



SR-99 North Corridor Study

Public Involvement Comments Report by Topic

2002-2003



**Washington State
Department of Transportation**

Table of Contents

	Page
Access	3
Aurora Bridge	13
Landscaping	22
Median	26
Miscellaneous Comment	28
Mobility	40
Non-Motorized	43
Other Safety	52
Parking	59
Ray/Halladay	66
Sidewalks	84
Speed Limits	88
Transit	90

Topic: Access

Location: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: Try not to impact local shop owner by restricting access to their property.
- comment: Study the entrances and exits to/from SR 99 in the Queen Anne area. Aloha, Valley, Roy, Wall, Denny, and Battery Streets.
- comment: Between Battery Street and Winona: Street access in this stretch should be limited to a system of six mini-interchanges (list follows paragraph) by reworking the geometry of some of the existing, ramp-like, accesses to include deceleration, acceleration, and (where warranted) add/drop lanes. All other public accesses should be closed off with bulbs or hammerheads and all parking should be prohibited. Private accesses should be evaluated for closure. Those that cannot be closed should be upgraded to current safety standards.
- comment: Exit-only lanes north and south off of (SR) 99.
- comment: Southbound right as exit only drop lane.
- comment: Crossing Bridgeway off-ramp to get to bus stop on SR 99.

Location: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

- comment: Don't take away our two-way left-turn lane....
- comment: Access to future development should only be permitted from side streets or at 1320 foot intervals if streets are not present. Many side street accesses should be closed off with a hammerhead or a bulb, especially those within 660 feet of a signal or those south of Woodland Park.
- comment: In general, the left-turn lanes along Aurora seem work. Adding restrictions and U-turn points will be a real pain.
- comment: You probably need one left turn light. I always thought it was on 77th to reduce congestion at Winona. That seemed to make sense. I know the people who live on that section of 77th want to turn that street into their own little private cul-de-sac but the rest of us would still like to use it.

Access: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

- comment: I'm not sure how much of a problem driveway access is for Aurora. The PCC one may be removed but Oak already has such restricted access, to force all traffic through the one light at 100th will probably make congestion worst.
- comment: Need southbound truck access to SR 99 for business on N. 87th St east of Aurora. Trucks cannot head eastbound and turn on Nagle place, so trucks must exit via N. 87th and Aurora.
- comment: As the owner of a medical supply house on Aurora near 107th, access is a main concern. A significant portion of the business comes from the NW Hospital and they access the Medical Supply shop by going east on 115th, south on Aurora, and then turn left into the supply shop. Concerned that if WSDOT cuts off left turn movement, the hospital would look elsewhere for supplies.
- comment: Left turn pockets at N. 90th okay. Dedicated left light because it will encourage cut-through traffic on residential streets.
- comment: Add right turn lanes, especially eastbound on 85th. May help but I think longer left-turn lanes on 85th would help more.
- comment: No left-turn sign over 2-way left turn lane northbound seems to be designed to fail. Need (no left-turn symbol) painted on street also to restrict left turns northbound at N. 88th. By westbound 99th, in this area, particularly, two-way left-turn lanes are important to preserve access to small businesses on both sides of the street.
- comment: Our family owned business has been here for over 50 years. The current two-way left turn lane on Aurora Ave is very important to me as a business owner. I need easy access for my customers. Removing these lanes will result in me losing customers.
- comment: Don't take away our two-way left-turn lane. This is critical to many businesses and to efficient business deliveries. If it is removed cars and trucks will be forced to circle through the neighborhood streets to get to the business they want. This will result in more business traffic in the residential neighborhoods causing disturbance to homeowners and children and will drive customers away from shopping in the area if they have a hassle trying to get into businesses. This will result in a loss of business and possibly force some businesses to close which will in addition cause the state and the city to lose tax revenue.

