

ESSB 6392: High Capacity Transit Planning and Financing Findings and Recommendations Report | **Appendix B: Public comments**



## ESSB 6392 Workgroup recommendations Public comment summary

---

Below is a summary of the comments received from community organizations, the general public and the city of Seattle on the High Capacity Transit Planning and Financing Findings and Recommendations Report during the comment period from Dec. 1 to 15, 2010. A total of 13 comments were collected.

### City of Seattle comments

#### Seattle Mayor

- High capacity transit: “It is important to ensure that high capacity transit options in this corridor adequately address the demand projected well into the future. The estimated 40,000 more trips per day across SR 520 by 2030 will need to be provided for in a way that moves people instead of vehicles and moves us closer to meeting state goals for vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions.”
- Light rail: “While progress has been made in the design to accommodate light rail, it has been established that the design must be studied further if we are to avoid a more costly and difficult conversion to light rail later on. However, the study of light rail and other HCT technologies is slated to happen in 2016 or later. I request that this study occurs as soon as possible.”
- Funding: “I am concerned about the lack of funding for transit as a whole that this report clearly communicates. Much of this lack of funding is identified as a result of our tough economic times. However, this report is not as helpful in identifying and addressing priorities, next steps, or a clearer picture of the best way to move forward and at least begin to bridge the gap in funding...I support using tolling revenue -- one of the potential sources identified in the report -- be used for transit operations. This would begin to address a portion of the funding gap as well as some of the equity issues that tolling presents.”

#### Seattle City Council

- On Dec. 13, 2010, WSDOT, King County Metro and Sound Transit provided an ESSB 6392 Workgroup update to the Seattle City Council. At this meeting, several council members verbally commented on the findings and recommendations for SR 520. Key topics included funding, transit planning and environmental aspects of the recommendations. A full summary of this meeting can be found in this appendix.

## **Community organization comments**

During the two-week December comment period, comments were received from four community organizations. These include:

- Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks
- Laurelhurst Community Club
- Ravenna/Bryant Community Association
- Sierra Club Cascade Chapter

The comments provided by each community organization are included in the comment summary below. Full comments can also be found in this appendix.

## **General public comments**

After the release of the draft findings and recommendations report, the public was invited to provide comments between Dec. 1 and 15 by e-mail, online survey, mail, or in person at the ESSB 6392 Workgroup meeting.

A total of eight general public comments were received, including:

- One by e-mail
- Five through an online comment form
- Two verbal comments at the Dec. 1 ESSB 6392 Workgroup meeting

Comments received focused on a variety of topics pertaining to the transit planning and financing findings and recommendations. Comments from both individuals and community organizations are included below in a summary of the most frequently referenced comment categories. Multiple comment categories from the same respondent are counted separately.

### **Transit (11 comments)**

Eleven comments were received on transit including topics such as bus lane locations and bus and HOV access. Several commenters expressed concern that the plans did not provide adequate bus service or routes, and that plans should be expanded. One commenter suggested that measures be taken to improve transit to the Eastside, and another commenter noted that the transit pathways in the Montlake area are in conflict with general- purpose traffic.

### **Bus stop locations (six comments)**

Six comments focused on bus stop locations, particularly about the removal of the Montlake freeway transit station. Most commenters discussing the Montlake freeway transit station expressed a desire to retain the station and its functionality in its current form, and not to remove it. Others commented on local bus routes (i.e. Metro routes 43 and 48), and ideas for relocating bus stops to be more convenient and effective.

### **Funding (six comments)**

Six comments related to funding for the project and transit. Some commenters expressed support for the use of tolls to finance various aspects of the SR 520 program, with a special emphasis on funding transit. One comment urged the use of toll revenue be used for operating funds for transit. Another comment stressed the importance of funding all bus rapid transit (BRT) elements included in the project. One comment noted the concern that a phased construction approach would result in a “bare bones” project, due to lack of funding.

### **Traffic calming (five comments)**

Five comments were received related to traffic calming. These comments focused on traffic congestion issues, particularly in the Montlake area, and potential solutions to the problems. One suggestion focused on adding more transit service, leading to fewer vehicle trips. Some comments expressed concern about adding traffic to local streets and the Arboretum as a result of the left turn from 24th Avenue E. to E. Lake Washington Boulevard.

### **Light Rail Transit (four comments)**

Four comments were received related to light rail transit, with one commenter asking that the SR 520 bridge be built with light rail installed from the very start. Another commenter recommended making the new SR 520 corridor light-rail ready with minimal necessary reconstruction. One community organization’s comments discussed the Sound Transit 2 (ST2) funded light rail study, noting that the study should be completed (not started) by 2016 when light rail opens at the University of Washington.

### **Montlake second bascule bridge (two comments)**

Two comments were received on the topic of the Montlake second bascule bridge. Both comments supported the second bascule bridge, and urged for the bridge to be constructed quickly, and without phasing. One commenter noted that transit reliability is severely compromised without the second bascule bridge.

### **Unrelated topics (2 comments)**

One comment was received about noise reduction, including support for planned noise mitigation measures such as noise barriers, quieter concrete and encapsulation of bridge expansion joints. One comment focused on the “peak oil” concept.



December 15, 2010

Ms. Kerry Ruth  
Project Manager-SR 520  
WA State Dept. of Transportation  
Suite 520  
600 Stewart Street,  
Seattle, WA 98101

Dear Ms. Ruth,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the recommendations of the Transit Planning and Finance workgroup, created by ESSB 6392. I appreciate the work done by this workgroup.

These recommendations reference and validate the 2008 High Capacity Transit Plan (HCTP) for SR 520. In this document, it is stated that the HCTP has three elements: Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) operating in the HOV lanes, a Montlake Multimodal Center, and High Capacity Transit operating on dedicated facilities (page 25). This last element states, "Sound Transit's ST2 plan funds a planning study of light rail in the SR 520 corridor to evaluate potential alignments, stations and costs, and potential implementation strategy for light rail in the corridor".

I am pleased to see this last element reflected in the workgroup recommendations in recommendation number three (page 13), which recommends a study examining the feasibility of light rail and other HCT technologies. As the HCTP also states, it is important to ensure that high capacity transit options in this corridor adequately address the demand projected well into the future. The estimated 40,000 more trips per day across SR 520 by 2030 will need to be provided for in a way that moves people instead of vehicles and moves us closer to meeting state goals for vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions.

These 40,000 trips (in addition to the many more trips in the following decades) are the reason for my stance that the SR 520 project be designed to be light rail ready from the beginning. While progress has been made in the design to accommodate light rail, it has been established that the design must be studied further if we are to avoid a more costly and difficult conversion to light rail later on.

However, the study of light rail and other HCT technologies is slated to happen in 2016 or later. I request that this study occurs as soon as possible. The funding for the study was allocated as a part of the Sound Transit 2 (ST2) package. The Nelson\Nygaard SR 520 Light Rail Alternatives report made available in April of this year, confirms that there is sufficient market demand to warrant a study for light rail in this corridor right now. This study could be done in conjunction with recommendation two of the workgroup report, which recommends finding funding for "a planning effort to identify and refine the short- and mid-term transit needs identified in the HCT Plan". By combining these studies, two things could be accomplished. First, there is funding identified through ST2 for the study of light rail, and the areas of study may overlap in part with the areas to be studied in the study included in recommendation two (which currently has no funding). Second, this would provide a full vision for the future of the SR

Office of the Mayor  
Seattle City Hall, 7th Floor  
600 Fourth Avenue, PO Box 94749  
Seattle, WA 98124-4749

Tel (206) 684-4000  
Fax (206) 684-5360  
TDD (206) 615-0476  
E-mail [mike.mcginn@seattle.gov](mailto:mike.mcginn@seattle.gov)

520 corridor instead of a shorter-term vision. Because the SR 520 bridge replacement has a lifespan of 75 years or more and project planning is occurring right now, it is essential to plan with a long-term timeframe in mind.

