Comment Theme	Council Comments - September and November Study Sessions	Incorporation of Comment
10-min neighborhoods	Support 10 minute neighborhood concept (ensures we're not planning projects everywhere but areas with a higher need/ density)	Prioritization: The 10-min neighborhood concept is addressed indirectly through the land use element/ scores such as using centers and commercial areas which aligns with the 10-min neighborhood concepts. Other scores include points for access to schools, parks and trails as well as transit access (also aligned with the 10-min neighborhood concept). Because the 10-min neighborhood analysis is not being updated (which included business licenses at that time), the current prioritization framework is meant to be supportive of the 10-min neighborhood concept.
CKC/ Eastrail	Actions under T-2.3 discusses wayfinding which should be done in coordination and in conjunction with the wider Eastrail corridor. Ideally these are co-branded as Cross Kirkland Corridor and Eastrail.	Policy T-2.3: Make walking, rolling and bicycling more intuitive and easier to navigate Action: Improve wayfinding to and from the Cross Kirkland Corridor (CKC) to destinations (recreational trail wayfinding system) and in coordination and co-branding with the Eastrail
CKC/ Eastrail	T-2.4 Cross Kirkland Corridor needs more details on "Construct the Cross Kirkland Corridor (CKC) Master Plan Vision". This is as an ambitious project and would like to see how develop the implementation plan and identify priority segments.	Policy T-2.4: Develop signature walking, rolling and bicycling facilities along the Cross Kirkland Corridor and Lake Washington with ample connections to the rest of Kirkland and the region. Action: Develop an action plan that outlines priorities and actions to implement the Cross Kirkland Corridor (CKC) Master Plan vision as well as the Connect, Construct, Complete concept for the Eastrail Corridor
CKC/ Eastrail	Include the Connect, Construct, Complete concept for the Eastrail	Policy T-10.9: Coordinate with the Eastrail Regional Advisory Committee members and Eastrail Partners to complete the Connect, Construct, Complete vision for the entire Cross Kirkland (CKC) corridor and connections to the larger Eastrail network.
CKC/ Eastrail	T-4: The item to pursue transit on the Cross Kirkland Corridor may need some caveats on appropriateness of mode (bus, streetcar, etc. vs. light rail) and criteria, to capture previous 2015 Council discussion	Plan Document: This will be discussed in the plan document noting the changes from when the CKC Master Plan was adopted, progress made, coordination with Eastrail on the Connect, Construct, Complete vision and the proposal for the CKC Action Plan.
Equity	Explore methods of evaluating equity as it relates to transit service that incorporates all neighborhoods and future planning/ land uses	Prioritization: This would be addressed through the transit access and land use connection scores.
Equity	Don't want to inadvertently lock in low-income patterns in our City. Language in policy is broad enough. Just want to make sure mapping tool does not make us myopic. Map is a current state. We have a vision for housing choices in all neighborhoods for all incomes. Worthwhile goal for a complete community.	Prioritization: While the CIP equity mapping tool does look at the current state of where our priority populations live (low-income, BIPOC, etc.), future land use such as transit supportive and future growth are addressed through other measures (link to land use and transit access).
Equity	Intrigued by Equity map, want to see how that compares to King County Metro priority populations map.	The King County Metro priority population map and the Kirkland CIP Equity map tool uses similar data sets such as locations where priority populations live (low-income, BIPOC, etc.). King County Metro does use ridership data where Kirkland's map does not but they both get at the same concept which is to identify areas where existing priority populations live. For prioritization, the proposal is to use the CIP equity map tool that was developed for Kirkland specifically to help prioritize capital projects in the CIP.
Equity	Equity scoring should reflect any historical gap rather than artificial overlay	Prioritization: The equity map tool provides information about projects that are located within areas with higher concentrations of priority populations. While historical gaps are important, the prioritization process must be replicable and relatively simple to apply to over 400 projects. It's important to note that the prioritization is a tool to help us guide the conversation and not the decisionmaker. Other factors can get into this element of need such as the identified sidewalk gaps on transit arterials, for instance.
General	It would be great to see various project scenarios as we evaluate the project list	Prioritization: Staff plans to bring various scenarios to Council at their March 19th, 2024 study session.
Land Use	Think about the more hyper local future - corner stores, grocery stores	Prioritization: commercial and neighborhood centers will now get the same points. The original proposal was to have one be priority over another which garnered much debate at the November study session so the proposal is to keep the scores the same so as not to favor one type of center over another outside of regional centers. This essentially allows more points for neighborhood centers than what was previously proposed.

Comment Theme	Council Comments - September and November Study Sessions	Incorporation of Comment
Land Use	Not just current density but future density	Prioritization: Projects are prioritized based on access to centers which include the NE 85th Station area which would address future growth. In addition, we've added future transit as part of the prioritization process.
