Topic: #B13, Edits to Transportation Chapter

OPC Sponsors: Roger Horn/Larry Leveen

OUTCOME FROM 2/25/13: MOTION PASSED TO RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING
- Exception: Highlighted items tabled for HDC discussion.

Complete Streets
Complete streets are those built for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders, as well as cars, trucks and buses. Complete streets are needed to increase the number of people walking, biking and using transit, while meeting the safety needs of motor vehicles. Complete street policies complement other goals related to economic vitality, reducing congestion, increasing land-use density, minimizing environmental impacts, and providing people more opportunities to be physically active.

Rationale: Suggestion by Thera Black. Also consistent with BPAC comment about the need for Climate Change to be addressed in the Transportation Section of the Comprehensive Plan.

Goals and Policies

GT1: All streets are safe and inviting for pedestrians and bicyclists. Streets are designed to be human scale, while accommodating motor vehicles, and to reinforce and encourage safe driver behavior.
Rationale: Suggestion by Thera Black. Consistent with policies in this section addressing transportation safety.

PT1.2: Build streets to be as narrow as possible in individual lane width and overall width, to discourage speeding, while facilitating the movement of larger vehicles, as needed to the level appropriate for the area uses.
Rationale: Narrow lane widths "calm by design". It is an important concept that we should embrace and state in the Comp Plan.

PT1.3: Establish speed limits to create a safe environment for pedestrians and bicyclists, while maintaining motor vehicle traffic flow. Speed limits shall not exceed 35 miles per hour on arterial and major collector streets and 25 miles per hour on neighborhood collector and 20 miles per hour on local access streets, and in the City Center.
***Put in letter that this might be able to be addressed through sub-area planning**

Rationale: Slower speed will protect children, bicyclists, pets, and people backing out of driveways. Many local access streets don't have sidewalks resulting in pedestrian use of streets.

PT1.4: Mitigate the impacts of high traffic volumes by creating buffers between pedestrians and motor vehicles with on-street parking, street trees, and planter strips, building wide sidewalks, and creating interest along the street with amenities and building design.* Put in letter that City might consider buffers for bicycle lanes

Rationale: Street trees also serve as a buffer and physically protect pedestrians. Research has shown that street trees reduce accidents (Speck, Walkable City, p. 225).

PT1.7: Use medians for access control and to keep the number of motor vehicle lanes to a minimum. ~~Use medians for pedestrian crossing islands, and to enhance the beauty of a street.~~

PT1.75: Use medians for pedestrian crossing islands, and to enhance the beauty of a street.

Rationale: Arguably not terribly substantive. Consider splitting up those two sentences into two different policies to reflect their different foci.

PT1.8: Build streets in a grid pattern of small blocks to allow streets to be narrow and low-volume, encourage walking, and ~~to~~ provide travelers with a choice of routes.

Rationale: Provides a more complete list of reasons for this policy.

PT1.95: Require consolidation of driveways and parking lot connectivity for adjacent commercial areas to facilitate access from one site to another without having to access the roadway.

Rationale: New policy. Allows for movement from one store or development to another with-out having to enter and exit the roadway. Providing such access reduces congestion on roadways and encourages non-motorized mode use.

PT1.11: ~~Recognize the unique character of a street and the unique use of a street by pedestrians, bicyclists, or transit.~~ Consider modified street design to enhance ~~the~~ function for all modes and to support the unique identity of a street.

Rationale: Combining concepts for clarity — simply "recognizing" doesn't lead to a substantive result for the community.

PT1.12: Provide adequate street and public pathway lighting for the safety of all modes in a manner that reduces light pollution.

Rationale: Add public pathways so that they will be lighted for safety and invite use.

GT2: As new streets are built or existing streets are reconstructed, multimodal features ~~will be~~are

added. Features defined for different types of streets are specified in the City of Olympia Engineering Design and Development Standards**.**

Rationale: Making the verb tense consistent with other goals. Note: the other underlined text isn't a change, but how the draft itself is formatted, because it is a hyperlink to the document in question.

PT2.1: Build arterial streets to serve as primary routes connecting urban centers and the regional transportation network. These streets include bike lanes, sidewalks, planter strips~~,~~ and pedestrian crossing features and other amenities that support pedestrian comfort and safety.~~, and in dense areas, a high-quality streetscape~~.