I am also concerned about the lack of funding for transit as a whole that this report clearly communicates. Much of this lack of funding is identified as a result of our tough economic times. However, this report is not as helpful in identifying and addressing priorities, next steps, or a clearer picture of the best way to move forward and at least begin to bridge the gap in funding. While it recommends that a study be done (in recommendation number two, as mentioned above) to assess next steps, it is important to remember that most of the improvements brought forth from the Transit Planning and Finance workgroup were originally proposed in 2008, and it was also recommended at that time that more study be done of funding gaps and funding sources and next steps.

In the meantime, the full SR 520 project has a \$4.65 billion price tag (and its own funding gap of \$2 billion). While parts of the project support transit priority, the price tag itself includes little funding that is allocated towards transit service improvements. This inequity in funding between highway expansion and transit funding is clear when one compares the price tag for funding the suggested near- and mid-term high capacity transit (in the form of BRT). Capital expense for BRT comes to \$84 to \$172 million per year, according to the 2008 HCTP. This is a small fraction of the price of the whole project, yet the proposed bus rapid transit phased approach would increase service on SR 520 by approximately 130,000 service hours.

As early as spring of 2011, when tolling begins on the corridor, it will be even more important to give people more and better options for transit so that they may have access to affordable transportation choices. My hope is that the serious picture of transit funding presented in the workgroup recommendations results in a responsive level of effort to achieve funding sooner, rather than later. To this end, I support using tolling revenue -- one of the potential sources identified in the report -- be used for transit operations. This would begin to address a portion of the funding gap as well as some of the equity issues that tolling presents.

I would like to continue working with WSDOT, among others, towards swift identification of next steps. Without significant action, this lack of funding will result in a level of service in the SR 520 corridor that is unacceptable.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Michael McGinn".

Mike McGinn  
Mayor of Seattle

Cc: Joni Earl, Chief Executive Officer, Sound Transit  
Kevin Desmond, General Manager, King County Metro



**Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks**

P.O. BOX 9884, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109-0884  
SEATTLEOLMSTED.ORG FRIENDS@SEATTLEOLMSTED.ORG

**Board of Directors**

Brooks Kolb  
President

Sue Nicol  
Vice President

Charlie Sundberg  
Treasurer

Susan Olmsted  
Secretary

Eliza Davidson

David Dougherty

Dodi Fredericks

Jim Gale

Karen Janosky

Ray Larson

Kathy Mendelson

Theresa Neylon

Jennifer Ott

Richard Piacentini

Larry Sinnott

Bob Baines, *ex officio*

Kathleen Conner, *Ex Officio*

**Board of Advisors**

Jerry Arbes

John Barber

Susan Black

Joan Hockaday

Douglas Jackson

Donald Harris

Gretchen Hull

Nancy Keith

Anne Knight

Kate Krafft

Carla Rickerson

Virginia Wilcox

Governor Christine Gregoire  
State Legislators

Wed 15 Dec '10

Re: Comments on SR 520 Transit Planning / Financing Report and  
Arboretum Mitigation Plan

Dear Governor and Legislators,

Never did two separate reports need more coordination than these, but the most reasoned solution is not the goal here, just more rubber stamps on a bad compromise. Our Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks (FSOP) representatives have been directly involved in SR 520 planning since the Translake Study through to the Mediation and Legislative Workgroup sessions. Please consider our comments on the latest documents for the SR 520 Bridge Rebuild.

The Transit Planning to put buses directly into the eastbound (inside) bus/HOV lane is the very fundamental flaw of this Preferred Alternative. This choice to weave across currently congested, and projected to be congested in the future, southbound Montlake Blvd to turn left onto the new Montlake lid, instead of weaving across a tolled, and potentially free-flowing, outside bus HOV on-ramp from the existing quarter clover-leaf, really defies common sense! This is the foundation upon which all of the added impacts to the Arboretum are built; three more lane widths at Marsh Island (more concrete/cost, more over water shading, more shoreline impacts, cuts off tip of WSDOT peninsula needed to trade for takings), major return of cut-through traffic through the Arboretum (via historic Lk Washington Blvd) after construction. Not only is this bad transit planning, it is absolutely disastrous for the Washington Park Arboretum because of compounding problems.

The first compounding problem is the forced left-turn from southbound 24<sup>th</sup> Av (on the lid) to Lk Washington Blvd. Because there are no real arterials from 24<sup>th</sup>/23<sup>rd</sup> Av back to Madison Park and Madronna if they are forced to right-turn toward Montlake Blvd (Alt A in the SDEIS had a better solution). Another bite out of the Arboretum.

The second compounding problem is moving the southbound bus stop at Montlake. Removing the existing bus-island and moving the stop to the

Hop-in Grocery parking lot makes the above mentioned 24<sup>th</sup> Av right-turn even more problematic during the peak hours, thus forcing the left-turn at 24<sup>th</sup>. Another bite out of the Arboretum.

The third compounding problem is the removal of HOV access from northbound 24<sup>th</sup> Av/Montlake Blvd to eastbound SR520. This Preferred Alternative removes this access to the quarter cloverleaf and forces that traffic to go eastbound on Lk Washington Blvd and there to make a left-turn onto the lid to access the eastbound bus/HOV ramps. Another bite out of the Arboretum.

All of the above is your current transit planning, and all of the above do more and more damage to the WP Arboretum, which is totally against the intent, if not the letter, of provision 4F of the Federal Highway Act. All the more reason these should not have been worked on separately.

There is a bright note in the construction planning. During construction the new street light at the end of the westbound 520 off-ramp at Montlake Blvd will have a southbound left-turn (exactly like Alt A in the SDEIS). Because of removing the existing 24<sup>th</sup> Av bridge to MOHAI and construction of the lid, work trucks will have to be able to make this left-turn. Madison Park and Madronna residents will then turn-left to Lk Washington Blvd, and the cut-through traffic mentioned above would have no reason to go through the Arboretum (the Preferred Alt has 25% more traffic through the Arboretum in the PM peak than Alt A). If this configuration were made permanent, then almost all of the Arboretum mitigation is un-necessary! Of course you would have to send the buses around the quarter cloverleaf, like they do now, and rebuild the bus-island. This would save both cost of construction and cost of mitigation.

Transit reliability is tremendously compromised without the second bascule bridge. The second draw-bridge is not discussed in either report. What could be more fundamental to transit planning than reliability? What could be more fundamental to impacts on the Arboretum than better alternatives to the automobile? The "triggers" proposed by the Seattle City Council have already been met! The second draw-bridge is needed now for bus reliability and consistent performance, which is basic to building commuter bus ridership.

It is time to step back and ask yourselves, is this Preferred Alternative really what we want for our future? FSOP believes you still have a chance to re-configure this plan more like Alt A in the SDEIS, and make it a much better plan for the Arboretum, for bus riders, for car traffic in Montlake. Oh, and by the way, it also saves money!