Land Use	targeted area to demonstrate the connected (10-min) network vs. dispersed improvements.	Prioritization: prioritizes projects along transit corridors and those that are in or connecting to centers
Land Use	some neighborhoods are not as excited about increased density. Should direct investments in areas where people can see what it's like to have that 100% investment in density, transportation, etc.	Prioritization: prioritizes projects along transit corridors and those that are in or connecting to centers
Link to Land Use	Need to get more hyperlocal - let's look forward to what that looks like in the future. Drug stores and grocery stores, etc.	Prioritization: Increased score for neighborhood centers.
Maintenance	Council supports a separate maintenance goal	New Goal: T-6: Maintenance and Preservation - Ensure adequate resources to preserve and maintain the existing and future transportation system.
Maintenance	Ensure maintenance of the system is supported incrementally as assets are added to the system. Maintenance should not drive decisions about capital investments, particularly related to safety.	Policy T-6.2: Plan for and incrementally increase maintenance resources in line with additional assets as new facilities are built and as the city grows.
Micro-mobility	Define types and allowable locations for alternative electric modes of transportation such as e-bikes, e-scooters, monowheels, etc.	Policy T-5.1: Support technology innovations that support reducing greenhouse gas emissions and modes that reduce single occupancy vehicle use Action: Develop definitions, policies and regulations related to the use of e-bikes and other electric micro-mobility devices that address locations of use, safety, education and enforcement
Outreach	Outreach should include people that live outside of Kirkland (reach out to people working here but may not live here, etc.)	Immediate implementation: Working Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) employers and communications staff to reach people outside of Kirkland. Policy T-10.1: Implement Kirkland's Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB) roadmap through community coordination and outreach Action: Conduct outreach with both Kirkland residents but also those outside of Kirkland, particularly those that work in Kirkland but do not live in the city limits
Partnerships	Be an Active Partner is still a relevant goal to maintain	Goal T-10: Be an Active Partner: Coordinate with a broad range of groups; public and private, to help meet Kirkland's transportation Goals.
Prioritization	Not worth it to add points to annexed area. Not the only annexed area, projects should be based on need. Need is the driver.	Prioritization: No extra points added to annexed area. Need is addressed through various other measures such as safety, missing connections, etc.
Prioritization in general	prioritization is a tool to help us guide the conversation and not just the decisionmaker	This is well stated and staff plans to highlight this point and ask Council for other considerations when looking at packages of projects. This will be part of the discussion at the March 19th study session.
Productivity/ Need	Safety, equity and productivity should be the criteria projects are evaluated on	Project List and multimodal concurrency: All projects will be assessed for which provide additional capacity vs. other types of projects that may have other benefits such as safety.

Comment Theme	Council Comments - September and November Study Sessions	Incorporation of Comment
Safety	Capital projects should consider roundabouts at intersections and protected bike facilities as the first option by default	Policy T-6.3: Maximize the useful lifetime of the transportation network at optimum lifecycle cost. Action: Identify opportunities to maximize lifecycle costs through technology and innovations (e.g. roundabouts instead of signals) Policy T-1.3: Advance the City's Complete Streets ordinance by accommodating all modes of travel in transportation system projects Action: Ensure safety is the first lens through which all capital projects are designed through the development of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), the Neighborhood Safety Program (NSP), the Neighborhood Traffic Control Program (NTCP), Greenways development, working with the development community, etc.
Safety	Not just historical collisions, but also being proactive looking at near misses or other reported issues. New information is available (INRIX example) Federal grants encourage looking at other sources of data.	Policy T-1.1: Implement the Vision Zero Action Plan and track progress annually. Action: Conduct near-miss analysis at selected intersections and improve methods to record other reported safety issues and explore additional data sources. Prioritization: Added language about reported near misses. While Kirkland will still require time to conduct additional near-miss analysis or procure additional data, there are still areas where staff has heard near-misses occurring that will be included in the prioritization process.
Safety	Improvements that get a high safety score should actually be a project that improves safety	Prioritization: Changed language from 'improves safety' to 'project provides a safety improvement' to the safety measures
Safety	Known gaps should get a high rating (vehicle speed, known sidewalk gaps)	Prioritization: Gaps and vehicle speeds will be used to assess the safety score
Safety	Safety should get at least tied with the highest score or highest	Prioritization: Safety now gets the highest score
Safety	Not enough weight to protected bike facilities and low-stress environments	Prioritization: process includes extra points for projects that provide a low-stress environment for people walking and bicycling (such as protected bike lanes on arterials, neighborhood greenways, RRFB's or HAWK signals at crossings, etc.). Added extra points to this category based on Council comment.
Safety	Define low-stress and the objective. Provide it so it is easy for people to choose not to get into their car. (low stress environment)	Prioritization: Added points to projects that provide a low stress environment. Level of stress was also used in the prioritization for sidewalk gaps (in the Active Transportation Plan).