Rationale: To clarify that all such streets should be complete streets, not just "dense areas" which is a somewhat vague term in this context (as is "high-quality streetscape"). Staff consider changing "and" to "to"

PT2.2: Build major collector streets to connect arterials to residential and commercial areas. These streets include bike lanes, sidewalks, planter strips~~,~~ and pedestrian crossing features~~, and in dense areas, a high-quality streetscape~~.

Rationale: Similar to the above change, it clarifies that all such streets should be complete streets, not just "dense areas" which is a somewhat vague term in this context (as is "high-quality streetscape").

PT2.3: Build neighborhood collectors to provide circulation within and between residential and commercial areas. These streets include sidewalks and planter strips. Selected neighborhood collectors include bike lanes, or signs and markings to designate a bike route (see Appendix D: Bike Network Map and List). These streets may also include pedestrian crossing features~~, and in dense areas, a high-quality streetscape~~.

Rationale: Provides a link to help understand which neighborhood collector streets are slated for bike lanes, though the rationale for *when such streets are slated for lanes* is not apparent in the Olympia Bicycle Master Plan. Also makes a similar change to dense areas, as above.

PT2.4: Build ~~small~~ local access streets to provide direct connections to properties within neighborhoods. All new local access streets include sidewalks and planter strips. Local access streets may include signs and markings to direct cyclists to the larger bicycle network.

Rationale: Improving clarity of policy. Idea for letter: Water infiltration systems as part of planter strips on all classes of streets

PT2.5: Provide transit stops and service accommodations, based on Intercity Transit's criteria.

Include sidewalk access to all designated stops and consider pedestrian crossing improvements to facilitate access, including mid-block crossing islands on high volume streets.

Rationale: Ensuring safe movement to/from bus stops is essential for supporting transit use.

PT2.6: Install or ~~Allow~~ allow traffic-calming devices on local access, neighborhood collector, and some major collector streets, where speeds, volumes and other conditions indicate a need. Consider pedestrian, bicyclist and transit bus safety and access when installing traffic calming devices.

Rationale: Allow implies the city just gives permission to neighborhoods or developers. The city also installs traffic calming.

PT2.7: ~~Add~~ Allow on-street parking ~~to~~ on local access and neighborhood collector streets, ~~when absolutely needed~~ ~~to serve as a pedestrian buffer and~~ to provide direct access to properties.

Rationale (Leveen): Space for cars is a "societal bad", just like stormwater and it should be dealt with "on-site" (i.e. on the property itself) to the greatest degree possible. On-street parking adds impervious surface, and when unused, makes roadways wider, encouraging speeding. To best calm streets and support pedestrians, install vegetation buffers which are continually present, and make a street nicer to be along, not by providing pavement for a car that might or might not be there.

Rationale (Horn): "Allow" rather than "add" eliminates the need "when absolutely needed." Lots of people park on the street in established neighborhoods; the way it reads, it sounds like that permission will be taken away. I don't think parking on local streets is necessarily a bad.

PT2.8 Prioritize adding ~~Build~~ bulb-outs ~~at street corners~~ for shorter pedestrian crossings and traffic calming on existing arterials and major collectors with on-street parking. Consider building bulb-outs on ~~local access and~~ neighborhood collector streets with on-street parking where overall narrowing of the street is not possible.~~Build bulb-outs on local access and neighborhood collector streets with on-street parking. Add bulb-outs to existing arterials and major collectors with on-street parking.~~

Rationale: We shouldn't have to bulb out low-speed, low volume streets. With limited dollars, we should prioritize more dangerous streets for such pedestrian crossing improvements.

GT3: Streets allow the efficient delivery of goods and services.

PT3.1Design streets to allow the efficient and safe delivery of goods and services, providing access for buses, commercial trucks, emergency and other public service vehicles at an appropriate scale for the local uses.

~~PT3.2: Provide access on all streets for public and commercial needs, while keeping street widths as narrow as possible to maintain a human-scale environment.~~ Designate and enforce appropriate linear curb space for loading and unloading of commercial vehicles in urban areas.
Rationale: Arguably the struck text is redundant (see prior policy). Written testimony pointed out that appropriate loading/unloading zones was not addressed in the Comp Plan.

PT3.3: Consider large ~~truck~~vehicle movement in the design of arterial and major collector streets, particularly at intersections and on streets in industrial zoned areas and mixed use areas.
Rationale: Delivery trucks that service stores should be considered in street design. Written testimony spoke to intersections being limiting factors for large vehicles. Two intersections in particular have been cited as reasons IT is not using three-bike capacity racks on their vehicles (Columbia and 5th and Harrison & Division).

