



Meeting Summary
ESSB 6392 Workgroup Meeting #2
Thursday, August 19, 2010
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500, Seattle

Workgroup members:

- Angie Thomson, Facilitator
- Peter Hahn, Seattle Department of Transportation (substitute for Bob Powers)
- David Hull, King County Metro
- Greg Walker, Sound Transit
- Julie Meredith, SR 520 Program
- Theresa Doherty, University of Washington
- Michael Fong, Seattle City Council

Welcome and introductions (Angie Thomson)

Angie Thomson, facilitator, welcomed everyone to the second ESSB 6392 Workgroup meeting and reviewed the agenda. Workgroup members introduced themselves.

Recap from July 22 (Kerry Ruth)

Kerry Ruth, I-5 to Medina Engineering Manager, led a recap of the July 22 ESSB 6392 Workgroup meeting. The accomplishments from the last meeting included the Workgroup's discussion and approval of recommendations on the following topics:

- Technical Coordination Team work plan.
- Location of transit/HOV lanes and transit signal priority on Montlake Boulevard E.
- Outcome of the SR 520 Montlake Triangle Charrette.
- Initial concepts for bicycle and pedestrian connectivity.
- Update on the Arboretum traffic calming and traffic management plan.
- Received public comments. Specifically, the Workgroup received 12 public comments at the July 22 Workgroup meeting.

Ms. Ruth reported that she and Stephanie Brown, Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), briefed the Seattle City Council on Aug. 3 on the Workgroup's progress. Ms. Ruth said that the Seattle City Council accepted public comments at this briefing and public comments have been shared with the Technical Coordination Team (TCT) during meetings and are included in Workgroup member packets.

Bicycle and pedestrian connectivity (Jennifer Wieland)

Jennifer Wieland, SDOT, provided an overview of the TCT's work on bicycle and pedestrian connections in the Montlake Boulevard E and I-5 areas. A subgroup, made up of representatives from the Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board, Seattle Pedestrian Advisory Board, Seattle Design Commission, SDOT and WSDOT met to discuss goals and identify key local and regional routes for bikes and pedestrians. The subgroup identified two goals to guide the recommendations:

1. Identify primary and secondary bicycle and pedestrian routes.
2. Ensure safe and efficient connections from the SR 520 regional path to existing and planned local and regional paths.

The group reviewed safety, connectivity, efficiency and capacity for bicycles and pedestrians, and provided options for cyclists and pedestrians, recognizing that there are varying levels of riders who travel through and in the Montlake corridor. Ms. Wieland reviewed the following key routes, which would provide a 14-foot clear path where feasible, while maintaining connectivity:

- Regional connection
 - An 18-foot bicycle and pedestrian path will be provided on the new Montlake Bascule Bridge to allow room for pedestrians and cyclists.
 - Many widths were considered but ultimately an 18-foot path was identified because it meets the design standards and accommodates the volumes of bike and pedestrian traffic while ensuring connectivity across the Montlake Cut.
- Dawson to downtown connection
 - Includes a new bicycle and pedestrian tunnel under Montlake Boulevard E. This enhancement would allow connections from the north and south to the Bill Dawson Trail, which runs to downtown Seattle and the Eastlake neighborhood.
- Arboretum path
 - The trail connecting the Arboretum to the SR 520 area is a key connection, and something that is currently under discussion with the ABGC.
- Montlake Boulevard E bypass
 - Improvements were made to the Montlake Lid design in order to reduce the crossing distance for pedestrians at key intersections.
 - Add eight-foot sidewalks on the east and west sides of Montlake Boulevard E.
- Montlake Boulevard E on-street and off-street paths
- Transit link
- Roanoke crossing
 - Add bicycle and pedestrian connections that run south along I-5 from E Roanoke Street, as there is currently no formal bicycle or pedestrian path here.
 - Add enhanced crossings at E Roanoke Street and Harvard Avenue E.
 - The technical coordination team evaluated important key routes throughout the I-5/SR 520 interchange area and identified these various routes for consideration.
 - In addition, WSDOT and SDOT are currently working through the Section 106 process to ensure the design of the 10th Avenue E and E Delmar Street lid is respectful of the historic character of the Roanoke neighborhood.