Sincerely,

Larry Sinnott, AIA  
Boardmember, Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks

Colleen McAleer  
Laurelhurst Community Club  
Seattle, 98105  
12/15 via online survey

The Laurelhurst Community Club supports the technical review committee's recommendations on sound mitigation included in the Preferred Alternative. We applaud the use of 4 foot high barriers which will be imbedded with noise absorption materials throughout the roadway from I-5 to the Floating Bridge as it passes over the Western high rise. We also support the use of quiet pavement throughout the entire bridge surface, and the use of acoustical material on the Montlake lid. Finally, the encapsulation of the expansion joints will also give relief to residents on all sides of the new bridge. These techniques will be more acceptable than high noise walls that could create a worsening of noise as it travels across Lake Washington.

The Laurelhurst Community Club has concerns about the later phasing of a second bascule bridge in the preferred alternative. The technical workgroup has recommended it, but the triggers that will facilitate its building are not clear. In addition to the entities named in the committee to monitor its need, LCC requests that NE Seattle businesses and our Community Club be named to it as a key stakeholder as Montlake Blvd is the major egress from our island-like neighborhood.

If a second bascule bridge is not an integral part of the initial phasing, the traffic modeling demonstrates a worsening of vehicular backups on Montlake Blvd which already operates at an F level of service. As previously noted, NE Seattle has aggressive development plans including doubling the size of Seattle Children's Hospital(1.3 million square feet), and the University Village by over 105,000 square feet which will compound the cumulative effects of the 45 minute existing backups. This growth is predicted to generate an additional 3800 daily vehicular trips along Montlake Blvd by 2020.

To build an expanded SR520 without adequate capacity through Montlake Blvd (with its longer bascule bridge openings) will result in gridlock for the residents of NE Seattle and reduce the reliability of transit performance in both pm peak and on weekends. See detailed report submitted by Colleen McAleer on April 15th to Jennifer Young, pages 16-19 and exhibit 17 for the bascule bridge openings.

Clearly, the preferred alternative can only move traffic north/south to SR520 with the inclusion of a second bascule bridge as part of the transportation system for transit, pedestrians, freight and vehicles.

**RE: Comments on the SR 520 Transit Planning and Financing Recommendations; Draft Report**

**The RBCA Supports the SR 520 Transit Planning and Financing Report Recommendations:** The Report provides some plans for the future of Transit on SR 520 with *flexible, limited and practical recommendations*, but is not a definitive statement promoting new ways to increase Transit use on local Arterials, and Regional Transit on the new rebuilt SR 520. Below are RBCA's suggestions primarily in the interest of increasing Transit use and meeting the challenge of reducing SR 520 traffic on local city Arterials and on the SR 520 rebuilt facility.

**A.1.RBCA supports the Report's reaffirmation of the 2008 SR 520 HCT Study**, that was completed earlier, publicly reviewed and endorsed during the SR 520 Mediation process that many of us participated in. The 2008 HCT Report update provides a realistic Schedule for Updating for the future with a Short, Mid and Long Range Timeline and Milestones that reflect current Regional Transit Plans for the SR 520 Corridor. We support more emphasis on Transit and new Transit Operation's funds in the future, possibly from 520 Tolls.

A.)1. **RBCA** supports greater emphasis on improving the use of Transit to the Eastside. (Page 3) in the above 11/30/10 Draft Transit Planning and Financing SR 520 Reports. By 2030, our region's Population and Employment growth projects 40,000 more SR 520 cross-lake daily trips. A new policy is needed for prioritizing **"Moving People First" on a SR 520 SMART Corridor, with adopted Transit Performance objectives, a Transit Public promotion program, a Monitoring of SR 520 Transit/HOV Performance and Reporting Outcomes regularly to the users and the Public. Who will do this? WSDOT, PSRC? ?**

**Even though a State Highway, the new urban SR 520 HOV Corridor if planned well, and with new Tolls** should serve a majority of the new cross-lake trips in the future on 520 in Transit and HOVs. The new two-way new SR 520 HOV lanes, and the future I-90 LRT system, along with Sound Transit's future North and South Link expansions, should provide an expanded unprecedented, new People-Moving Regional system that will bring new service to the Seattle and the Eastside Commuter shed. Eastside urban land-use policies are in transition, to transform from auto-dependent development to Transit Oriented Communities, as recent State GMA law revisions provides.

**2. RBCA is Opposed to SR 520 HOT/HOV lanes**-No comment was made in the Report about the potential initiation of SR 520 HOT/HOV Lanes and whether they will be managed **to always assure preferential treatment for Transit /HOVs.** The new 520 HOV lanes are valuable additions that will have long-term capacity only if they move more people faster than those traveling east and west in the two outside E/W vehicle lanes. WSDOT's need to fill the \$2 Billion Westside funding gap with HOT Lanes, must consider the negative 520 operational impacts, as well as the financial benefits of HOT lanes. WSDOT staff should consider the **negative impacts of HOT lanes on Transit/HOV operations, with careful monitoring, if this option is considered in the FEIS and implemented.**

**Important--Once the lanes are opened to HOT tolled users, WSDOT will never be able to remove them, and give priority for HOV and Transit users.**

**3. RBCA Supports Promoting the use of Transit and Informal 520 Carpooling:** The RBCA would encourage WSDOT to initiate a program for informal Carpool pick-up/drop-off locations for accredited riders to wait for a 520 HOV pick-up, called "slugging", as they do at the Bay Bridge in California. We know that WSDOT needs the Tolls to pay off the Bonded indebtedness costs of Westside Construction, and their financial Goals may overcome the real objective of moving more people on transit and carpools across the Lake on the SR 520 Bridge and I-90 Corridors, and preventing the need for ever having to build another cross-lake Bridge in a new location.

**B. 1.Other Issues/Problems: Not mentioned in the report was the Stalling or Stopping the Construction of the parallel Mountlake Bridge that could have important consequences for new 520 Transit Service.**

**Indecision on this important multimodal improvement will impact** the ability to increase the use of Transit service speed and reliability, and we think that it should have been included in this Report.

Our organization was deeply disappointed with the above TCT Report's avoidance/omission or any mention of the *need for the second Montlake Bridge ASAP*, and the overall impact on Transit service, without two new dedicated Transit Arterial lanes. They are near the 520 Interchange with Montlake Blvd, and new Transit lanes and Operator control of the intersection Montlake Blvd/NE Pacific Street traffic light.

This is because the Seattle Council's current political position has been to delay or never build a parallel Montlake Bridge, in response to opposition to the parallel bridge. It is a very short-sighted policy, and lacks any objective studies to document that "political conclusion". Without change the gridlock and congestion at the bridge, it will increase, particularly, during construction, and after 520's completion.

The long term impact of this policy on the Arboretum, and the increased Traffic on Lake Washington Blvd. was never presented or discussed openly outside the Work Groups or in Public Meetings. This was due to the fragmented and separate TWG-Arboretum Planning processes, created by the 2010 state Legislature's ESSB 6392. There was no overseeing the need for integrating or improving the consistency on major issues to present a comprehensive overview and statement in the Final reports. Perhaps this will be left to the State Transportation Committees Legislative Reviews to fix in 2011?

2.) Every work-day today, 520 destined and other city Arterial users on Montlake Blvd. are held hostage in stalled, crowded lanes in the current daily Montlake Blvd. gridlock. Many can't avoid using the historic 4-lane Montlake (bascule) Bridge for work trips on SR 520. Support for new efforts is needed today to evaluate the and objectively discussion of the new parallel Bridge designs options and the feasibility of alternative narrow/widerl bridge designs for Transit, Peds, Cyclists and Vehicles. --

-\* to allow more space for increased Transit on E.23<sup>rd</sup> Ave/Montlake Blvd. and NE Pacific St.