PT3.4: ~~Encourage~~ Require alleys and retain alleys as public right-of-way.

PT3.5: ~~Encourage~~ Require alleys behind lots fronting on arterials and collectors, so that houses or businesses can face the street, sidewalks are continuous, and vehicles can access properties from behind.

Rationale: Using "encourage" guarantees us nothing. If we want alleys, they should be required.

PT3.55: Maintain functionality of alleyways for delivery and service vehicles by ensuring they are not blocked by trash receptacles, cars or other obstructions.

Rationale: New policy to help ensure the alleys we have and require are actually usable for the purposes intended. This allows delivery vehicles to exit the street, which reduces friction/congestion, and assists commerce by allowing convenient access for deliveries.

~~PT3.6: Provide access to individual properties from the smallest type of street when a lot fronts more than one street.~~

Rationale: Policy is redundant. Policy PT1.9 (see citation below) does a better job addressing Access Management without being overly restrictive. Corner lots (e.g. Grocery Outlet plaza at Harrison & Division, the former K-Mart on Martin & Sleater-Kinney) and "through-lots" (e.g. Hardel on Harrison, which goes all the way to 4th Ave. SW) would be unduly affected, possibly stifling (re)development. The specifics of the access management policies can be handled through the development code and the EDDS. Again, we suggest retaining the following policy:

PT1.9: Minimize driveway curb cuts along major streets to reduce conflicts between vehicles and bicyclists and pedestrians. Use shared driveways, or provide access off side streets and alleys.

GT4: The street network is a well-connected system of small blocks allowing short trips that are direct for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, motorists, and all types of service vehicles.

PT4.1 Connect streets in a grid-like pattern of smaller blocks. ~~Ideal~~ Block sizes should range from 250 feet to 350 feet in residential areas and up to a maximum of ~~550~~ 500 feet along arterials.

Rationale: Provides more explicit direction on the size of blocks consistent with block spacing criteria and tables in EDDS. Large blocks in residential neighborhoods impede pedestrian movement and create longer trips to get to transit and services.

PT4.3: Build new street and pathway connections so that people walking, biking, or accessing bus stops have direct ~~short~~ route options, making these modes more inviting.

Rationale: Includes non-motorized pathways. Also, gets at the policy's point better – not short trips, but direct ones.

PT4.8Build new arterials, major collectors and neighborhood collectors based on the general location defined on the Transportation Maps in Appendix B. ~~and using the guidance~~ Require use of the Engineering Design and Development Standards for such roadways.

Rationale: The EDDS are not a suggestion. They are our standards.

PT4.10Require that ~~Ensure~~ new developments connect to the existing street network and also provide for future street connections to ensure the gridded street system is built out concurrently with future development.

Rationale: Clarifies and strengthens connected streets policy. Developments should not be permitted if they do not connect to the existing street network. Furthermore such developments should have to provide connections for future development so that connections are as obvious as possible for potential residents; these should never be a surprise.

PT4.11: Retrofit existing development into a pattern of short blocks.

Issue: We are unclear what staff is proposing in PT4.11. Was it intended to be "use eminent domain to retrofit *now*", or "retrofit where possible, such as when redeveloping an area"?

PT4.13: Build an adequate network of arterials and collectors to discourage heavy traffic volumes on local access streets~~.~~ [For more information see: ~~as identified in~~ Appendix B: Transportation 2030 Street Capacity and Connectivity Project List and Maps. – Consider using this format where Appendix mentioned in other policies]

Rationale: Provide the reference so the public knows what to expect.

PT4.14: Build a dense grid of local access and collector streets to provide multiple points of ingress/egress from a neighborhood, and so that local traffic does not have to use arterial streets for trips within the neighborhood.

Rationale: A dense grid of local and collector streets provides more than just the ability to get to points *within* a neighborhood. It provides redundant exits and entries as well.

PT4.15: ~~Discourage~~Disallow ~~cul-de-sacs. and~~ oOnly allow cul-de-sacs ~~their use~~ as the result of topographic and environmental constraints. Cul-de-sacs that are built should have a maximum length of 300 feet and be built with pedestrian and bike connections to adjacent streets, or to destinations such as schools, parks and trails wherever possible.