Comment Theme	Council Comments - September and November Study Sessions	Incorporation of Comment
Safety - CKC	Look at data on CKC for crashes, interested in not just crashes but conflicts i.e. near misses	Policy T-1.1: Implement the Vision Zero Action Plan and track progress annually. Action: Conduct near-miss analysis at selected intersections and improve methods to record other reported safety issues and explore additional data sources Policy T-1.5: Promote and Institutionalize a Culture of Safety Action: Identify opportunities to implement a culture of safety along the Cross Kirkland Corridor and to reduce speeds and potential conflicts Policy T-1.1: Implement the Vision Zero Action Plan and track progress annually. Action: Conduct near-miss analysis at selected intersections and improve methods to record other reported safety issues and explore additional data sources. Prioritization: Currently the project is to develop an action plan for the CKC so not adding this to prioritization but the study will look at how to address conflicts.
Safety - Parking Lots	Safety needs to capture partnering with private properties, in particular, owners of parking lots.	Policy T-1.5: Promote and Institutionalize a Culture of Safety Action: Coordinate with the Department of Planning and Building and with private businesses to improve safety in private parking lots (such as dedicated pedestrian pathways, speed control, lighting, etc.), Work with developers and contractors to improve implementation of safe routes of pedestrians and bicyclists through construction zones
Safety - Parking Lots	Last vision zero update finding was fatalities occurring in parking lots. How are we prioritizing this?	The capital project list includes projects that are in public right-of-way so prioritization of projects would not address private parking lots. The plan includes an action to work with private businesses to improve safety in private parking lots
Sustainability	Reducing SOV is key for reducing GHG. We should score higher. More important than protecting environmentally sensitive areas.	Prioritization: The Sustainability category adds 20 points for projects that reduce vehicle miles traveled and support alternatives to single occupancy vehicle trips. Transit and Active Transportation support are also represented by other measures
Sustainability	Salmon killing tire dust, when we have a solution to that? Stormwater solution should be reflected	Prioritization framework does include support for projects that reduce SOV. Otherwise, this will be reflected in planning level cost estimates.
Tech and Innovation	many low-tech solutions may be more impactful than one large tech solution	Project scenarios: This will be part of the conversation when we look at packages of projects at the March 19th study session.
Timing	Sustainability Master Plan had timeframes on actions. Only Vision Zero has the annual marker, would be helpful to have timeframes for all	The 20-year list feeds the 6-year list which leads to the 2-year budget cycle. Additional time-frame reporting can be discussed when we talk about monitoring in the coming months.
Trail Connections	Finn hill green loop? Other trails? Change language to 'larger transportation trails such as the CKC', don't want to limit in forward thinking	The prioritization process is meant to be straightforward and also transportation oriented. The CKC is a transportation corridor that connects the entire city north to south and connects to transit centers. Other trails are more local, neighborhood oriented and generally more recreational in nature. While the Finn Hill green loop is meant to connect parks and green spaces, it is still not completed and it would be difficult to identify these segments or other trails throughout the city that are truly transportation oriented. Most other trail systems are within parks or short connector segments.

Comment Theme	Council Comments - September and November Study Sessions	Incorporation of Comment
Transit	Be proactive when advancing goals for transit service and explore additional options outside of existing transit service agencies.	Policy T-3.8: Improve transit service in Kirkland
Transit	T-3 Public Transportation needs an action item on Transit Strategy development	Action: Conduct a transit needs study that evaluates future transit needs that identifies potential alternative transit services (such as circulator services, private shuttles, etc.)
Transit	hyperlocal transit options, transit not just how we're not traditionally thinking about transit but more hyperlocal projects	
Transit Access	Consider mobility share connections as part of the first/ last mile to transit	Policy T-3.3: Prioritize active transportation networks that connect to transit service, providing the critical first and last connections making transit feasible for more people Action: Pursue mobility share options that provide the first/ last mile to transit Policy T-2.1: Make walking, rolling and bicycling safer, easier, accessible and more convenient. Action: Develop polices that will create regulations and incentivize micro-mobility programs (such as bike or scooter share, electric car sharing, micro-mobility hubs, etc.)
Transit Access	Ensure first/ last mile to transit is a core component of the TMP in order to meet mode-shift goals	Policy T-3.3: Prioritize active transportation networks that connect to transit service, providing the critical first and last connections making transit feasible for more people
Transit Access	Instead of bus stops, suggest high frequency corridors- local corridors- future routes. Not the stop but service on the route. Access to transit, speed and reliability on arterials. Ridership not just improvements to the system, but we've lost ridership and the infrastructure hasn't changed. Ridership loss more than just infrastructure- also behavior, demand, service, reroutes. Want to see this detail in the KTP.	Prioritization: Took out reference to bus stops and note support of connecting to transit corridors. Plan document: The plan will discuss ridership loss, challenges with lost service and strategies to bring that back ridership such as our Transportation Demand Management program which looks at incentivizing behavior, regional coordination and advocacy, etc.
Transit Access	Prioritize K Line, future transit route	Prioritization: Added future high frequency transit routes to the prioritization measures
Walkability	Would like to see a map of walkability as it relates to density	Plan document: There is not a general citywide map for this outside of identifying sidewalk gaps on arterials and transit routes but the Active Transportation Plan, Appendix B, has a detailed series of maps that outline walk access to transit and activity centers. This information was used to prioritize the pedestrian network (sidewalk gaps and crossings) which is proposed to be used as the prioritization framework for the sidewalk program.