- SDOT and WSDOT will continue to work together to evaluate recommendations from the TCT and Section 106 consulting parties in the identified bicycle and pedestrian routes in this area.

(Slide 3 provides additional information)

Ms. Wieland reviewed the regional connection path, and highlighted the existing and proposed cross sections at Montlake Boulevard E at E Hamlin Street and E Shelby Street. During this cross section review, Ms. Wieland highlighted the following options for future consideration:

- Create a two-way bicycle boulevard on E Shelby Street. This two-way path would cross the proposed second bascule bridge and allow room for cyclists and pedestrians to stop on the bridge, as they currently do on the existing bascule bridge. The path would also connect to the Montlake Triangle, the University of Washington Rainier Vista project, and the University of Washington light rail station.
- Expand the widths of the sidewalks to 10 feet on Montlake Boulevard E at E Hamlin Street. These sidewalks would act as a shared use path for bicycles and pedestrians. The TCT acknowledges that the group must work with the community for feedback on this particular recommendation.
- Add an 8-foot contra lane for bicycles on E Shelby Street heading west towards Montlake Boulevard E (in the opposite direction of vehicle traffic).

Ms. Wieland mentioned that all of these options require further coordination with the neighborhood to receive their input.

(Slides 4-5 provide additional information)

QUESTION: Under current conditions, the bicycle path at E Shelby Street is a one-way going westbound? (David Hull)

RESPONSE: *Yes, this is correct. Additionally, E Hamlin Street features a one-way eastbound bicycle path. The reasons for these consolidated bicycle movements on one street versus the other are due to the width of the sidewalks on Montlake Boulevard E. The idea is to move people off of Montlake Boulevard E as quickly as possible, so they can move to a wider space. (Jennifer Wieland)*

QUESTION: Everything you've showed us so far is assuming that a second bascule bridge will be in place. Is there a backup plan if there is only one bascule bridge? (Peter Hahn)

RESPONSE: *If only one bascule bridge is in place, then it would not be possible to further widen the sidewalk and cyclists and pedestrians would need to negotiate a tight shared space. These bicycle connections would function the same as they do today, but likely with more congestion for bicycles and pedestrians. (Jennifer Wieland)*

QUESTION: To clarify, the difference in pathway widths between existing and proposed in this plan is around 8 feet? Will this new 18-foot pathway be used for bicycles and pedestrians? (Peter Hahn)

RESPONSE: *Yes, the path across the bridge is currently 10 feet, with some of that space being used for trusses. This pathway would be shared use, and the idea would be to use some sort of striping or paint treatment to indicate a separation. (Jennifer Wieland)*

QUESTION: The proposed options on slide nine speak to expanding the shared use pathway by taking away some of the landscaping. Is there any opportunity to narrow the lane widths instead of taking away landscaped areas? (Mike Fong)

RESPONSE: *Yes, we discussed this possible opportunity. We made the assumption that we would have to move the curb line back farther than it is today. However, the transit agencies have concerns about reducing lane widths, so it is a tradeoff that we will have to consider. (Jennifer Wieland)*

COMMENT: I'm not sure what the community feedback would be concerning the removal of the landscaped portion of this design. (Mike Fong)

RESPONSE: *Our next steps include working with the community on these designs. (Kerry Ruth)*

Workgroup recommendation: The Workgroup concurred with each TCT recommendation to provide a 14-foot clear path where feasible while maintaining connectivity, and to include key pedestrian and bike routes through the Montlake Boulevard E and I-5 area. The Workgroup also concurred with the recommendation that a future process will be necessary to define other design refinements such as lighting, bike storage and signage, and concurred with the recommendations for options at E Shelby Street to be considered in the future.