Rationale: Cul-de-sacs are the bane of good land use and transportation planning. Comp Plan language should be very strong on this, only allowing exceptions in extreme circumstances. The "*where possible*" phrase acknowledges that some constrains, such as topography might make requires bridges over ravines.

GT5: Pathways enhance the transportation network by providing direct and formal off-street routes for bicyclists and pedestrians.

PT5.2: Require new development to ~~look for opportunities to~~ provide pathways and connect to adjacent developed properties in order to provide direct bicycle and pedestrian routes. These will be at the same interval spacing as street spacing requirements or at closer intervals.

Rationale: "Super blocks" are a barrier to movement. Development layout should enable one to move across or through to get to uses within, or on the other side. 'Looking for opportunities' does not direct that indeed the connections are made. Recent large developments have not provided numerous connections. This policy language needs to be strong enough to inform and direct that connections are made.

PT5.4: The City will coordinate with the State regarding increasing bicycle and pedestrian permeability of the Capitol Campus.

Rationale: New policy. Currently, the Capital Campus is a significant impediment both for north-south and east-west travel for both modes. The campus should instead be a resource for these modes, but requires dedicated attention by both parties to achieve this result.

GT7: Impacts of new development on the transportation system are addressed by establishing level-of-service standards that indicate when improvements are needed.

***PT7.1: Measure level-of-service using the average vehicle volumes that occur during the highest volume consecutive two-hour period. Use the two-hour level of service as a screening tool to determine capacity needs at intersections and along streets. Consider location efficiency in this calculation to remove disincentives for development along Urban Corridors where increased density is desired.**

Rationale: This is a recommendation of the Urban Corridors Task Force report.

PT7.2: Determine the need for, and feasibility of, motor vehicle capacity improvements by considering street hierarchy and street spacing criteria; environmental, social, and urban form impacts; cost; and physical constraints.

Rationale: Cost should also be considered. Other measures may be more cost-effective.

PT7.25: Consider signal upgrades and signal timing as standard elements in addressing congestion.
Rationale: New Policy. In every analysis, we should consider these cost-effective, congestion-reducing strategies as an alternative to, or adjunct to, building additional capacity.

PT7.3: ~~Ensure that n~~No street will exceed the width of five general purpose auto lanes (two in each direction and a center turn lane) mid-block when adding capacity to the street system. Turn lanes may be added as appropriate, with careful consideration of pedestrian and bicyclist safety ~~at intersections.~~

Rationale: Clarifies and strengthens policy.

PT7.4Consider roundabouts as a strategy to maintain mobility ~~where appropriate~~ ~~along a street with minimizing street widening~~.

Rationale: Original wording is vague. Changes make it more succinct.

PT7.5: Establish and maintain appropriate level-of-service using the following guidelines; (see street

system maps in Appendix B and Corridor map in Appendix H):

- Level-of-service E will be acceptable on arterials and major collectors in the City Center and along Urban Corridors
- Level-of-service D will be acceptable in the rest of the City and Urban Growth Area
- Higher levels of service may be maintained in parts of the City because of low-traffic demand
- For some intersections, level-of-service is F is acceptable
- **On Strategy Corridors, where widening is not an option, levels-of-service may ~~exceed~~ fall below adopted standards**

Rationale: Clarification of policy intent. "Exceed" implies LOS is better than the adopted standard.

GT8: The impacts of new land-use development on the transportation system are mitigated appropriately.

Rationale: Not mitigated by just any means – for instance we don't widen roads past 5 lanes.

PT8.1: Require mitigation for new developments so that transportation level of service does not fall below adopted standards except where adopted policies allow.

Rationale: The City has policies to not widen roads beyond 5 lanes, and will not knock down buildings in downtown to widen roads.

PT8.2: Construction of improvements or contribution of funds may be required of new development to help the function and safety of the street, such as installation/upgrades/timing/re-timing of traffic signals, installation of bike lanes, pedestrian improvements, turn pockets, special lanes for buses and conversion of signalized intersections to roundabouts.

Rationale: Tools for addressing traffic impact are should be more comprehensively listed.

GT9: In designated Strategy Corridors, when road widening is not an option, mobility and system capacity is ~~added~~ increased through ~~increasing~~ the addition of walking, biking and transit ~~trips~~ facilities, supportive land use, and by eliminating system inefficiencies.

