



## CITY OF KIRKLAND

Department of Public Works

123 Fifth Avenue, Kirkland, WA 98033 425.587.3800

[www.kirklandwa.gov](http://www.kirklandwa.gov)

---

### MEMORANDUM

**To:** Kurt Triplett, City Manager

**From:** David Godfrey, P.E., Transportation Engineering Manager  
Pam Bissonnette, Interim Public Works Director

**Date:** March 6, 2014

**Subject:** King County TBD and Kirkland Projects

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

It is recommended that the Council review various options for projects that could be funded by revenue directed to Kirkland from the King County Transportation Benefit District. More details on this subject will be provided at the March 18 Council Meeting. A public hearing on Council support for the measure is scheduled for the April 1 meeting, and additional project information will be available at that meeting as well.

### **BACKGROUND DISCUSSION:**

#### *Introduction*

The King County Council has voted to place a Transportation Benefit District measure on an April 22<sup>nd</sup> ballot. There are two funding sources for the TBD 1) a 0.1% increase in sales tax and 2) a \$60 vehicle license fee. The measure would sunset after 10 years. Sixty percent of the revenue would be used to fund King County Metro Transit, and forty percent would fund improvements for local and County transportation systems. It is proposed that funding would be passed through to cities in proportion to each city's populations. It is estimated by King County that Kirkland's share of the funding would be approximately \$2.1M per year. At their March 4<sup>th</sup> meeting, Council directed staff to describe possible transportation projects that would be candidates for the local funding.

#### *Metro service*

Kirkland would benefit from the portion of the TBD revenue that will be used to fill the funding "gap" King County Metro is currently facing. At the January 21<sup>st</sup> Council meeting, staff provided Council with a briefing on the numerous service cuts that Metro was contemplating in Kirkland and throughout the entire system. Attachment A is a summary of the cuts and restructuring that is proposed if funding is not secured. With TBD funding, these cuts would not be needed and a restructuring to improve service in Kirkland with existing or even additional hours is possible.

*Implementing the Kirkland 2035 Vision - Other transportation projects*

The visioning work for the current Comprehensive Plan update and Kirkland 2035 process has developed the themes of a vibrant, walkable community that is Livable, Sustainable, and Connected. Therefore, the projects selected for discussion here have a connection to these themes.

Table 1 contains various project sets that the Council may wish to consider as candidates for funding with Transportation Benefit District funding. There is no particular priority order to the projects in the table.

The groups shown in table 1 are a sample of possible projects. Staff's intention is to get Council's impression of this set of project groups and understand other projects Council may wish to examine. It is intended that various options from project groups could be combined.

Each project group has a purpose, and several groups have multiple options. Entries in the element column describe work that is part of that option. In many cases costs come from CIP projects or plans. In other cases, costs are order of magnitude estimates with ranges. More details on costs are anticipated to be available at the March 18<sup>th</sup> Council meeting along with a map of the projects.

The Council should consider several policy questions when evaluating potential project lists:

- Should the projects be focused on implementing the Kirkland 2035 vision of a livable, walkable community? Or should additional road maintenance investments be made such as street overlays or slurry seal to reduce the backlog?
- Should the projects have rough geographic equity and make investments throughout the City? Or should projects be focused on economic centers such as Totem Lake and Downtown?
- Should projects be able to be completed within the 10 year time frame?

As described above, it is estimated by King County that approximately \$2.1 million annually will be available for 10 years, for a potential total of \$21 million over the life of the initial TBD term. It would be possible to bond this amount as well. Note that if a project were funded by the County TBD, those same project elements would not be eligible for a local Kirkland TBD funding. Also, coordination would be necessary for funding from the TBD and any funding Council may wish to seek from other sources such as levies or bond measures.

Attachment A: King County Metro Proposed Service Cuts

Table 1 Project suggestions for Kirkland from County Transportation Benefit District.