Bus stop locations and connectivity (Kerry Ruth)

Kerry Ruth presented the current and proposed transit stops. The TCT's recommendations for bus stop locations include:

Montlake Boulevard E Interchange

- Add a transit pull-out in the eastbound direction on the Montlake Lid to allow buses to pull out of the way of HOV traffic accessing the direct-access ramp.
- Signalize the intersection at Montlake Boulevard E to allow westbound buses to move through the signal onto northbound Montlake Boulevard E.
- In the southbound direction, relocate existing bus stops on Montlake Boulevard E to a location near the Hop In Market. This location would be safer for riders.
- In the northbound direction, provide a bus stop on Montlake Boulevard E adjacent to the Montlake Lid. A transit-only lane would be added at this stop so the general purpose traffic on Montlake Boulevard E would not back up when the bus stops.
 - Add a receiving lane north on Montlake Boulevard E to allow buses to merge into traffic and make a smooth transition to the inside transit/HOV lane on northbound Montlake Boulevard E. A bus stop at this location would provide a shorter walking distance for passengers connecting between local and regional stops.

([Slides 7-8](#) provide additional information)

QUESTION: For a westbound in-lane bus stop on the Montlake lid, if an HOV driver is caught behind the bus while it stops, the HOV driver would wait? (Peter Hahn)

RESPONSE: *Yes, this is correct. HOV drivers must wait behind transit while making in-lane stops in this area. (Kerry Ruth)*

COMMENT: In this area, we anticipate that we [King County Metro] would have problems with delays. Additionally, when transit would make out of lane stops, we would have trouble getting back into traffic. Because of these issues, King County Metro supports an in-lane stop on the Montlake Lid in the westbound direction. (David Hull)

QUESTION: With the planned regional transit stops located on Montlake Boulevard E, passengers must backtrack to access any local lines? (David Hull)

RESPONSE: *Yes, this is currently the situation. At the new Montlake Lid, there will be a pedestrian path and crosswalks for pedestrians to connect to the local stops on Montlake Boulevard E. (Kerry Ruth)*

QUESTION: Is this movement unlikely, as people are coming down from 23rd Avenue E, exiting their buses and traveling east? People get off of their buses and go anywhere they want to in this area. There is no clear path shown on the lid that makes a direct connection between the stops. (David Hull)

RESPONSE: *We have not yet determined how pedestrians will move on the lid. The paths you see on the slide are conceptual. (Kerry Ruth)*

COMMENT: King County Metro strongly supports putting this recommended stop at this location on the Montlake Lid. (David Hull)

COMMENT: In terms of potential delays with having the westbound bus in this lane, the passengers getting off of the bus at this location will be unloading quickly, through both doors, and not having to pay as they're disembarking, because they paid while boarding the bus. On the eastbound side, these delays would be longer with an in-lane stop, as passengers would only be loading through the front door, and having to pause and pay. (Greg Walker)

QUESTION: Does the receiving lane north of Montlake Boulevard E fit within the existing right-of-way, or will it require other adjustments? (Peter Hahn)

RESPONSE: *The receiving lane is within the right-of-way, but it will impact existing landscaping. (Kerry Ruth)*

QUESTION: Is this public landscaping? (Peter Hahn)

RESPONSE: *This is landscaping within the WSDOT right-of-way. (Kerry Ruth)*

QUESTION: Does the landscaping currently provide a good buffer between the neighborhood and the road? (Peter Hahn)

COMMENT: The neighbors think it is a buffer, yes. (Julie Meredith)

RESPONSE: *The closest resident in this area lives just north of the receiving lane. (Kerry Ruth)*

QUESTION: Would you be able to provide some sort of landscaping to soften this edge? (Peter Hahn)

RESPONSE: *The right-of-way is right against this area. We could certainly look at it. (Kerry Ruth)*

COMMENT: This buffer area is the Canal Reserve, on University of Washington property. (Theresa Doherty)