Rationale: You can't add walking and biking trips, but you can add facilities to encourage them. Even so, without supportive land use, such as short block spacing and mixed-use zoning, bike/walk/bus trips will not materialize. There is a greater context to "if you build it they will come".

PT9.2: Review and update concurrency ordinances as appropriate to implement multimodal and system efficiency strategies in Strategy Corridors. (See Concurrency Report explanation in Appendix A.)

Rationale: It's not just multimodal strategies, but whole system efficiency too. For example, if traffic signals are not timed properly, the overall system efficiency drops.

GT10: System capacity improvements ~~move~~focus on moving people and goods more efficiently, minimizing congestion ~~is minimized~~ by replacing car trips with walking, biking and transit trips, and by increasing system operational efficiency and reliability.

Rationale: More inclusive and clearer language. There is an important difference between system capacity and system efficiency.

~~GT12Growth will be concentrated in our urban areas, making walking, biking and transit viable modes for more people.~~
~~PT12.1Promote infill and densification, in order to reduce motor vehicle trips and make the best use of the multimodal transportation network.~~
~~PT12.2Use zoning to create housing near places of employment, allowing people to live closer to where they work, reduce trip lengths and increase access to walking, biking and transit.~~

GT12: A mix of strategies is used to concentrate growth in the City, which both supports and is supported by walking, biking and transit.

***PT12.1: Consider upzoning areas in the downtown core and along parts of the Urban Corridor, and downzoning areas in the periphery of the City.**

***PT12.2: Consider a geographically-influenced impact fee structure to incentivize (re)development in the downtown core and along parts of the Urban Corridor.**

*** PT12.3: Consider incentives to address the specific challenges downtown redevelopment faces.**

*** PT12.4: Promote infill and densification in close-in neighborhoods, activity centers, and downtown, in order to reduce sprawl, to reduce motor vehicle trips and make the best use of the existing transportation network.**

*** PT12.5: Allow residential uses in commercial and employment areas in order to reduce commute and errand trip distances and increase the feasibility of alternatives to driving alone.**

*** PT12.6: Allow neighborhood retail in residential areas to reduce commute and errand trip distances and increase the feasibility of alternatives to driving alone.**

Rationale: Decades of using the July Draft policies have not resulted in directing growth to the core of the City. A more sophisticated approach is needed to effectively incentivize (re)development and infill in these areas. The policies we propose are responsive to the “best available” information from regional studies (Urban Corridor Task Force), yet are not overly prescriptive.

GT13: Greater density along priority ~~b~~Bus ~~c~~Corridors optimizes investments in transit and makes transit an inviting mode of travel. (See Appendix H, the Corridors map for Bus Corridors.)

PT13.1: ~~Achieve~~Encourage transit-supportive density and land-use patterns along priority ~~b~~Bus ~~c~~Corridors, through zoning, incentives and other regulatory tools.

PT13.2: Guide transit-dependent land uses to locate on priority ~~b~~Bus ~~c~~Corridors. This includes schools, public services, major employers, and senior and multi-family housing.

Rationale: "Bus Corridor" is a term with a specific meaning in the Comp Plan — not all bus routes are Bus Corridors. Including "priority" helps reinforce this idea.

***PT14.1: Retrofit City streets in Urban Corridors to City Street Standards to attract new development and increase densities.**

Rationale: Typo. Also, questions to clarify the intent were asked of staff: Is the intent that the City will do/pay for this? When as standalone projects or during street overlays?

*PT14.2 Request the State of Washington include Urban Corridors in the State's preferred leasing area, so that state buildings are easily accessible by walking, biking and frequent transit.

***PT14.3: Encourage public agencies to build in the Urban Corridors, so that they are easily accessible by walking, biking and transit and support the City's transportation-efficient land use goals.**

Rationale: To be explicit that public agencies as major employers are partners in helping to implement the Comp Plan. Can we instead require that public agencies do this? Also, perhaps this policy should be combined with "PT25.3Work with the State to locate new worksites in the dense urban area, in locations that are accessible by frequent transit and that allow employees to more easily walk and bike." GT14 is about Urban Corridors, and GT25 is about encouraging non-SOV commute modes.

***PT 14.4: Partner with the cities of Lacey and Tumwater to pursue the ~~land use and transportation measures identifies for the Urban Corridors~~ the coordinated transportation and land use objectives associated with the region's premier transit corridors of Martin Way, east 4th and State Avenues, Pacific Avenue and portions of Capitol Way/Boulevard.**

Rationale: Emphasizes the coordination of transportation and land use, and the importance of these corridors to achieving transformative change.