-\*-to improve and schedule, reliability and speed of Transit operations on Preferential Transit lanes and Traffic lights that can be actuated by operators of Buses and Trolleys, and-

-\* for adequate, safe space for increased use by Cyclists and Pedestrians, to provide a variety of Transportation choices,

-\*-to promote increased and **reliable local and regional Transit service options to reduce auto traffic, especially through the Arboretum's LW Blvd., the Northeast Seattle area, U of W, from Madison Park the Central Seattle and Montlake Communities.**

\*-to reduce the daily delay, due to the "Montlake Gridlock," due to this narrow existing Bridge, a 'Pinch-point' at a WSDOT owned, historic 4-lane Montlake Bridge, that has adequate city Arterial streets on either side, with a total of seven lanes. (The estimated cost to build is \$80 million.) costs and benefits need to be compared to calculate the overall Public Benefits to Seattle and Eastside citizen's, and users for their daily time lost in traffic, versus the gains and improvements from an improved future Bridge addition.!

4.)We don't need or have to wait for more information. The adopted "Triggers", and criteria for surveying daily stalled Transit, Cyclists, Pedestrians and Vehicles, or on SR 520 Mainline east/west travel delays are present with existing conditions **easily meeting the City Council's "Triggers" NOW!** Everyday the Gridlock continues and worsens, and verifies the need for the added parallel Bridge, for new added space for moving Transit and other modes today.

**(Note: The parallel Montlake Bridge was in the SR 520, April 2010 adopted Preferred SR 520 Alternative Design announced by the Governor and should be included in the SR 520 FEIS, and built now.**

5.) With the future **new Lidded Montlake Transit Stop, southeast of the "Cut," and the new SR 520 North side Bike/Ped Trail-Eastside E/W Route, there will be a increased growth for alternative travel modes, including Transit users crossing the"Cut," to get to and from the rebuilt SR 520, the new Sound Transit cross-lake BRT routes, the U of W Hospital, and Stadium Link station, to be completed in 2016.** Also there will be more trips between the Burke Gilman Trail and to the planned southeast Pedestrian friendly Arboretum Trails and Cycle/Routes, connected with the existing and new SR 520 Bike Trails in the city.

4.) There are over **600 buses** that daily use the major Montlake Blvd. area Arterials. **Today this area of the city's Transit use/routes/service is second highest in our region, and next to the Seattle CBD. Transit to and from a major Seattle urban center that includes the U of W, the University Hospital, the U Dst. and Northeast Seattle. Moving ahead on improving a multimodal Arterials, would be consistent with the Seattle City Council's adopted Ordinance for promoting a city's "Complete Street's Policy," which currently seems to have been forgotten...**

- WSDOT needs to seek a Public Process and Schedule to legally condemn the needed land for the new parallel bridge, taking one or two houses,
- WSDOT should apply soon and receive a U.S Coast Guard Permit for construction of the new bridge over a "Lake Washington Ship Canal "Waterway", and that will take time.

**RBCA** urges acceleration to the parallel bridge design process. It is needed now, ahead of the disruption of all of the proposed Westside SR 520 long- term Construction projects. If built early it would reduce some of the long term impacts and detours for our Communities, and **shorten the long delays for improving Transit service and routes for users, with reliable service.**

**5.) WSDOT's projects Arboretum internal and thru traffic increases and traffic Impacts were not considered- as part of an overall Multimodal 520 Plan, and should be included in the SR 520 FEIS.**

This was due to the past fragmented planning process established in the 2010 ESSB 6392 Legislation, when the Transit and Arboretum planning process were separated, and never coordinated. Little study of the overlap of Arboretum Traffic issues were included in the SR 520 TWG studies of adjacent City arterials. Unfortunately there also appeared to be little staff communication between the two processes.

**The result is that ABGC members have accepted the narrow Findings to meet the December 2010 deadline. ABGC had adopted a Goal of decreasing traffic through the Arboretum, but that will not happen in the future, if the proposed package of SDOT TDM proposals will be all the information that is available. Traffic will continue to increase thru the Arboretum , and continue to reduce the ambience of Park the Lake Washington Blvd. that was built for 4000 vehicles a day, and now carries over 18,000, 50% of which are headed to or from SR 520.**

6.) Left Turns at E.24th-In addition, the **ABGC** approved a new route to allow SR 520 traffic exiting westbound destined vehicles to go South to use the new Lid street at E.24th and to make a left turn exit to LW Blvd. RBCA supports this route only as an incentive for 520 HOV's, as was supported in the SR 520 A Preferred Alternative, that was adopted in April 2010.

A reason for **ABGC** position is that SDOT studies found that not using E.24<sup>th</sup> to the LW Boulevard it would require Montlake Blvd. Arterial intersections to need added capacity (widening) at some intersections, along 23<sup>rd</sup> Ave that the city of Seattle currently opposes. This "Trade-off" had limited discussion and was made in favor of the not impacting or widening city Arterials for increased traffic, that could have resulted in reducing traffic through the Arboretum. *The ABGC accepted this policy.*

**ABGC's** current hope is to cure the increased Traffic through the Arboretum, with a tentative SDOT proposal funded by WSDOT, for a Traffic Calming and TDM program. Not included at this time in the current Traffic studies, is a new two-way Arboretum public Park Tolling proposal for Lake Washington Blvd. This is the behind the scenes **ABGC** LW Blvd. traffic reduction solution, that has not been studied, and may or may not be supported by the city of Seattle, to reduce the LW Blvd traffic. *The status of this option is unknown.*

**7.) RBCA** urges that this fragmented planning process be fixed by the 2011 state Legislature so it can become a comprehensive/unified process in the future. Continued work on new options, including Tolling, to decrease increased Traffic through the Arboretum and on Montlake Blvd should be continued. To comprehensively consider the changes/impacts of 520 Tolling, increased use of Transit and other policy questions/issues, and revisions on major city Arterials in the vicinity of the Arboretum, before any of the recommendations are implemented.

Recent work related to the Arboretum Traffic Calming Recommendations, were studied separately from the overall regional Park issues, the Community Arterial systems and 520's new design, and need to be unified.

**5/ Prepare early for the removal of the existing 520 Arboretum Ramps--** Current SDOT studies have found that even with the removal of the two 1963 SR 520 vehicle on/off service ramps to a state highway, and Traffic Calming, LW Blvd. speed cushions and other SDOT TDM programs, that by 2030, ***there will still be more vehicles than ever traveling through the Arboretum, despite the implementing' phased TDM package of proposals.***

**RBCA's Position-** *Our organization does not accept that current inadequate study Conclusions, and does not support unprecedented two-way Tolling on the Blvd. of a Public Park, as a "cure" for reducing traffic on our historic, Olmsted designed Lake Washington Blvd.*

↓  
If legal, and found feasible, it would be a temporary Traffic reduction "Band-aid" as driver's adjusted to paying a Tollor using another route. It is costly to sign up vehicle users, to install automated Park Tolling Equipment and to administer a separate Toll Program. How will the ABGC determine who are a daily SR 520 users from thru traffic, or from Arboretum Park visitors? In our opinion, the system could not be paid for by WSDOT 18<sup>th</sup> Amendment funds for Park Mitigation, or part of the SR 520 Tolling System funds.

Other more complete studies for reducing the traffic problems of the Arboretum should be done now, More emphasis in required on ways to increase trips on other Modes, including local and Regional Transit systems, Rather than using only WSDOT Traffic studies that project historic traffic trends into the future, which is presently changing and unknown.