QUESTION: I'd like to make sure I fully understand the tradeoffs between option A and option B. Are you saying the advantages to a bus stop on the lid is that it would facilitate more convenient connections between regional and local service, and it would mitigate pedestrian and vehicular conflicts at this intersection? Are these the principal advantages to a stop on the lid? (Mike Fong)

RESPONSE: *Yes, these are the principal advantages to a stop on the lid. (Kerry Ruth)*

QUESTION: Do you have a sense of how many riders are making transfers between local and regional service at this location? (Mike Fong)

RESPONSE: *About 300 riders make this transfer daily. (Kerry Ruth)*

COMMENT: These transfers happen primarily during peak periods. (David Hull)

COMMENT: Having the bus stop on the lid will add the convenience of having a shorter distance between stops, but I also think there's a safety issue. I feel much safer having the bus stops on the lid. (Greg Walker)

COMMENT: The City Council might be sensitive to receiving public feedback on this point. The Council will be interested in learning more about this receiving lane and using green space on the lid. The Council is especially interested in assuring that we have convenient and safe transit connections. At the same time, receiving feedback from the community on some of these changes is important. (Mike Fong)

RESPONSE: *We would like to move forward and receive public feedback on these recommendations. Depending on the feedback we receive, we will move forward or make adjustments to these refinements. (Kerry Ruth)*

QUESTION: What is the relative distance for pedestrians in terms of transit and HOV access for each of these proposed stops? (Peter Hahn)

RESPONSE: *While evaluating stop locations, King County Metro usually evaluates travel time, not travel distance. (David Hull)*

QUESTION: Is option B an in-lane stop? (David Hull)

RESPONSE: *Yes, and this stop also impacts traffic on Montlake Boulevard E. (Kerry Ruth)*

QUESTION: Stop A does not impact traffic on Montlake Boulevard E? (Peter Hahn)

RESPONSE: *No, stop A is out of the flow of traffic. (David Hull)*

QUESTION: Where is the next bus stop further up the road? (Mike Fong)

RESPONSE: *The next stop today is at E Roanoke Street, not very far away. (Kerry Ruth)*

QUESTION: I see that bus stop C is proposed to relocate to the south side of the Hop In Market. Is this because of business access? (David Hull)

RESPONSE: *This location change is to ensure pedestrian safety, and to ensure that buses stopping in this area do not conflict with vehicles accessing SR 520. When looking at bus stop locations, our goal is to maintain access to the Hop In. We are still refining where the bus stops will be in this area. This particular stop is a design refinement that we will complete in the future. We will also coordinate with the Hop In Market to ensure access. (Kerry Ruth)*

Montlake Triangle vicinity

- All bus stop options under consideration at the Montlake Triangle area (options A through H) fulfill the requirements of Engrossed Senate Substitute Bill 6392 to provide an effective transit connection with a distance of less than 1,200 feet.
- The TCT has identified the following options to consider.
 - Options A – C are stops the TCT previously identified that it will evaluate further for feasibility in conjunction with the University of Washington Rainier Vista project.
 - Options D – H were added for consideration to help ensure that all options that meet the 1,200 foot goal are evaluated. Some of these stops have previously been considered by Sound Transit when planning for the University of Washington light rail station.
- The TCT is currently evaluating transit travel times and the distances between stops and destinations while maintaining transit reliability. The TCT will consider this information and make a recommendation at the next workgroup meeting.

([Slides 9-10](#) provide additional information)

QUESTION: Some of these bus stops in the Montlake Triangle area would require a left turn at NE Pacific Place. What impact would this have to traffic in the area? (David Hull)

RESPONSE: *We are still evaluating this. (Kerry Ruth)*

QUESTION: How many riders do you expect at each bus stop? (Julie Meredith)

RESPONSE: *We are still screening the options by distances traveled as well as travel time by buses to ensure transit reliability in this area. (Kerry Ruth)*

Workgroup recommendation: The Workgroup concurred with each TCT recommendation, and agreed that each recommendation for the Montlake Interchange should move forward for further review, and that additional information and recommendation for the Montlake Triangle area will happen at the next meeting.