GT16: Bus corridors have high-quality transit service allowing people to ride the bus spontaneously, and easily replace car trips with trips by bus.

PT16.1: Develop a system of bus corridors with fast, frequent and predictable service. Transit service should operate at least every 15 minutes on weekdays where supported by land use.

Rationale: Not reasonable to expect 15 minute service on every route. Focus should be on trunk routes.

PT16.2: Increase the density and mix of land uses along bus corridors to support high frequency service.

Rationale: This is a land-use oriented policy and belongs in Goal 13 (see above) – unless the two goals are combined.

PT16.7: ~~Reduce~~ Eliminate minimum parking requirements along bus corridors.

Rationale: We need a more aggressive approach than just reducing parking requirements in order to achieve the densities along bus corridors.

PT16.8: Give priority to sidewalk investments and mid-block pedestrian crossings that enhance access and safety on high frequency Bus Corridors.

Rationale: New policy to provide pedestrian enhancements provide important support for safe access to transit on Bus Corridors.

GT17: Intercity Transit's short- and long-range plans are supported.

PT17.1: Support Intercity Transit's existing and planned services and facilities by ensuring that street standards, system operational efficiencies, land uses, and ~~building placement~~ site design support transit along current and future routes.

Rationale: A more complete and accurate listing of the city-controlled factors that affect transit.

PT17.5: ~~Work with~~ Require new development to provide facilities to support the transit rider, as they walk or bike to and from stops. These include such things as transit shelters, awnings, bike parking, walkways, benches, and lighting.

Concern: If we want something, it should be required.

GT18 The region is prepared to advance high-capacity transportation.

PT18.3Integrate land use and high-capacity ~~transit~~ transportation planning so that dense urban centers are developed around future rail stations.
Rationale: We think this was the policy Dennis Bloom from I.T. meant to refer to in his testimony.

PT18.4: Encourage the Washington State Department of Transportation and the Thurston Regional Planning Council to ~~increase~~ identify and address deficiencies in regional commuter services.

Rationale: These agencies are not transit service providers, but can play a role in supporting regional commuter services.

PT 18.5: Achieve the land use necessary to support high capacity transportation.

Rationale: New policy. High capacity transportation will only happen if it is significantly supported by proper land use. Ask Thera for clarification.

GT19: The rail system is a cost effective and efficient method of moving materials ~~regionally~~long distances.

PT19.1: Work with regional partners and the Washington State Department of Transportation to support and expand freight rail to and from the region~~in Washington~~ State~~the region, because it can be efficient and extend the life of the street system~~.

Rationale Leveen: Using the word "region" doesn't accurately represent how rail is used – for long-distance freight movement, not intra-county transport.

Rationale Horn: Seems too broad. Suggest the following alternative:
Work with regional partners and the Washington State Department of Transportation to support and expand freight rail to and from the region ~~in Washington State~~the region, because it can be efficient and extend the life of the street system.

GT20: Walking is safe and inviting, and more people walk for transportation.

PT20.8: Allow payment of a fee-in-lieu for sidewalks in certain instances so that sidewalks and other pedestrian improvements can be constructed in the locations they are most needed.

Rationale: This is an entirely new policy, suggested by BPAC, that would allow flexibility to help ensure that developer contributions provide facilities that serve the community's highest need.

GT21: Sidewalks make streets safe and inviting for walking.

PT21.2: Focus City sidewalk construction on major streets, where heavy traffic volumes and speeds make it difficult for walkers to share space with motor vehicles. Priorities for sidewalk construction are based on street conditions, presence of transit and proximity to destinations.

Rationale: Providing pedestrian access to transit is crucial.

GT22 Pedestrian crossing improvements remove barriers for walkers on major streets, especially wide streets with high-vehicle volumes.

PT22.1: Build new streets and retrofit existing streets with crossing islands and curb bulb-outs to increase pedestrian safety. ~~for pedestrians trying to reduce a pedestrian's exposure to motor vehicles as they cross the street~~.

Rationale: Minor change. Pedestrian exposure is the same regardless of whether or not a crossing island is present. However, refuge islands break up the task of crossing multiple lanes of traffic into two significantly easier tasks, which increases safety.