Access: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

- comment: Cut off N. 83rd from Aurora Ave on both sides at Green Lake Way.
- comment: We have a heavy volume of large trucks accessing our facility. At this time they are able to pull over and park for a short time in front of our building without blocking traffic. Often these same vehicles (the majority of which are 65' plus tractor/trailers) will also pull into our driveway leading to our lot dock. We also have many large trucks leaving our lot and heading south. If we lose the two-way left turn lane then all of these large vehicles will be forced to use neighborhood streets. WE are certainly concerned that residents of our immediate area would be exposed to more noise, traffic congestion, and parking problems as a result.
- comment: I chose a lot on Aurora, at 88th, to put up a building for my business. I chose this lot because of the left-turn lane at 88th. Now you may take that turn lane away. If you do, my business will be dead. I spent a great deal on permits and fees to build in 1996, was it all for nothing?
- comment: While the newly added left-turn restrictions at N. 87th Street are a start, this still doesn't prevent left-hand turns heading East on N. 87th out onto Aurora. Long-term I would like to see is the physical barrier at N. 86th Street extended up at least to N. 87th Street or further.
- comment: Don't take away our two-way left-turn lane. We are located next to the Evergreen-Washelli cemetery lies on both the east and west sides of Aurora. Our flower business relies on customers that visit this funeral home and cemetery and is crucial that our customers are able to access us from both sides of SR 99.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: At Winona southbound--left turn access should be provided.
- comment: Don't take away left-turn lanes; trucks, traffic will go through neighborhood. We have worked hard to make it final and safe. There used to be a median; would like to see safety stats before when there was a median.
- comment: While the newly added left-turn restrictions at N. 87th St are a start, this still doesn't prevent left hand turns heading east on N. 87th St out onto Aurora. Long-term I would like to see the physical barrier at N. 86th extended up at least to N. 87th St. or further.

Access: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

- comment: Extend left-turn lanes on Aurora at 85th St. for both north and south bound traffic.
- comment: Currently, our parking lot is accessible on Aurora from the North or South. In the early 1990's, there was a median in the street that prevented access to our store from the North. We found this to be confusing and hazardous for our customers. Some customers would become frustrated with trying to access and egress our store and actually drive on the wrong side of the road for 50 feet or more. Since the median was removed in the early 90's, I haven't witnessed or heard of a single accident that has occurred by someone coming in or out of our parking lot. My office is less than 40 feet from the street, and I haven't seen or heard an accident in front of our business.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: dedicated left-turn lane should remain.
- comment: Consideration will be given by all parties to the allowing of a left-turn southbound access lane to Winona (eastbound) being installed at Winona and Aurora Ave as well as a replacement of the signalization to allow definite left turns with their own light at this intersection.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: All existing driveways to remain unless major redevelopment of properties should occur, then driveway access/egress should conform to one per 50 feet.
- comment: Review accident frequency before eliminating driveways to PCC Market (75th) and Oak Tree.
- comment: We are particularly concerned that our two-way left-turn lane stays along Aurora. It is critical to our customers and suppliers to be able to have that kind of convenient access to our businesses. If you take that away, you will force the traffic into the residential neighborhoods. We will also lose customers, because it will not be worth the hassle for them to try to get to our businesses. They will probably go somewhere else that is more accessible. With the economy the way it is right now, every customer is important to us. We can't afford to lose ANY business.

Location: North (N. 110th St. to N.)

- comment: Don't take away our two-way left-turn lane....
- comment: Provide access to Sam's Club parking lot from street to the north.
- comment: Response to "Without the two-way left turn lane, trucks and cars will be circling through neighborhoods to get to their destinations." Increase Aurora's capacity.
- comment: Don't take away our two-way left turn lane. The current two-way left turn lane along Aurora is CRITICAL to our business and many other small businesses. Efficient business deliveries will be greatly hampered if it is removed, cars and delivery trucks will be forced to turn at the next dedicated turn, and then circle through the neighborhood streets to get to the business they want. The result will be more business traffic in residential neighborhoods and customers choosing not to shop along Aurora because it is a hassle to figure out how to get into a business. The result will be a 25% or more loss of business for us and possible failures of many businesses.
- comment: Without the two-way left turn lane, trucks and cars will be circling through neighborhoods to get to their destinations.
- comment: I would like to go on record opposing changes to turn lanes and driveway consolidations. This approach to traffic safety is a short-sided remedy at best. It will hurt many businesses along the Aurora Ave Corridor. Which I would like to remind you is a "Business District". Channeling vehicles into turn lanes and shared driveways just consolidates problems into defined areas. The same cars will still turn left across Aurora Avenue.
- comment: Mid-block openings needed by super blocks; per Haller Lake Broadview plan.
- comment: Create more left-turn lanes to reduce rear-ender accidents North of N. 125th.