Project group	Basis for group	Options	Elements	Costs (millions)	Ref No.
School Walk routes	Council has a sustained interest in school walk routes. Active Transportation Plan set goals	Sidewalk on one side of collector and arterial streets	Sidewalk construction	\$3.9	1
		Sidewalk on one side of all school walk routes		\$16.3	2
Juanita Drive	Recently completed study. Addresses safety for active and motorized modes	Uphill bicycle lane	Restriping, some widening	\$0.6	3
		Complete crosswalks and walkway	Pavement widening and crosswalk treatments.	\$1.5	4
		Intersection treatments	Turn lanes at intersections. Some surface water improvements.	\$5.3	5
		Quick win projects	Selected higher benefit/lower cost projects	\$1.35	6
		Complete set of improvements for Juanita Drive	All elements in study	\$20	7
Greenways	Connect to CKC makes bicycling more approachable, improves conditions for walking	NE 60th Street	Marking, signing, crossing treatments at arterials. NE 141 includes bridge over I-405, Possible surface water treatments, signal improvements, traffic calming.	Variable, \$0.1 -\$1.0 each. NE 141 St bridge \$4.5	8
		NE 75th Street/Kirkland Way			9
		NE 100th Street			10
		NE 141st Street			11
ITS improvements	Supports efficient use of transportation facilities	Juanita Drive ITS component	Fiber connections and new equipment to intersections not connected in phase I or phase II	\$1.1	12
		Connections to other signals, other enhancements		\$1 - \$5	13
Bicycle and/or Pedestrian network improvements	Projects where grants are unlikely.	116th Avenue bike lanes S. City limits to NE 60th Street	Construct bicycle lanes and pedestrian facilities	\$3.4	14
		84th Avenue Sidewalk, NE 124th Street to NE 145th Street	Construct sidewalk	\$4.1	14a

Table 1 Project suggestions for Kirkland from County Transportation Benefit District.

Project group	Basis for group	Options	Elements	Costs (millions)	Ref No.	
Cross Kirkland Corridor	Goal in Active Transportation Plan Strong Community support	Connections	NE 100th Street/Crestwoods Park	Trail or possible bridge connection (works with NE 100th Greenway)	\$2.5 -\$5.0	15
			Redmond Central Connector	Improve Willows Road requires Eastside Rail Corridor improvement	\$3.7	16
			Forbes Creek Drive Trail	Path on north side of Forbes Creek Drive from 98th Avenue/Market Street to CKC	\$2.0	17
		Improve major street intersections on CKC	NE 124th Street/Totem Lake Blvd	Overpass to Totem Lake Park	\$5.7	18
			120th Avenue NE	Signal or grade separation	\$0.75 - \$5.0	19
			6th Street S	Grade separation/gateway treatment	\$1 - \$5	20
		Rebuild trestle at Kirkland Way	Improves auto/bike/ped safety and connectivity	\$7	21	
		Construct a section of the corridor as described in Master Plan	Trail and amenities	\$2-\$10	22	
NE 132nd Street improvements	Add capacity at intersections, works in connection with future I-405 interchange	Package of 6 intersections and roadway improvements could be divided into separate projects	Intersection widening, construct medians, sidewalk reconstruction improve bicycle lanes	\$12	23	

# Proposed Revision: Northeast King County

In the 2014-2015 service reduction proposal, Metro has revised the Northeast King County network to:

- Save as many resources as possible
- Shorten some routes that have less productive segments
- Reduce duplication
- Better match service provided to the demand for that service
- Maintain frequency in areas with high ridership
- Reduce service coverage to areas with fewer riders

### All day routes in proposed network

Route	Routing revision	Approximate minutes between bus trips				
		Weekday peak (6-9 a.m., 3-7 p.m.)	Weekday midday	Weekday night (after 7 p.m.)	Saturday	Sunday
B	No	10	15	15-30	15	15
221	Yes	30	30	60	30	30
224	No	120	150	-	-	-
226	No	30	30	60	30	60
234	Yes	30	60	-	60	60
235	Yes	15	30	30	30	30
236	Yes	30	60	60	60	60
245	Yes	15	15	30-60	30	30
248	No	30	30	60	30	30
249	No	60	60	-	45	45
255	Yes	10	15	30-60	30	30
271	Yes	10	15	30	30	30
331	No	30	30	-	30	60
372X	Yes	6-30	30	30-60	30	30

### Peak only routes in proposed network

Route	Routing revision	Weekday peak	Route	Routing revision	Weekday peak
216	No	12 trips	309X	No	9 trips
232	No	8 trips	311	No	21 trips
252	No	13 trips	312X	No	34 trips
257	No	10 trips	342	Yes	9 trips
268	No	9 trips	931	No	7 trips (both directions)
269	No	14 trips			



Información importante sobre el servicio de autobuses de su zona  
 Các thông tin quan trọng về dịch vụ xe buýt tại khu vực quý vị  
 有關您所在地區巴士服務的重要資訊



Scan the QR code with your smart phone for more information.  
[www.kingcounty.gov/metro/future](http://www.kingcounty.gov/metro/future)

## Attachment A