PT22.3: Add safe mid-block crossings for pedestrians to new and ~~rebuilt streets~~existing streets. This is especially important on major streets that have long distances between signalized crossings, and those with high frequency transit service.

Rationale: Safe pedestrian crossings are important facilities that support transit.

PT22.5: Consider use of pavers or colored, patterned concrete on crosswalks in commercial or mixed-use areas to increase ~~the~~ motorist awareness ~~and safety~~ of pedestrians, and to improve the appearance of an area, when doing so will not negatively affect cyclists or pedestrians.

Rationale: Pedestrian awareness is not the target of distinctive walking surfaces; motorist awareness of the potential presence of pedestrians is. The new phrase refers to the unfortunate experience the City had with stamped concrete *sealer* in the Gateway Corridor project; the sealer was removed because it caused cyclists to slip and fall. Aesthetics are a secondary benefit, and are less important than providing safe surfaces for non-motorized users.

PT22.6 Consider the needs of the elderly and disabled in all crosswalk design and signal timing.

Rationale: New policy. Even though there are standards addressing ADA, we should be explicit that these citizens' needs should be considered.

GT23: Streetscapes buffer walkers from motor vehicle traffic, enhance the experience of walking, and increase the attractiveness of an area.

PT23.3: Provide sidewalks of sufficient width to ensure adequate space for all appropriate streetscape elements ~~Build wide sidewalks in densely populated areas~~ to create more public space and support active street life. In ~~these~~ heavily-peopled areas, install benches, artwork and other features to make streets interesting and inviting, while maintaining safe walking surfaces and adequate space for those in wheelchairs.

Rationale: Policy focus is on ensuring adequate space for streetscape elements with context sensitivity – sidewalks in outlying neighborhoods might only warrant street trees, whereas sidewalks in the downtown might include more elements to support the greater number of pedestrians and diversity of activities on urban sidewalks (gathering spaces, newspaper vending, bicycle parking, etc). The last phrase is an acknowledgement that safety and accessibility should trump aesthetics (e.g. mosaics on the sidewalks of the 4th Avenue Bridge are very slippery, and are a nuisance to pedestrians in wet weather).

PT23.4: Require continuous awnings over the sidewalk along building frontages in densely developed areas to protect pedestrians from weather, and encourage them everywhere else.
Rationale: Awnings are a crucial element of "pedestrian habitat" and they are needed in many areas. Rain does not just fall in "densely developed areas".

GT24: Bicycling is safe and inviting, and ~~more~~ many people bike ~~for transportation~~to meet their travel and activity needs.

Rationale: More explicit than "transportation."

PT24.1: Retrofit streets to provide safe and inviting bicycle facilities. Use the Bicycle Master Plan (2009) to guide facilities development~~.~~, but look for other opportunities to provide bicycle facilities where possible.

Rationale: Recognizes that on-the-ground opportunities may arise that the Bicycle Master Plan did not forsee.

PT24.2: Build bike lanes on new major streets: arterials, major collectors and selected neighborhood collectors. Bike facilities planned for specific streets are defined in the Engineering Design and Development Standards.

Rationale: Minor change to make the underlined text be a hyperlink to the EDDS, as was done elsewhere in the Transportation Section.

PT24.4: Explore the use of bicycle boulevards to support novice and family bicycling - streets with low volumes and special accommodations for bicycling.

PT24.45: Ensure that pedestrian crossing islands provide adequate refuge space for family cycling.

Rationale: New policy. The demographics of the cycling public is changing – more families are biking. Family cycling often involves either longer wheelbases (adult cyclist pulling a child trailer or trailer-cycle), or a "flock" of one or more adults with one or more kids on separate bikes.

PT24.9: ~~Encourage~~ Partner with businesses, schools, developers and employers to support bicycling through effective site and building design and provision of end-of-trip facilities and promotion of bike use.

Rationale: We will have more success if we actively engage these entities to support cycling. Encouraging them relies too much on hope. Coordination is needed to best integrate developments of all types with the surrounding community, and to help achieve land use and transportation goals for the City.

PT24.11: ~~Encourage~~ Educate drivers about and enforce regulations that protect the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians~~walkers~~.

Rationale: Wrong verb. Following laws is not optional for drivers.

GT25: Walking, biking, riding the bus and carpooling are inviting for trips to work or school. Fewer drive-alone trips will reduce pollution, energy consumption, and the growth in traffic congestion.

