

**SR 99 North Multi-Modal Corridor Study
Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
August 27, 2001**

Attendees: (see attached sign in sheet)

Introductions:

Nytasha Sowers, WSDOT Project Manager, began the meeting by with having the attendees introduce themselves and identify the interest or organization they represented. She thanked the attendees for agreeing to be a part of this project.

Overview of Project:

Nytasha Sowers provided an overview of the SR 99 North Multi-modal study. She explained that the purpose of the study is to develop a long-range corridor plan of improvements that will improve safety and mobility for drivers, pedestrians and bicyclists along the SR 99 Corridor between the Battery Street Tunnel and 145th Street. Nytasha noted that WSDOT is conducting the corridor study in partnership with the City of Seattle, the City of Shoreline and King County Metro Transit.

Nytasha presented an 18-month timeline for the study. She explained that the study began in July 2001 and will be completed by December 2002.

Meeting attendees asked the following questions in regards to the project overview:

Question: Has there been any contact with legislators regarding this study?

Answer: Not yet, but we will be contacting them.

Question: How are accidents counted?

Answer: The data on specific location/cause comes directly from the police reports.

Question: Where is the representative from (King County)Metro?

Answer: Metro is a partner on the project and a member of the steering committee. They were invited but unable to attend this evening.

Study Scope:

Karl Westby, Consultant Team Manager, provided an overview of the study's scope. Karl explained that the study will have the following major tasks:

- Identification of transportation needs – information will be gathered from a number of sources including traffic data, local plans, accident data, and others
- Projected future traffic volumes development – volumes will be projected to determine future traffic demand
- Alternatives development – evaluation criteria and conceptual corridor improvement strategies will be developed
- Screening – alternatives will be evaluated against the established criteria
- Preferred alternative – the preferred corridor improvement strategy will be identified

This project covers eight miles of SR 99 from the Battery St. tunnel to 145th St. During the study, the corridor will be divided into subsections to address the differing characteristics of SR 99 from south to north. It is anticipated that 3-5 subsections will eventually be identified. As the project goes through each phase, the individual subsections will each have different alternatives developed. The end product for the study is identification of a preferred concept for each of the sections. This concept will be used as the starting point for implementation of individual projects along the corridor.

Question: Will we have a copy of what Shoreline has already done?

Answer: Yes. WSDOT will make a summary of the City of Shoreline's corridor plan available. The City of Shoreline is a partner on this study to ensure that proposed improvements from this study are coordinated with the City of Shoreline's planning activities on Aurora Avenue.

Question: How will we balance safety and mode mobility? Specifically, there is a concern regarding cyclists. It is suggested that the team review the City of Seattle Bike Facilities Plan. Bikes will continue to use SR 99 and we need to address their safety.

Answer: The project management team will review existing bike plans as they relate to the corridor and will include identified needs in the study process. We recognize that there are some conflicting interests but an overall balance is emphasized in the study's mission statement.

Question: Are we looking at reducing, maintaining or increasing capacity of this major arterial? There is a concern if capacity is re-directed to the neighborhoods.

Answer: The study will involve identification of needs along the corridor and use that information to determine future recommendations. At this point, the team is coming in completely open to all discussion.

Question: Are the underpass crossings (ex. 38th and 46th) a part of this planning effort?

Answer: Yes, within the corridor we will look at major crossings.

Schedule and Related Studies:

Nytasha Sowers provided an overview of the schedule for the project

There was general discussion on the links between this project and both the SR 99 work that is being done in Snohomish County and the Alaskan Way Viaduct project. Charlie Howard, WSDOT Planning Manager stated that they are probably not looking at capacity increase on the viaduct and there will be internal coordination between the two studies. The schedule for our project details that planning efforts will be complete before a decision is made on the viaduct.

There was also question on how this study related to other SR 99 North studies that were done in Snohomish and to the south and if there was a master plan for developing the corridor. Charlie Howard explained that WSDOT was not engaged in developing a master plan for the SR 99. Nytasha noted that the section of SR 99 from the Battery Street Tunnel to 145th Street is currently the only section of SR 99 that does not have a plan for transportation improvements.

