

Des Moines City Council PS&T Committee Minutes - 07/03/08

Meeting called to order: 6:05PM on July 3, 2008, in North Conference Room @ 21630 11th Avenue So., Des Moines WA 98198

Purpose/Agenda:

1. Review of final Comprehensive Transportation Plan items regarding growth in housing and jobs, future transportation network and intersection operations/levels of service prior to Thursday night's presentation to full Council.
2. Continued discussion of street design and construction standards policy questions.

Attendees: Chairman Dave Kaplan; Dan Sherman, Mayor Pro Tem; Ed Pina, Councilmember
Staff: Grant Fredricks, PB&PW Director; Dan Brewer, Asst. Director Transportation & Engineering;
Tony Piasecki, City Manager; and Linda Wright, Secretary

Guests: Katherine Casseday and Don Samdahl (Fehr & Peers / Mirai) Transp Comp Plan Consultants

Discussion:

1 Continued discussion of street design and construction standards policy questions:

- Discussion on acceptance of the Professional Engineer-stamped drawings as part of the standard w/o Council review.....Developer can just input our Engineer-stamped document so approval already granted....streamline process. Will be on website. Committee concerned w/ones that would deviate from standard. Deviation process: written appeal to Director, with possible review by PS&T and/or full Council
- Dan to make a list of type of changes that would require PS&T or full Council approval
- Pavement thickness 2" to 6" on principal arterials
- 240th concerned w/ 2" thickness requirement because of current standard... only have preliminary plans in ...during civil review can require extra thickness because use, soil conditions or other engineering considerations
- Curb, Gutter, Sidewalk requirements: discussion between 6' commercial, 5' residentialshould determination be by road classification or location/pedestrian use? Principal arterial @ least 6 ft. Pedestrian traffic should determine min. standard...5' low density, 6' high density; local and commercial high density.....Councilmember Pina suggested a combination of the two. *[Existing sidewalk width standard is 6' in commercial / 5' in residential. Proposed width standard based on classification: 5' for local & neighborhood collectors; and 6' for collectors, minors and principals and commercial min./high density pedestrian]*
- Policy Question 2: Single family permits currently exempted from frontage improvements...**should this be revisited? All agreed that it should be.** Discussion around subdivided properties, redeveloped, ownership changes, some owners got around improvements 50 years ago...gave examples of streets. Discussion about how to fund sidewalks: City fund held in trust until certain # houses or length of frontage - then sidewalks installed. LID No protest agreements in lieu of fee for 6 yrs. Would it bind future property owners - covenants? **Committee felt this issue should be brought before full Council for their thoughts.**

- Driveway Access Discussion -
 - 2 separate properties 30 ft; joint use each 24'/48'
 - Max? Driveway - limit access? Where along property to control 24 ft max?
 - Pedestrians SFR 12 ft.
 - Minor / Major - no sidewalk; lots of traffic/hi volume need sidewalk & 36 ft 2-lanes road exit e.g., Judson Park
 - Exceptions?
 - Deviation request? How do we handle intent of standard as good or better? Would come to Dan, Grant, Hearing Ex or PS&T; Policy process needs to be established in new standards
 - Property owner notify surrounding property owners depending on type of request
 - Chairman Kaplan - shared driveway; separate btwn ADA sidewalk; 6 ft landing pad 6 up 6 across and 6 down = 18 ft. Dan 10 ft. ???
 - Distance between driveways on Minor/Major - type of road....should be Minimums, not Maximums
 - Development and redevelopment changes.
 - Roads / issues where other jurisdictions impose on us i.e. Kent/SeaTac - SR99, KDM, MVD, SR509 WAC
- Street Ends
 - Hammerheads / T's / Turnarounds/ Cul d sacs Max # lots 25/250 ADT (Average Daily Traffic)
 - Measure from edge of roadway....400 ft or 600 ft?
- Need to revisit Max and Minimums lots - Council as a whole

2. Transportation Comp Plan Update....Mirai arrived 7:05P

- Discussed the Level of Service A=best, F=worst Volume to Capacity. [Higher than capacity is stop n go, traffic stack up, light cycle delay]. Most of our bigger intersections are "D/E" PHS @ 216th, KDM Road, and Redondo
- Is there an upper limit to F - what # would be the threshold?
- KDM west of PHS, 500 peak trips getting to freeway standard doesn't allow to meet standard....need a range to mitigate. "F" but what other factor?
- 216th/Port area 24-PHS, Pac Ridge, 5 lanes "D" upper threshold. EIS "F" retail, regional capacity, allow for growth, what LOS.
- Accept growth north end: momentum 24/208th to KDM - not just 216th but north/south routes i.e. 16 to 216th. His LOS sooner than later. Clients; project logistics
- Necessity to set LOS - rethink east/west routes, neighborhoods - may need to revisit
- Think of Intersection as a whole i.e. PHS/220th LOS "E" all day long? Green time on PHS? Side streets = "F"
- Individual intersections; side streets, east west balance; signal timing; responsibility vs privilege
- WSDOT can influence KDM/PHS 216th KDM - can we have any influence? Timing has to do w/I-5 peak hours....don't want ramp back up issues.

All things to think about.....consider as we go along and make assumptions.

Need to brief and get full Council input re Levels of Service (LOS) acceptability?

Adjourned 7:27 PM

Respectfully submitted - Linda L. Wright, Secretary