***PT25.3: Work with the State to locate new worksites in the dense urban area, in locations that are accessible by frequent transit and that allow employees to more easily walk and bike.**
Minor Concern: Perhaps this policy should be combined with "PT14.3Encourage public agencies to build in the Urban Corridors, so that they are easily accessible by walking, biking and transit."
GT14 is about Urban Corridors, and GT25 is about encouraging non-SOV commute modes.

PT25.4: Encourage all employers in the City to reduce employee drive-alone commute trips. Provide specific emphasis for worksites in the City Center.

Rationale: Combining the above policy with PT25.6 (see below).

PT25.5: Provide infrastructure to support walking, biking, transit, and ridesharing ~~for commuting~~.

Rationale: TDM is not just about commuting, but for errand trips too.

~~**PT25.6: Work with employers and employees of the City Center to create programs that reduce drive-alone commuting.**~~

Rationale: Combining the above policy with PT25.4 (see above).

PT25.10: Encourage employers to allow telecommuting and compressed work weeks to eliminate commute trips.

Rationale: Allowing employees to work fewer, longer days is an important CTR strategy.

PT25.12: ~~Encourage and r~~Require end-of-trip facilities, such as clothes lockers, showers and bike parking for walking, biking and transit users at schools and worksites.

Rationale: Have clear language with teeth. An exception to this change might be that encouragement is aimed at schools and worksites that do not have to comply with any specific code – that is, to provide these facilities regardless of not being required to. Policy 24.7 could address provision of such facilities when *required*, or they could be combined or further differentiated so as not to appear overlapping at all. "PT24.7 Require new commercial developments, public facilities, schools, and multi-family housing to provide end-of-trip facilities for bicyclists, including covered bike racks and lockers."

PT25.13Encourage walking, biking and ridesharing programs at schools to reduce congestion near schools, introduce children to transportation options, and, at high schools, reduce the need for parking. Encourage walking and biking so students get more exercise.

PT25.14: Develop mutual policies with the school districts to site new schools in locations where students can easily walk or bike to school, and where school employees and students can use transit ~~at~~to commute to and from the site. Consider multi-story buildings on smaller lots~~, multi-story sites~~ to accommodate capacity needs closer to the urban core and to reduce disruption to the street grid.

Rationale: Correcting a typo. Also introducing the idea that multi-story school designs can help reduce sprawl and reduce the impact of a campus on the street network.

GT27: Transportation facilities and services are funded to advance the goals of the City and the region.

PT27.1: Plan and prioritize projects consistent with available and projected funding to advance the community's transportation vision.

Rationale: Many projects will be planned based on assumptions of future funding, not just what's available.

PT27.2: Utilize master plans, subarea plans and facilities programs to identify system needs and funding strategies, evaluate competing priorities and trade-offs and define short-term actions.

Rationale: We need clear and strong language that directs the City to evaluate the costs and benefits of transportation projects.

PT27.7: ~~Encourage~~Partner with community organizations to help complete ~~priority~~ projects.

Rationale: It is unlikely that community organizations are going to significantly contribute to major PRIORITY projects. Rather, it will likely be smaller projects, but let's not even limit or specify what partnerships can achieve.

PT27.10: Of all potential transportation expenditures, maintenance of the City's existing transportation system is the highest priority.

Rationale: New policy. Prioritizing maintenance is a choice the City must actively make. This policy clarifies that it is in fact the highest priority.

PT 27.11: Enhancing transportation system operational efficiency is a high priority for City funds.

Rationale: Some projects provide no extra capacity, nor safety improvement, but are worthwhile nonetheless because they allow us to get more out of whatever system we have (e.g. traffic signal improvements, extended green time for transit).

GT29: Olympia engages with neighboring jurisdictions to advance common goals and solve regional problems.

PT29.2: Establish and maintain compatible street standards with Thurston County and the cities of Lacey and Tumwater.

Rationale: The county controls standards in the UGA and should be consistent in contiguous areas.

PT29.3: Work with the cities of Lacey, Tumwater and Thurston County on ~~bus~~ Transit~~c~~ Corridor development.

Rationale: Prefer terminology that is consistent with neighboring jurisdictions.

PT29.6: Coordinate with the Port of Olympia on truck access routes and freight rail. Work with the Port of Olympia, as needed, to address air and water transportation needs.

Rationale: Rail was left out. Coordination is important because trains must travel slowly through downtown Olympia and they disrupt the street grid in the heart of the city.