult and needs to be translated in digestible bits. How will these potential changes impact the Chinatown/International District, Pioneer Square, and SODO and other neighborhoods outside the downtown? These are neighborhoods, not just hubs.
- Property owners along 4th and 5th avenues are concerned with how these plans might affect their neighborhoods in the long term. Potential safety issues between pedestrians and bicyclists should also be addressed, as forty percent of the population of the Chinatown/International District is over the age of 55.
- The graphs and infographics have been helpful in explaining the information to those who speak other languages - please continue to produce them. The International District is a neighborhood as well as a hub, and community members are concerned that businesses and local seniors may be negatively impacted. 5th Avenue leads many to the International District, and adding buses to it will likely have a negative impact.
- Making 5th Avenue transit-only will have negative impacts on retail and the pedestrian experience.
- How can this information be communicated to members of the blind and deaf-blind community? This information must be accessible to them. This community is really interested in east-west connections. Transferring and getting up and down hills are concerns. Routes that are changed by construction impacts are problematic – people have to learn new routes and need information in advance. Any change is significant.
- Construction workers need parking. A large unused piece of property north or south of the city should be made available for construction workers to meet up and carpool. It does not need to be permanent.
- One Center City should give more attention to Denny Way and the surrounding area.

- Option B may not do enough, Option C might preclude the bike network expansion, and Option D might negatively impact the retail environment. Option C could be improved if an SOV lane was cut to save a bike lane. Solutions that add capacity to 3rd Ave and buses are critical.

Scott thanked the Group members for their feedback and encouraged them to continue thinking outside of the box. He asked Group members to consider how difficult options could be improved.

Small Group Discussions:

Penny broke up the Group members into four groups for small group discussions. The first three groups each focused on a different Option (B, C, or D), while the final group focused on bus service changes.

Penny asked the small groups to discuss the following questions:

- What would have to be changed to make this option the best option?
- How well does this option align with the Guiding Principles?
- What's missing from this option?

Following the small group discussions, Penny asked Group members to report any key takeaways from their conversations. Group members shared the following comments:

Comment: Regarding Option B, it is important to maintain the current size of the sidewalks and to maintain the street canopy. There is concern that removing a vehicle lane will increase street congestion. The solution to 5th Ave does not have to be one size fits all - it could include three lanes at the north end of 5th Ave which could reduce to two lanes after passing the east-west freeway feeder streets. Protected bike lanes are good, especially when they go with the flow of traffic.

Question: What specific issues do Group members have with 3rd Ave? It would be helpful to understand this before the next meeting.

Comment: More time should be given to assess how well these options align with the Guiding Principles. A subset of Group members could and should do some of this work.

Public Comment:

One meeting attendee explained that more and more people are walking as a form of transportation. He urged the Group and project team to pick Option D, think boldly, and focus on the pedestrian experience.

Wrap-up and Next Steps:

Meghan Shepard, Seattle Department of Transportation, provided an update on outreach activities. She began by thanking Group members who had already invited the project team to speak to their

community groups, and encouraged others to do so if they hadn't already. She then noted that the One Center City online open house had received 1,500 unique visitors by that afternoon, 84 of which had completed the survey. She explained that the project team is working on translating a similar piece into 12 languages, and has developed a specific set of outreach strategies that are targeted at the International District/Chinatown, which will begin over the next few weeks. Meghan encouraged the Group members to consider alternative outreach activities with their groups besides briefings, such as informative happy hours. Lastly, she noted that the online open house has been extended to March 3, 2017.

Question: What kind of feedback has been received thus far via the online open house?

***Response:** The feedback that has been received via the online open house is consistent with the feedback that Group members have been providing.*

Question: Can the project team provide the group with information to send in an email along with the online open house link?

***Response:** Yes, the project team will send out an email with a link to the online open house that can be forwarded to members of the community.*

Before adjourning the meeting, Penny suggested that a subcommittee be formed to develop performance indicators based on the Guiding Principles. Peggy, Cary, Reese, Rico, Carl and Catherine volunteered to take part in the subcommittee. Penny thanked them for volunteering and noted that the project team would be in touch with them regarding next steps.

Before adjourning the meeting, Peggy asked if the Group would be willing to stay an extra 30 minutes at the next meeting. There was consensus among the Group to extend the next meeting by 30 minutes.

Penny thanked the Group members for attending and sharing their perspectives. She noted that the next Advisory Group meeting would be on March 9, 2017.

Identified Action Items:

- The project team will reach out to the newly established subcommittee to develop performance indicators based on the Guiding Principles.
- The project team will create a Google Groups platform for the Group to use.
- The project team will send out an email with information about the online open house which group members can forward directly to their community members.

Attendees:

Advisory Group Members:

- Anders McConachie
- Brian Ferris (phone)
- Carl Leighty (for Leslie Smith)
- Cary Moon
- Catherine Hennings
- Cindy Zwart
- David Wiggins
- Deanna Dawson
- Erin Goodman
- Hester Serebrin (phone)
- Holly Houser
- Jared Johnson
- Jeff Myrter
- Jennifer Butler
- Jenny Schmitz
- Jessa Timmer
- Jim Erickson
- John Pehrson
- Maiko Winkler-Chin
- Michael Davis
- Monty Anderson
- Peggy Martinez
- Reese Tanimura
- Rico Quirindongo
- Sabrina Villanueva
- Staci Haber
- Tom Graff

Observers:

- C.J. Grove
- Gordon Padelford
- Jane Lewis
- Jeff Hammerquist
- Kelsey Mesher

Agency Staff:

City of Seattle

- Andrew Glass Hastings, SDOT
- Chisaki Muraki-Valdovinos, SDOT
- Diane Wiatr, SDOT
- Eric Tweit, SDOT
- Gary Johnson, OPCD
- Kevin Shively, Mayor's Office
- Meghan Shepard, SDOT
- Scott Kubly, SDOT
- Tracy Krawczyk, SDOT
- Steve Pearce, Office of the Waterfront

Sound Transit

- Wesley King

King County DOT:

- Frank Abe
- Kim Becklund
- Paul Roybal
- Tristan Cooke

Downtown Seattle Association:

- Don Blakeney
- Jonathan Hopkins, Commute Seattle
- Jacqueline Gruber

Other Project Staff:

- Tom Brennan, Nelson/Nygaard
- Tyler Cohen, EnviroIssues
- Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
- Justin McCaffree, EnviroIssues
- Erin Tam, EnviroIssues
- Brett Watson, EnviroIssues