Turning, queuing and channelization (Kerry Ruth)

Kerry Ruth presented the TCT's work on turning, queuing and channelization for the Montlake interchange. The TCT evaluated lane channelization for SR 520 and the connections to the local street system. The goals of the TCT were to:

- Minimize the pavement footprint in order to maximize green space and minimize environmental effects.
- Ensure the best possible speed and reliability for transit in the area.
- Ensure the best possible experience for non-motorized trips.
- Continue to facilitate traffic movement in the area without adversely affecting safety on the local streets and freeway.
- Maximize the functionality of the Montlake Interchange.
- Consider the traffic movements that will be displaced by the removal of existing access ramps to and from SR 520 and E Lake Washington Boulevard.
- Maintain and improve *No Build* operations.
- Minimize queues onto the SR 520 corridor.

Ms. Ruth presented the TCT's general recommendations on turning, queuing and channelization to the Workgroup, which include:

- A barrier on the Montlake Lid to ensure that pedestrians will use safe routes.
- 11-foot westbound off-ramps throughout the corridor, and 12-foot lanes in the westbound and eastbound direction of the Montlake Lid.
- Two lanes in the southbound direction on E Lake Washington Boulevard and 24th Avenue E.
- A right turn only lane on southbound E Lake Washington Boulevard. A second lane should allow for left turns or straight movements.
- 14 feet of planted median along E Lake Washington Boulevard to provide a look and feel consistent with Olmsted Park.

([Slides 11-14](#) provide additional information)

QUESTION: Has the TCT discussed what restrictions may be on the left turn movement from 24th Avenue to E Lake Washington Boulevard? (Mike Fong)

RESPONSE: *The function of that left turn is an important topic that the TCT and the Arboretum and Botanical Garden Committee (ABGC) have been discussing. (Kerry Ruth)*

QUESTION: What if we prevented that left turn? Would this move SR 520 traffic out of the Arboretum? (Mike Fong)

RESPONSE: *Removing the left turn would create additional traffic on Montlake Boulevard E, which would require additional improvements to accommodate additional traffic. Additionally, widening the roadway south of the Montlake Boulevard area to accommodate additional traffic would negatively impact the neighborhood. The left turn movement on 24th Avenue E is important because it alleviates congestion through the nearby neighborhoods. (Kerry Ruth)*

RESPONSE: *The team can also revisit this issue to see what else can be done. We could look at placing turning restrictions into this area during certain times of the day. We could also look at placing signage that would encourage vehicles to take a right onto E Lake Washington Boulevard and drive to Montlake Boulevard E and 23rd Avenue. We will continue to work very closely with the ABGC on this issue. (Jennifer Wieland)*

COMMENT: The City Council feels that we need to strike a balance here. The Council will be interested in seeing a traffic management plan for this area. (Mike Fong)

COMMENT: This makes sense to me, and I support moving forward with these recommendations. (Theresa Doherty)

COMMENT: I still have concerns about the left turn at 24th Avenue E. I think it's important that we document what the consequences are of having or not having this turn. (Peter Hahn)

COMMENT: Will this decision require more coordination with the ABGC? (Theresa Doherty)

RESPONSE: *Yes. In the future we can provide additional analysis and information about the implications of a left turn restriction. (Kerry Ruth)*

Westbound off-ramp

Ms. Ruth stated that by evaluating the updated traffic volumes, the TCT determined that vehicles can exit SR 520 in a single-lane off-ramp, though there still remains a need for two lanes of storage west of Foster Island to Montlake Boulevard E to ensure that there is adequate vehicle storage during peak congestion, when the Montlake bascule bridge is open. The westbound off-ramp lane configuration is designed to meet city standards with 11 foot lanes.