Times are changing along with the 520 user's future choices of transportation travel modes. Environmental issues like the need to reduce green houses gases, the increased consumer costs for a using foreign oil, reduced future use gas powered vehicles, along with the new high Peak-hour SR 520 user Tolls, and the reduced Federal and State Gas Tax funds.

Right now our planning for our Transportation future required that we keep options open, and it is difficult to predict the impacts on the public's future use of the Boulevard. RBCA supports an objective study the whole system of adjacent Seattle Arterials, and the Boulevard together. Revised, and new city Arterial projections should include alternative estimates of future SR 520 users and local Arterial users for Transit and other modal alternatives. Future impacts on Tolling 520 info should also be included..

**We need an objective review of current studies to determine new methods to reduce of auto trips through the Arboretum, our historic Park.**

**(NOTE: Current SR 520 State Legislation authorized WSDOT to levy SR520 Tolls before construction and after Opening, and then only on the 520 non- HOV users of the existing and new floating 520 bridge segment.)**

\*\*\*\*\*



SIERRA  
CLUB  
FOUNDED 1892

## Cascade Chapter

180 Nickerson St, Ste 202  
Seattle, WA 98109  
Phone: (206) 378-0114  
Fax: (206) 378-0034  
www.cascade.sierraclub.org

15 December 2010

Ms. Kerry Ruth, SR 520 Project Manager  
WSDOT / ESSB 6392 Workgroup  
600 Stewart St., Ste. 520  
Seattle, WA 98101

### Comments on SR 520 High Capacity Transit Planning and Financing Report

Dear Ms. Ruth:

We appreciate this opportunity to comment on the SR 520 High Capacity Transit Planning and Financing Report. The ESSB 6392 Workgroup has performed a valuable function by reassessing the 2008 High Capacity Transit Plan given a 2010 perspective.

Sierra Club urges the development of transportation options that support state, county and city greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction goals. We support an optimized role for transit in the SR 520 corridor since high capacity transit (HCT) promotes compact, walkable residential and commercial areas around transit stations, which reduces sprawl and its associated GHG emissions. Our specific comments that follow are organized around the recommendations presented in the draft report released December 1.

1. Sierra Club agrees that **new revenue sources are needed for the high capacity transit plan**. The starting point in seeking this additional revenue should be to secure a portion of the toll revenue to support transit service in the SR 520 corridor. As noted, the state tolling policy bill (ESHB 1773) authorizes that revenue may be used “to provide for the operations of conveyances of people or goods,” clearly allowing its use for transit operations.

- *Revenue sources should assess fees based on use of transportation system and resulting environmental burden*

The Sierra Club favors the use of fees that charge the user based on the environmental burden created by using the roadway whether in the form of pollution or added congestion and delay that affects all transportation system users. In addition to funding transit service from corridor toll revenue, these other sources should be preferentially used:

- carbon tax applied to motor vehicle fuel consumption;

- local sales and use tax on motor fuels; the entire amount of this sales tax levied on motor fuels (presently exempt from sales tax) should be available for transit operations, not confined to the 0.9 percent portion of sales tax that is designated for transit systems;
- system wide congestion pricing of all limited access highways in the central Puget Sound region;
- vehicle weight-based fee included as part of annual vehicle license fees.

- *Service funding deficiency highlights need for transit flexibility: Retain flyer stop functionality at Montlake Blvd.*

All of the potential revenue sources outlined in the report can be used for capital improvements, but on-going revenue to support operations is more problematic. This dilemma should prompt WSDOT, Sound Transit, and Metro Transit to reevaluate changes in the Montlake Blvd interchange under the Preferred Alternative that create the need for even more transit service. Sierra Club disagrees with the finding that HCT report recommendations are all valid (p. 11), in particular that service plans be based on eliminating the Montlake Flyer stop (p. 5). Instead, we strongly urge all project partners to redesign the Montlake Blvd interchange along SR 520 to retain the functionality of the present transit flyer stop.

A revised interchange allowing easy transit access at the regional stops to and from the west provides more flexibility in routing, scheduling, and service levels for transit across the SR 520 bridge. The same transit routes can serve both downtown Seattle and University District markets through transferring and connections. The resulting greater number of options for a given quantity of service hours benefits the transit user and the operating agency's already strapped budget. Suggestions for reconfiguring the interchange were listed in our September 24, 2010 comment letter on the SR 520 Design Refinements and Transit Connections Draft Recommendations Report.

**2. Planning efforts for short- and mid-term transit needs must consider the eventual inclusion of high capacity transit in the SR 520 corridor.** Beyond transit service planning, the project proponents need to ensure the capital facilities constructed in the SR 520 corridor are designed to be light rail ready with minimal reconstruction. The phasing of transit improvements, from upgrading existing bus service to a bus rapid transit (BRT) level of service to installation of light rail transit in the corridor, will be greatly assisted by designating as transit only the additional two lanes added by this project.

- *Transit plans for the SR 520 corridor affect the need for and design of the capital facilities proposed for this project*

Establishing priority use of the corridor for transit can help to avoid the problem of extra capacity, that it produces latent demand for highway space resulting in the new lane miles filling up with more congestion. Tolling is an important tool to manage congestion, and needs to be accompanied by ambitious transit improvements that offer more travel options. Transit planning for SR 520 needs to occur within a framework that sets objectives for travel efficiency, adjacent land use patterns, and GHG emission reductions. Transit priority on SR 520 is consistent with a smaller project footprint in Seattle, realized by assigning the additional two lanes for transit use only and reducing the width

of through traffic passing underneath Montlake Blvd. to four lanes, and the Portage Bay bridge to four or five lanes without any managed shoulder.

- *Potential phasing of project is opportunity to promote transit priority*

The funding shortfall that besets this project creates the distinct possibility of the present western approach connected to a replacement six-lane floating bridge during an interim period. Sierra Club recognizes such a phased implementation of the project as an opportunity to create the exclusive transit-only lanes described above. The only practical way to manage a 6-lane floating bridge that funnels to four lanes between Foster Island and I-5 is to restrict the fifth and sixth lanes to only transit use with priority for merging transit vehicles. Once initially established during construction, the transit-only designation can remain in effect for the additional lanes as the transit plan progresses to BRT and then light rail.

**3. A study of the long-term demand for and feasibility of HCT in the SR 520 corridor should be a high priority to complete – not start – by 2016 when light rail is extended to the University of Washington.** The funding for this transit plan is identified through Sound Transit 2 (ST2) to study light rail and other HCT technologies. Sufficient market demand exists to warrant a study for light rail in this corridor right now based on the April 2010 Nelson\Nygaard SR 520 Light Rail Alternatives report. Folding the long-term HCT plan into short- and mid-term transit plans will yield better facility design features to accommodate HCT such as light rail.

**4. Transit ridership in response to tolling of the existing SR 520 bridge will reveal valuable information that can inform not only the transit service level, but also the scale and extent of planned project elements.** The preferred alternative should be modified as described above for transit connections at Montlake Blvd. and transit use of the additional lanes. It should also be updated based on the monitoring and evaluation of transit service and general driver behavior. Significant developments in the system that can be expected to affect transit ridership include the extension of Sound Transit light rail to the University of Washington and then to Northgate, and the start of ST East Link service across I-90.

The emphasis on highway mega-projects continues to enable increased traffic and more numerous and longer urban trips, while constraining fiscal capacity for building out our mass transit system. The current system is neither sustainable nor scalable; we should redirect resources away from added vehicle capacity towards transit investments that help stop sprawl and reduce GHG emissions.