Community Outreach:

Brad Hoff, lead consultant for the study's public involvement approach, presented an overview of the study's public involvement program. Brad explained that the "tools" for this effort include the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC), Open Houses, Newsletters, Postcards, a Speakers Bureau and the Project Website. These tools will be utilized during various phases of the project. Brad emphasized that the study's project management team is looking to the members of the SAC to relay information to their constituents and to provide contact information for the Speakers Bureau.

There was general discussion on future SAC meetings. It was suggested that the documents should be distributed for review prior to the meeting. The schedule for future meetings will be every 2-3 months.

Question: Will presentations by the Speakers Bureau be tailored for specific groups?

Answer: Yes. Identification of specific issues prior to the meeting would be helpful.

Mission Statement:

Nytasha Sowers reviewed the study's mission statement. Nytasha explained that the study's mission is to recommend a set of transportation improvements that balance the needs of all of the corridor's transportation users. She asked meeting attendees if they were comfortable with the mission statement and if they were comfortable supporting the study's mission for the duration of the project.

Meeting attendees asked the following questions about the Mission Statement:

Question(s): Why does WSDOT have a mission statement for a project within the City of Seattle's boundaries? There is a history of projects within the City's boundaries that have been completed by WSDOT and not always to the benefit of the City.

Answer: The City of Seattle is a partner on this corridor study. WSDOT jointly developed the study's mission statement with the City of Seattle and the study's other partnering agencies. WSDOT will be working closely with the City of develop the corridor's transportation improvement plan.

Question: The Mission Statement's 3rd bullet states: "The design and operational principles that will be utilized to improve safety, mobility, the appearance of the corridor, as well as support the planned land use along the corridor"—whose planned land use does this statement refer to?

Answer: The City of Seattle's and the specific neighborhood plans that have been adopted. The team is also looking at the plan being developed by the Aurora Merchants Association. The wording will be revised to read "existing and adopted".

It was suggested and agreed upon that all partner agencies will be listed. With the revision of these two items, the Mission Statement was endorsed.

Roles and Responsibilities:

Nytasha Sowers reviewed the roles and responsibilities as well as the critical path for all information development, review and decisions. Meeting attendees had the following questions in regards the roles and responsibilities of the different study committees.

Question: How is bicycling represented?

Answer: Bicycling interests are represented on the study's Technical Steering Committee.

Question: Who is representing freight mobility?

Answer: Fright mobility is also represented on the study's Technical Steering Committee.

Summary of Data Collection Activities:

Karl Westby reviewed maps detailing existing street inventory. There was some discussion on when/were the count information came from. Karl explained that updated information

from Seatrans is nearly complete and will be included when available. SAC members were asked to provide any corrections/revisions to either Nytasha Sowers or Karl Westby. The project management team was asked to include a description of legend items.

There was general discussion on how data was shown for the bridge. Safety issues and the current lack of any barrier/separation was discussed. Nytasha relayed that the bridge would be one of the project focus areas.

There was additional discussion on the SR 99 crossings. Several members felt that as currently configured the highway was a significant breach in the city street grid. Within the southern project limits, there are currently only 3 major crossing points. The scope of this study does not specifically address these crossing points. It was suggested that the scope be revisited to include flow and access issues across SR 99. Charlie Howard responded that this information would be relayed back to all the partners to see what the scope/budget allows.

It was noted that Queen Anne did not appear on the Neighborhood Transportation Recommendations Table. Nytasha apologized for the omission and said it would be corrected.

Meeting Feedback:

Nytasha asked the meeting attendees to provide comments/suggestions on the meeting and if they were any meeting elements/activities that could be improved.

+	Δ
(aspects of the meeting that went well)	(aspects of the meeting that could be improved)
Handouts and maps provided were great	It would have been helpful to have all of the materials before the meeting to review.
	Update name plates for all and include the group/interest they are representing.
The members appreciate being involved early in the process.	The SAC members don't want to be forced into something – there is value in looking at other examples/solutions – not all of them have to be from Washington State. Come up with new ideas – not necessarily WSDOT's. The examples provided don't necessarily reflect the character/concerns of our study area.
Very pleased that there is a safety coalition here on committee.	It would be helpful to clarify titles and number all handouts.
Meeting time of 7-9 is ok – this is a good location.	