([Slide 12](#) provides additional information)

E Lake Washington Boulevard

Ms. Ruth shared the TCT's channelization recommendations for E Lake Washington Boulevard, which include:

- Maintaining the existing southern curb line of E Lake Washington Boulevard. Any additional width is recommended to be added along the north side.
- Provide lanes in the westbound direction between 24th Avenue E and Montlake Boulevard E.
- Maintain on-street parking as it is today.
- Create a five-foot bicycle lane next to the sidewalk on E Lake Washington Boulevard between 24th Avenue E and the east ends of the Montlake Lid.

([Slide 13](#) provides additional information)

Basculer Bridge

Ms. Ruth explained that the TCT incorporated the Workgroup's feedback from the last meeting on July 22 to narrow the general purpose lane from 12 to 11 feet on the second bascule bridge. Ms. Ruth shared a cross section of the Montlake second bascule bridge, adding that the cross section reflects the 18-foot bicycle and pedestrian path on the second bascule bridge. Ms. Ruth also explained that the TCT recommends keeping the planted median on the Portage Bay Bridge.

([Slide 14](#) provides additional information)

QUESTION: Is the bicycle and pedestrian path 18 feet in both directions? What does this path feed into? (Greg Walker)

RESPONSE: *This 18-foot shared pathway is only in the northbound direction. Just south of the bridge, this path will feed into an existing sidewalk which is between 8 and 10 feet. The TCT is looking at these options, and ways to keep bicycles and pedestrians moving through this area. (Kerry Ruth)*

QUESTION: The Council would like to see a further examination of the second bascule bridge and interim measures for traffic management before the bridge is put in. (Mike Fong)

RESPONSE: *To clarify, the TCT recommendations are for the channelization and phasing of the proposed second bascule bridge. The TCT work is not focused on whether to move forward with the bridge itself. (Angie Thomson)*

QUESTION: Have we looked at just adding a bicycle and pedestrian appendage to the existing bridge? (Peter Hahn)

RESPONSE: *We cannot modify the existing bridge, because it would be an adverse impact to the historical bridge, and structural capacity may not be able to support additional weight. (Kerry Ruth)*

RESPONSE: *We will note your question and do further analysis. (Angie Thomson)*

QUESTION: What is the width of the planted median? (Peter Hahn)

RESPONSE: *6 feet. (Kerry Ruth)*

QUESTION: Will we really be able to eliminate 6 feet off of the width of the bridge, or do we need a median of some sort? (David Hull)

RESPONSE: *We have been planning for two narrow barriers on the outer edges of the planted median. These will still be there, even if no planted median exists. (Kerry Ruth)*

QUESTION: To confirm, people don't feel like this planted median is a worthwhile investment? (Peter Hahn)

RESPONSE: *That is correct. We have not received any positive feedback yet about the planted median. (Kerry Ruth)*

Workgroup recommendation: The Workgroup supported the TCT's recommendations on turning, queuing and channelization.

Arboretum traffic calming and traffic management (Jennifer Wieland)

Jennifer Wieland shared the goals of the Arboretum traffic calming and traffic management work effort. These goals include:

- Reduce the total number of automobile trips through the Arboretum.
- Reduce vehicle speeds through the Arboretum.
- Increase vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian safety.
- Increase bicycle and pedestrian use in the Arboretum.
- Increase visitor use in the Arboretum.
- Maintain existing character of the Arboretum.
- Reduce vehicle-generated noise on E Lake Washington Boulevard in the Arboretum area.
- Reduce pollution and improved air quality.
- Reduce queue lengths in the Arboretum.

Ms. Wieland noted that SDOT presented their recommendations for traffic calming and management at the ABGC meeting yesterday. SDOT's recommendations include:

- Marked crosswalks.
- Radar speed signs.
- Raised crosswalks.
- Speed cushions.
- Landscaped curb bulbs.
- Sign improvements.
- Additional pedestrian activated signals and improvements to the intersection at Foster Island Road.

The TCT recommends supporting the adoption of the SDOT recommended traffic plan, along with any further modifications that may come from the ABGC later in the week.