Access: North (N. 110th St. to N.)

- comment: Don't take away our two-way left-turn lane. The current two-way left-turn lane along Aurora is critical too many small businesses and to efficient business deliveries. If it is removed, cars and delivery trucks will be forced to turn at the next dedicated turn, then circle through the neighborhood streets to get to the business they want. The result will be more business traffic in residential neighborhoods and customers choosing not to shop along Aurora because it is a hassle to figure out how to get into a business. The result will be loss of business and possible failures of many small businesses.
- comment: Keep N. 130th pedestrian overpass; people use it!
- comment: Don't take away left-turn lanes; trucks, traffic will go through neighborhood. We have worked hard to make it final and safe. There used to be a median; would like to see safety stats before when there was a median.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: Area between 137th to 145th--existing driveways to remain on both east and west sides, however, when placing new sidewalks, WSDOT, AAMA, and SeaTran should work with property owners to ensure that ingress and egress is adequate for their business.
- comment: The owner of the monument business is particularly insistent that closing the center turn lane would harm business and challenges WSDOT's "purported" fact that accidents can be reduced by closing the lane and focusing left turns. He has been there a long time and said he has seen very few accidents. Specifically, he felt this would lead to traffic winding through residential neighborhoods in an attempt to get going in the direction they wish to travel.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: Dedicated left-turn lane should remain.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: All existing driveways to remain unless major re-development of properties should occur, then driveway access/egress should conform to one driveway per every 50 feet.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: Area between 115th to 137th--existing driveway to remain on both east and west sides.

Access: North (N. 110th St. to N.)

- comment: There will be consultation between all parties including business and property owners in the vicinity of 132nd (Albertson's/Rite Aid/Starbucks/Outback/K-Mart/Staples, etc) as to how the problem of left-turn access to the various large shopping areas will be controlled in order to try to solve the traffic problems of access being difficult because of already existing driveway placements which have caused some confusion on the part of drivers trying to access shopping areas.
- comment: Consideration will be given by all parties to the allowing of a left-turn southbound access lane to Winona (eastbound) being installed at Winona and Aurora Ave as well as a replacement of the signalization to allow definite left turns with their own light at this intersection.
- comment: Put left-turn lane between N. 125th and N. 127th to take care of new Krispy Kreme and Jack -n-Box traffic and for accident reduction in area between 125th and 130th. (there is no road "around a block".)
- comment: A pawn shop owner in the vicinity of 125th St is worried about losing left-turn access. She is afraid it will seriously hurt her business. Another pair of small business owners had the same concern.

Location: **Access: General Location**

- comment: Reduced left-turns will lead to more "u-turns" and vehicles driving into businesses only to turn around and drive out to get to where they really want to go.
- comment: Please get rid of the 2-way turn lanes on roads with 3 lanes in each direction--I believe they are inherently unsafe. I believe there are other acceptable ways to provide business access.
- comment: Look at pedestrian access all along Aurora.
- comment: Driveways: All driveway should be eliminated if possible, especially if there is access to a side street. There are several driveways that are too narrow for two-way operation: PCC Market and the Oak Tree driveways.
- comment: The impact of eliminating left turn lanes on Aurora. The current two-way left-turn lane along Aurora is critical to many small businesses, including my tenants. If the left turn lanes are eliminated, cars and delivery trucks will be forced to turn at the next dedicated turn and then circle through the neighborhood streets to get to their destination. The result will be more business traffic in residential neighborhoods. The result will also be a reduction in customers for businesses along Aurora as customers choose to shop elsewhere because of the hassle of getting around Aurora. The direct result of the elimination of the left-turn lane will be loss of business and the failure of many businesses along Aurora.
- comment: Please get rid of 2-way left-turn lanes on roads with 3 lanes each direction--I believe they are inherently unsafe. I believe there are other acceptable ways to provide business access.