**5. The planned infrastructure improvements in the SR 520 program must be designed to complement high capacity transit plans developed for SR 520 including light rail transit.** The cause – effect relationship cited in the workgroup recommendation number 5 is backwards.

Sierra Club is committed to a future of smarter energy and transportation choices. Our choices today will determine whether we achieve a sustainable system tomorrow. When

investing in transportation infrastructure for three-quarters of a century, the state must ensure we reduce GHG emissions, meet increasing demand for transit, and prepare for the inevitable price spikes in petroleum resulting from the realization of peak oil. The transit plan associated with this long-term infrastructure investment must reveal an equally long vision.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the transit plan associated with such an important transportation investment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Morgan Ahouse". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Morgan Ahouse, Chapter Chair  
Sierra Club Cascade Chapter

John Barber with the Leschi Parks and Green Space Committee  
Received via 12/1 Workgroup meeting verbal comment period

“The Wedge” (WSDOT Peninsula) should be returned to the Arboretum as part of this mitigation process. This fits under Sections 4(f) and 6(f) and the city of Seattle’s Initiative 42, and returning this piece of land should be a priority.

Additionally, please prioritize measures to keep SR 520 traffic out of the Arboretum. To do this, do not restore the left turn on 24th Avenue E. By reducing traffic, you will allow for better traffic conditions on 23rd Avenue E. and Montlake Boulevard E. Constructing the second bascule bridge will also improve traffic in this region. Overall, improvements to the 23rd Avenue E. and Montlake Boulevard E. area are very important.

Bill James  


Why spend capital on changes for which there will not be oil to power to operate based on published reports by the US military's Joint Forces Command and the International Energy Agency's 2010 World Energy Outlook.

General Mattis's report is the more pointed of the two:

"By 2012, surplus oil production capacity could entirely disappear, and as early as 2015, the shortfall in output could reach nearly 10 million barrels per day."

"A severe energy crunch is inevitable without a massive expansion of production and refining capacity. While it is difficult to predict precisely what economic, political, and strategic effects such a shortfall might produce, it surely would reduce the prospects for growth in both the developing and developed worlds. Such an economic slowdown would exacerbate other unresolved tensions, push fragile and failing states further down the path toward collapse, and perhaps have serious economic impact on both China and India. At best, it would lead to periods of harsh economic adjustment. To what extent conservation measures, investments in alternative energy production, and efforts to expand petroleum production from tar sands and shale would mitigate such a period of adjustment is difficult to predict. One should not forget that the Great Depression spawned a number of totalitarian regimes that sought economic prosperity for their nations by ruthless conquest."

"Energy production and distribution infrastructure must see significant new investment if energy demand is to be satisfied at a cost compatible with economic growth and prosperity."

"The discovery rate for new petroleum and gas fields over the past two decades (with the possible exception of Brazil) provides little reason for optimism that future efforts will find major new fields."

Richard Korry  
Seattle, 98115



I am concerned that the plan calls for the elimination of the 520 Flyer stop at Montlake. I use this stop every day to commute to Microsoft in Redmond. I can arrive at the Montlake Flyer stop and get a 545 or a 242 and generally never wait more than 5-10 minutes. With the elimination of the Flyer I will need to rely on the 542 as my only option. The 542 is scheduled to run every 15 minutes which is much less frequent than the 545. This plan makes my commute much more difficult.

It will be sad and ironic that new 520 plan will make transit less attractive and make me want to drive more.

Larry Sinnott with Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks  
Received via 12/1 Workgroup meeting verbal comment period

With many of your SR 520 improvements, you're negatively impacting the Arboretum.

I was curious to hear you mention a multimodal center. Is this the transit stop on top of the lid? If so, it's really only an annex, because your light rail is 2,000 feet away. If it is a multimodal center, it comes at high cost to the Arboretum, as it means more lanes over Marsh Island, more impacts over water, and more shoreline impacts. Allowing left turns from the Montlake Lid to Montlake Boulevard E. is not good. I believe that southbound traffic on Montlake Boulevard E. will remain congested, which negatively impacts the Arboretum.

Additionally, eliminating the southbound bus island and moving the bus stop near the Hop-In Grocery will bog down traffic and also impact the Arboretum. A new light will be in place during construction at the west end of the off-ramp at Montlake Boulevard E. This light will lower traffic thru arbor, and should be made permanent. If it isn't made permanent, then tolling should be considered as a way to reduce traffic through the Arboretum. Finally, I'm also concerned about encroachments to medians on Montlake Boulevard E.

Liam Stacey  
Seattle, 98112

In regards to the bike and pedestrian and car solutions to Pacific St and Montlake intersection.

All plans presented in 2008 draft high capacity transit plan (page 30-35) have serious drawbacks:

1. Covering bike trail presents a danger, removes views. (exhibit 2-3)
2. Keeping cross walks at intersection serves no purpose: Hospital visitors should be on overpass (or direct underpass from the train). Cyclists would have a faster ride avoiding waiting for cars on overpass -- and ramps must be very long!
3. Driveway from is not necessary! Drivers can enter E12 through E10! This enables us to remove the Stop light for Northbound Traffic on Montlake Blvd.
4. Once north bound traffic does not have to stop, the right land of the bascule bridge can become the lane used by buses, AND thus these buses can turn left by adding a third left turn lane for buses only. Part of the big triangle can be taken up for this additional bus lane, thus freeing up left turn traffic.
5. It is key to create a pedestrian avenue that reconnects the Rainer Vista pedestrian boulevard to the Waterfront activities center. This connection could serve the sound transit center, Sports celebrations of all kinds, hospital visitors who use the transit center or who wish to go on a nice walk by the water and cyclists who would no longer have to ride next to noisy car spray, and endless slow lights.
6. Drives looking for parking never need to drive from Pacific Ave to the E12 lot, since the hospital already provides parking, and there are lots and garages on the east side of campus.
7. Contrary to grade crossing advocates, the at grade crossing is not nice. It is, however noisy, subject to car spray, requires waiting for two lights, perhaps even three. and creates waves of cyclists and pedestrians who have to negotiate each other in head-on waves of movement, rather than easily negotiated small groups.
8. At grade crossings also eliminate the freedom of a safe right turn on red while driving from Pacific St. to South bound Montlake blvd.

**From:** Carl Stork [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 15, 2010 5:45 PM  
**To:** SR520 Technical Workgroup  
**Subject:** Transit Planning and Financing Comments

Ladies & Gentlemen,

I have several comments regarding the transit planning for the SR-520 bridge project, especially in the Montlake area. I believe the transit function of this project is very important as high capacity transit will play an increasing role in transportation with scarcer fuel and higher energy costs.

Most important is that this project should do everything possible to retain the Montlake Flyer freeway station.

Connectivity and Enabling Transfers is an absolute core function of an effective all-day transit system. All-day transit is important because it lets people choose transit for more than just commute-to-work trips. Today there are thousands of riders using the Montlake stations every day. Evenings and weekends U-District service is very limited and even in the best of cases, the demand isn't there to maintain good service nights and weekends – but the Montlake Freeway station both retains service and enables connections even when U-District demand isn't there by enabling buses headed to Seattle to provide the connection. This function, which exists today, should be maintained.

We are spending \$4 billion on this corridor and have designated it a BRT corridor. We should not remove the single most important point of connectivity along its route.