[\(Slides 15-17](#) provide additional information)

QUESTION: What is a "speed cushion"? (Greg Walker)

RESPONSE: *It's also known as a speed hump. A speed cushion features more of a table design, not a short bump. (Jennifer Wieland)*

Workgroup recommendation: The Workgroup concurred with the TCT recommendation, and agreed that the SDOT traffic plan move forward for further review.

Legislative report update (Kerry Ruth)

Ms. Ruth explained that this Workgroup will submit a report to the legislature by October 1. In this report, each item that this group has created recommendations on will be included in this report. The two items recently reviewed by the TCT that have not been discussed yet are noise reduction strategies and the health impact assessment.

Noise reduction strategies

Ms. Ruth stated that WSDOT is moving forward with noise analysis through the corridor, recognizing that noise walls are the most common way to mitigate traffic noise on a highway system. WSDOT also recognizes that there is a desire from the community for alternative ways of noise reduction throughout the corridor. Several alternative noise reduction strategies that WSDOT would like to proceed with are:

- Including 4-foot high barriers on the Portage Bay Bridge and the West Approach that include noise absorptive materials.
- Placing noise absorptive material at portals to each lid and around expansion joints.
- Installing quieter concrete through the corridor from I-5 to Medina, including the floating bridge.

Health Impact Assessment

Ms. Ruth shared that the Preferred Alternative has met the goals of the health impact assessment by:

- Providing lids throughout the corridor.
- Developing noise reductions strategies.
- Providing landscaped features.
- Improving bicycle and pedestrian connections.

Recommendations report and next steps:

Ms. Ruth then provided an overview of the following key dates for the recommendations report:

- Sept. 7: TCT will submit a draft recommendations report to the Workgroup.
- Sept. 9: Workgroup meeting to discuss the draft report provide feedback.
- Sept. 13-24: Public comment period on the draft report.
- Oct. 1: Final recommendations report due to the Governor and Legislature.

Ms. Ruth introduced the topics for discussion at the next meeting. These topics include:

- Transit connections.
- Light rail transit accommodations.
- Urban design and streetscape.
- Roadway operations: SR 520 reversible transit and HOV lane.
- Roadway operations: Portage Bay Bridge managed shoulder.
- Second Montlake bascule bridge phasing.

- Neighborhood traffic management plan.
- Corridor management plan.
- Montlake Triangle bus stop locations.

([Slides 18-20](#) provide additional information)

Public Comment

Comments below are a summary of verbal comments and are not recorded verbatim.

Comment 1: Kerry Lack with the Laurelhurst Community Club

I am very interested in cycling issues, and I have a long history of cycling in Seattle. I would first like to compliment the bicycle planners for recognizing that there are many different cycling styles. I just returned from San Francisco, and I noticed a few things about cycling in the city. One thing that worked very well in San Francisco was their bus, bicycle and HOV shared lanes. When a bus had to stop, the city provided a pull out for the bus, and HOV and bicycle traffic could be routed around the bus. San Francisco also utilizes signs telling traffic to change lanes, and often, cyclists had their own lane. From a cyclist's standpoint, this was efficient, safe, and comfortable. My main concern with the SR 520 project is routing cyclists and pedestrians across the bascule bridge. During a Husky football game, the bridge is impassable in both directions. I hope that with any design, you can keep cyclists and pedestrians separated. In San Francisco, they split the Golden Gate Bridge on the weekends. One side of the bridge is used for pedestrians; the other is used for cyclists. I hope you can consider doing something like this for high-volume days in the Montlake neighborhood.