Second most important is to provide operating funding for BRT. It can be justified on equity grounds, given the toll levels. To provide transportation choices for people who can't afford the tolls – or are being environmentally responsible – it is right to make sure that the funds are there to operate quality transit service. It should be part of the 520 bridge project.

Finally, the dedicated transit lanes and priority and connecting stations at Montlake are severely lacking. The transit pathways all conflict with general purpose traffic. Southbound, they must cross with traffic accessing 520 in both directions. A center dedicated lane would work for far better, with a stop over 520. Even northbound a center lane might work better so that buses are already on the left for the turn onto Pacific. The current plan to move to southbound stop all the way to the Hop-In grocery, without a good pedestrian connection to 520 buses. It's not adequate.

The likely continuing bottlenecks on the 520 bridge make it even more important to retain the Montlake Flyer stop.

Sincerely Yours  
Carl Stork

Anonymous

Please build the new bridge with light rail installed from the very start. Delaying a light rail rollout will not serve the public. A delay in constructing will also necessarily mean additional construction inconvenience if the bridge is later retrofitted for rail.

Anonymous  
12/15/10  
Via online survey

#1 Request - Please retain the Montlake Flyer Freeway station. The Montlake Flyer Freeway station is essential to offer frequent service, especially during the off-peak periods, especially evenings and weekends when there isn't enough demand to have frequent dedicated service to the UW -- and this is not just for people headed for the UW but people headed to Capitol Hill, Central District, or even just walking nearby like the hospital and Montlake neighborhoods. We prefer the 520 buses because they come more often and are more reliable than the buses that use the Montlake Bridge.

#2 Make the transfers work better at Montlake. It is very lame to move the southbound 43/48 stop even further away down to the Hop-In grocery. How about what they do in Europe where there are dedicated bus lanes and stops in the center of the road - get the buses out of the 520 onramp congestion and put them closer.

#3 Funding for transit. A portion of the toll revenue should go to operating funds for transit.

#4 Generally the bus lanes up & down Montlake Blvd don't look like they will work very well, there is too much conflict with other traffic. Southbound you have the buses on the right, conflicting with onramp traffic to 520 in both directions. Northbound the buses are on the right but have to merge to the left to make the turn to Pacific. Neither is very efficient. But it also gets back to #1 - please keep the Montlake Flyer station so that we can access bus routes along 520 and not be relegated only to the infrequent, shorter service period UW buses.

**Seattle City Council Briefing**  
**Dec. 13, 2010**  
**10:55 – 11:25 a.m.**

**Purpose:**

- To provide a briefing for council regarding ESSB 6392 Workgroup efforts, including the SR 520 High Capacity Transit Planning and Financing Findings and Recommendations Report and the Washington Park Arboretum Mitigation Plan

**Councilmembers present:**

- Richard Conlin
- Jean Godden
- Sally Bagshaw
- Bruce Harrell
- Sally Clark
- Tom Rasmussen
- Tim Burgess
- Mike O'Brien
- Nick Licata

**Presenters:**

- Mike Fong, Council Central Staff
- Sara Belz, Council Central Staff
- Kerry Ruth, SR 520 I-5 to Medina Engineering Manager
- Greg Walker, Sound Transit
- Victor Obeso, King County Metro
- Stephanie Brown, Seattle Department of Transportation

**Follow up items:**

- **Councilmembers** would like the mode-split information related to the projected 40,000 additional cross-lake trips projected for the year 2030.
- **CM O'Brien** would like an explanation about the projected models and how the project will achieve the State's VMT reduction goals.
- **CM Bagshaw** wants a private briefing to follow-up on the project's adherence to the Health Impact Assessment.
- **CM Bagshaw** would like to be kept up to date regarding noise mitigation and progress related to the department's evaluation of quiet asphalt and concrete and probably just needs to be kept in the loop on any decisions made with regard to noise mitigation and in particular, those related to the North Capitol Hill area.

**Questions and answers**

- **QUESTION:** [Clarifying background info] Kerry, did you say 115,000 vehicles, both directions, 24-hours a day? (CM Bagshaw)  
**RESPONSE:** Yes, each weekday 115,000 vehicles travel across SR 520, and 15,000 passengers ride transit through the corridor. Among the weekday trips, 10,000 passengers ride in the peak period. (Kerry Ruth)
- **QUESTION:** By what date will the additional 40,000 daily trips cross SR 520 occur? (CM O'Brien)

- RESPONSE:** *The additional 40,000 daily trips is project in 2030. (Kerry Ruth)*
- **QUESTION:** How does the increased 40,000 trips per day jive with the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction target at the State level, or are they completely unrelated? We need to consider the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions rather than just continuing to expand the infrastructure to meet demand. (CM O'Brien)

**RESPONSE:** *I am not certain about that. I will get back to you with an answer. Not certain about the correlation between the proposed construction and greenhouse gas reduction models. We will get back to you. (Kerry Ruth)*
- **COUNCIL COMMENT:** We have laws that say we want to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions, and one of the ways is to reduce our VMT, and yet our models keep showing up that we are just going to build more capacity because that is what happened for the last fifty years, and at some point, we need to reconcile those two points. (CM O'Brien)

**RESPONSE:** *One of the important points is that that means 40,000 trips; that doesn't necessarily mean 40,000 vehicles. So Transit is intended to try to actually get to that goal. (Greg Walker)*
- **QUESTION:** Would that be 40,000 on top of the additional 115,000 vehicles? (CM Burgess)

**RESPONSE:** *40,000 additional people—trips; not vehicles. It is not mode specific. (Kerry Ruth)*
- **QUESTION:** Do you have the breakdown of the 40,000 trips, by mode? (CM Burgess)

**RESPONSE:** *No, we do not currently have that information. We can get that to you. (Kerry Ruth)*

**RESPONSE:** *The goal is to have as many of those 40,000 new trips captured by transit as possible. (Greg Walker)*
- **QUESTION:** Is there perhaps an inconsistency or some confusion in terms of how we're counting transportation measures or data? We talk about trips; we talk about vehicles; we talk about passengers, and we have a goal of reducing VMT. So, should we arrive at one way of counting trips, and continue to use that, rather than using several different ones? (CM Burgess)

**RESPONSE:** *What may be confusing is that we have different numbers we use when it comes to planning the corridor and the services. So, the existing numbers are actual counts; the models project future trips. The Future Forecasting Model has several different steps, the first of which is to generate a raw number of trips. That is where we get the 40,000 additional trips per day. Then, we have to go through different exercises to decide how they are going to be mode-split. We anticipate that the majority of the trips will be captured by transit, given that there will be no capacity expansion for single-occupant vehicles in the corridor. (Greg Walker)*
- **QUESTION:** Can you get us that breakdown of assumed mode-split? (CM Burgess)

**RESPONSE:** *Yes, and we will also get you the VMT information. (Kerry Ruth)*
- **QUESTION:** Has there been discussion with our Legislators about the potential of CO<sub>2</sub> taxes? We know that in Europe, CO<sub>2</sub> taxes are levied both upon the weight of the vehicle and the efficiency of the engine, and it is monies that can then be used for transit, as contrast to a gas tax, which has to be used on roads. (CM Bagshaw)

**RESPONSE:** *Many additional potential sources of revenue have been considered. I am not specifically familiar with that tax and what has happened on that front. (Victor Obeso)*