Comment 2: Jonathan Dubman with the Montlake Community Council

The community rejects a second Montlake bridge to the extent that it is used for bicycle improvements. If only used for bicycle improvements in the area, this bike lane would cost \$30 thousand per square foot. Additionally, all views from the east side of the historic Montlake bridge would be removed. Removing the parking lane in the E Shelby Street neighborhood would jeopardize parking for residents. If you are asking the residents of E Shelby Street to cut their car usage in half, you should ask everyone in the region to do the same. With the 10th Avenue E and Delmar Lid, why not put a bicycle lane under 10th Avenue E? Next, positioning bus stop connections within 1200 feet in the Montlake Triangle should be the upper limits of any proposed stop. Ideally, stops would be much closer than that. Finally, nobody is addressing transit connectivity from the north. There will still be massive backups, and all of these transit improvements that we are discussing won't be accessible from the north and northeast.

Comment 3: Larry Sinnott with Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks

At the preferred alternative announcement in April, the Governor, the King County Executive and others were excited to announce how this alternative was protecting the Arboretum. In a meeting yesterday, the technical coordination team demanded that the Arboretum Botanical Garden Committee agree to reductions in traffic. This traffic should have never been allowed through the Arboretum in the first place. By allowing traffic to turn left on 24th Avenue E, you will be bringing more congestion to the Arboretum. Thank you to Mr. Hahn and Mr. Fong for

voicing their concerns today. This proposed left turn on 24th Avenue E does not support the expectations that our political leaders voiced four months ago.

Comment 4: Jean Amick with the Laurelhurst Community Club

I'd like to second what Jonathan Dubman said. Traffic from northeast Seattle hasn't been properly addressed yet. I'm speaking today as an individual and as a member of the Coalition for a Sustainable 520. It's important to note that traffic in this area is often caused not by SR 520 congestion, but by the traffic lights at E Hamlin Street, E Shelby Street, the University of Washington hospital, and Husky Stadium. I'm concerned that we're adding three new lights on the lid that will cause huge congestion for the area.

Comment 5: Paige Miller with the Arboretum Foundation

I'm speaking today on behalf of Arboretum Foundation. The Foundation appreciates the time and effort that WSDOT and SDOT are putting into working with the Arboretum. The Arboretum Foundation is very concerned with left turns onto 24th Avenue E. We need to have capacity on Montlake Boulevard to handle traffic and to allow buses to move adequately through the Montlake corridor. We need to rethink in-lane stops on Montlake Boulevard, and see if pull-outs or queue jumps need to be added to reduce traffic through the Arboretum. Another big issue is the channelization through Foster Island, and reducing speeds across Foster Island, which will allow you to reduce the width of the roadway across the island. Reducing the roadway width across the island would create a smaller footprint, which would meet the goals for ESSB 6392. Reducing speeds across the island would also reduce noise to the Montlake, Madison Park, and Laurelhurst neighborhoods, and would be a huge win for the area. Finally, we are happy to see that you're planning on reducing the queue lane.

Comment 6: Virginia Gunby with the Ravenna-Bryant Community Association

I'm representing myself today, as well as the Ravenna-Bryant community association. We are glad that the Arboretum ramps are being removed, as we want to protect the Arboretum by reducing traffic. Additionally, we are opposed to left turns to 24th Avenue E. We think that transit should have preferential treatment on Montlake Boulevard. We are also interested in a planted median on the Portage Bay Bridge, as we think it could reduce noise on the bridge and add beauty. We are also concerned about quieter pavement, as we're concerned about the negative impacts this might have to the community. I've heard that quieter pavement has to be reconstructed every five years. Finally, we want to thank you again and tell you that we're happy you have this great process going on.

Comment 7: Mark Weed

I represent the business community today. I've noticed that one of the groups missing in this process is the freight mobility group. The city has a freight mobility task force that is an approved city entity, and I feel that they should be represented in this process. I've looked at the 45th Street Viaduct closure that's happened this summer, and I think it may give us an indication of what happens when construction creates traffic in our neighborhoods. As you are discussing the second bascule bridge, I really feel that this is needed and a big issue and a problem to consider. Finally, I think we need to have the left turn on 24th Avenue E replaced.

Adjourn

The group was reminded that the next meeting is on September 9, and adjourned.