- **COMMENT:** It is probably premature at this point, but Frank Chopp wrote about it and shared it with legislature—it is another step to consider that might make alternative vehicles more attractive. At least add it to the conversation list. I am specifically thinking of Michael O'Brien on this. (CM Bagshaw)
- **QUESTION:** There are a number of potential revenue sources listed here. Are they prioritized? Are there specific ones you wanted us to pursue? (CM Burgess)  
**RESPONSE:** They are not currently prioritized; Each can be used for transit at different levels. They are all used today, in the Puget Sound Region. They do have a heavy precedent to support transit here or elsewhere. (Victor Obeso)
- **QUESTION:** Once we have [BRT] 'Reliability', how does that translate into either head times or frequency of service, etc.? (CM Licata)  
**RESPONSE:** *BRT has three main components: Frequency (such as the ST 545 serving Redmond to Downtown Seattle), Reliability, and, what we need, Travel Time Competitiveness. (Greg Walker)*
- **QUESTION:** Is another opportunity to pay in advance so people are not fumbling with their money when they get on [the bus]? Also, I thought there was an opportunity to have multiple entrances. (CM Bagshaw)  
**RESPONSE:** *There are numerous add-ons possible that can be added to the service which can enhance the service; but we need the three major points—Frequency, Reliability, and Travel Time Competitiveness. (Greg Walker)*
- **QUESTION:** Are there any findings from the study? (CM Licata)  
**RESPONSE:** *One recommendation is to obtain new or enhanced support to fund a study, implement Park-and-Ride expansion, and improve arterial treatments. We do not have the capital dollars or operating dollars to do so. Our budgets are currently maxed out. Another recommendation is to perform an additional study to evaluate the implementation of HCT Plans. (Victor Obeso)*
- **QUESTION:** You expressed that you need sustainable revenue sources, but were there any specific revenue streams identified or prioritized? What percent of the revenue from Sound Transit is now going to bus service? (CM Licata)  
**RESPONSE:** *No, specific sources have not been identified at this time. It is the majority of the operating budget; the minority is from the capital budget. (Greg Walker)*
- **QUESTION:** What percent of the Sound Transit budget is capital? (CM Licata)  
**RESPONSE:** *I do not have that exact number right now. It is the majority. More than 50 percent. To guess, I would say 60 – 70 percent is capital. (Greg Walker)*
- **COUNCIL COMMENT:** The concern is that so much is going into capital; so little is going into the bus, as far as capital investment is concerned, and since operations probably contain less than 30 percent of the budget. Was there any dialogue in the project to consider what to do as far as the bus service, as opposed to investing in fixed rail? (CM Licata)  
**RESPONSE:** *Nearly the entire focus of the HCT study in 2008 was how to improve the*

bus service. That resulted in the additional 100,000 hours of ST Express Service in ST2, about 30,000 of that was applied to the SR 520 corridor.

- **QUESTION:** But how can you accomplish that without adjusting the ratios? We want to fight the dream-like state of always obtaining new revenue. We would like to see the dialogue of the evaluation of improvements to bus service given the current resources, rather than just asking for more funds. (CM Licata)  
**RESPONSE:** *Well in that case we had the ST2 plan to add the additional revenue. (Victor Obeso)*
- **COUNCIL COMMENT:** Without identifying additional revenue sources, there is a squeeze. We can fall into a dream-like state of wanting to add more to the infrastructure without having specific revenue sources any identified. (CM Licata)
- **COUNCIL RESPONSE:** It is really a political decision to provide specific sources. We need to influence the Legislature on this, and we can identify specific sources, but WSDOT could not have had the ability to talk about reprogramming transit. (CM Conlin)  
**RESPONSE:** *Also, we need a long-term sustainable source for the entire system. The system is much larger than this corridor, which would help in the system extension. We need long-term sustainability for the entire network—to get to BRT status. Therefore, we likely could not identify a specific source and amount. (Victor Obeso)*
- **QUESTION:** Does this map [of the Arboretum/ I-5] show WSDOT/ Arboretum ownership? (CM Conlin)  
**RESPONSE:** *It includes other entities. The map defines the Arboretum Park Boundary and the WSDOT peninsula. (Kerry Ruth)*  
**COUNCIL RESPONSE:** *People need to understand that all of this area adjacent to SR 520 [WSDOT peninsula] can become compatible with the Arboretum. (CM Conlin)*
- **QUESTION:** Has there been any progress on Tribal coordination related to Foster Island? (CM Bagshaw)  
**RESPONSE:** *We have been working with the Tribes throughout the process. We plan to meet with them today. (Kerry Ruth)*
- **QUESTION:** What are the uses and resources regarding Foster Island? (CM Rasmussen)  
**RESPONSE:** *Foster Island has been identified by the National Historic Preservation Act as a traditional cultural property because traditional ceremonies occurred at this site. All modifications must seek Tribal concurrence. (Kerry Ruth)*
- **QUESTION:** Is further use of this site planned by the Tribes, or simply as recognized as a site that had been important? (CM Rasmussen)  
**RESPONSE:** *That is to be determined. Ultimately, the University of Washington and the City of Seattle have ownership, but concurrence comes through the Tribes by the National Historic Preservation Act. (Kerry Ruth)*
- **QUESTION:** Is it not true that the corridor is specifically designed to not touch the historical portion? (CM Conlin)  
**RESPONSE:** *Actually, the corridor does go through the historical portion; but it has been minimized to reduce effects to cultural resources and the site. There are opportunities for enhancement and/or restoration in this area. (Kerry Ruth)*

- **QUESTION:** Do you anticipate turning over ownership of the land? (CM Conlin)
- **RESPONSE:** *That is to be determined; it is currently in discussion. (Kerry Ruth)*
  
- **QUESTION:** Are there noise reduction results? (CM Bagshaw)
- **RESPONSE:** *We continue to discuss mitigation measures. WSDOT has already committed to quieter concrete, a 4-foot barrier with noise-absorptive materials, and including noise-absorptive materials elsewhere. (Kerry Ruth)*
  
- **QUESTION:** Has there been any success with quieter pavement? (CM Bagshaw)
- **RESPONSE:** *WSDOT is currently testing quieter asphalt. There has been no determination yet. We do not have experience with quieter concrete in Washington, though it has been used in other states. We are committing to implement it here and monitor its effectiveness.*
  
- **QUESTION:** I would like to discuss this further. Concerns have been expressed by residents with the noise walls—height and width—creating a “box” with the noise, particularly by one North Capitol Hill neighbor who is well-known, and stopped the I-90 work for ten years. (CM Bagshaw)
- **RESPONSE:** *We will follow up with the Noise Analysis.*
  
- **QUESTION:** Can you clarify why the work is done in phases? (CM Clark)
- **RESPONSE:** *Due to funding needs. (Kerry Ruth)*
  
- **COUNCIL COMMENT:** It should be stated that the original intent was for Lake Washington Boulevard to be a parkway not a boulevard. (CM Bagshaw)
- **RESPONSE:** *That is correct. (Kerry Ruth)*
  
- **QUESTION:** Do you need State approval or just City approval for tolling Lake Washington Boulevard? (CM Burgess)
- **RESPONSE:** *We would need clarification from others. That is not clear based on the mixed answers available by different sources. (Stephanie Brown)*
  
- **QUESTION:** How does the WSDOT Health Impact Assessment come into play? (CM Bagshaw)
- **RESPONSE:** *It is an important element and is incorporated into the plans. The preferred alternative specifically states how it meets the goals of the Assessment. (Kerry Ruth)*
  
- **QUESTION:** Can we discuss the specifics of how the WSDOT Health Impact Assessment is addressed at a later time?
- **RESPONSE:** *Certainly. We can provide an update at another time.*