Access: General Location

comment: (September 30, 2002 letter): RE Work with neighborhoods to identify potential right hand turn restrictions on to and off of Aurora. 1. Identify which neighborhoods will be consulted regarding right hand turn restrictions, median treatment, left turn access restrictions. 2. Provide Federal, City or State regulations that allow neighborhoods to make decisions regarding traffic restrictions on a State Highway. 3. Provide supporting documentation that right turn restrictions contribute to safety, mobility and business access including any and all Federal, State and City studies or reports. 4. Provide supporting documentation that right turn restrictions contribute to economic increases of businesses located in areas where restrictions have been already implemented, including all Federal, City or State studies or reports. 5. Identify locations of all potential right turn restrictions on to an off of Aurora Avenue between 65th and 145th together with supporting documentation necessitating these restrictions be they Federal, City or State.

comment: (September 30, 2002 letter): RE: Install left turn pockets and medians at identified high accident locations for pedestrian safety and to reduce vehicular accidents. Identify any Federal, State or City studies that support your position that designated left-turn pockets to "increase access and actually help businesses". This position has been taken verbally several times. Provide all accident statistics that prove that necessity of installing left-turn pockets and median treatments. Provide statistics on a block by block basis, between 72nd and 145th including the following: 1. Total number of accidents in the year 2000 and 2001 between 72nd and 145th. 2. Location, date, and time of all accidents. 3. Description of accident. 4. Estimated cost of each accident. Provide economic statistics identified by any Federal, State, or City decisions to install left turn access pockets that businesses are expected to experience due to lack of ingress/egress.

Access: General Location

- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: The dedicated two-way center left-turn lane wherever it occurs along Aurora Avenue is to remain. Aurora Avenue Merchants Association has worked with SeaTran to optimize this key feature of our corridor, which allows side street access from neighborhoods and direct access to businesses on both sides of Aurora. Elimination of this center left-turn lane access would substantially increase traffic (including delivery trucks) through neighborhood streets circling to get to specific businesses or residents going out of their way to get to their homes. In addition, restricting access to businesses would discourage patronage at those businesses.
- comment: Curbs with driveways, or raised medians, would severely limit ingress and egress to area businesses, resulting in loss of customer access and reduced viability as a market place.
- comment: Reduce the amount of continuous, two-way, center turn lane on Aurora. Rationale: pedestrians should know at what point large vehicles and cars may turn from the center of the roadway to cross the pedestrian right-of-way. Limiting left-turn locations from the center lane will enhance pedestrian safety.
- comment: Reduced left turns will lead to more U-turns and vehicles driving into businesses only turn around and drive out to get to where they really want to go. Also favor flashing yellow turn lights. If I come to a left-turn lane too late to try to go the left turn around I hate having to sit thru an entire cycle when there is no traffic!

Topic: Aurora Bridge

Location: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: Need a safe way to get off of bridge and turn down to Fremont. We backup because there is no light on Bridgeway.
- comment: Cars are generally 6" wide, trucks 8', new metro buses 9.5'! Drivers should learn to drive within 9.5' lanes. Placing walkway beneath bridge, essentially within a cage, is a safety problem: no "eyes" to keep a person feeling safe. If anything, place above the traffic, again for visibility.
- comment: Bike lanes! Add bike lanes on the on/off ramps on the north end of Aurora--it is illegal to bike on the sidewalk the Hawthorne Bridge in Portland, OR is an excellent example of this.
- comment: 25mph bridge seems unrealistic, would probably cause congestion (3 people concurred on flip chart)
- comment: Please select a cantilevered walkway rather than relocating sidewalks under bridge.
- comment: Don't enclose the walkway in chain-link fencing! Preserve the view (or enclose the roadway in chain-link fencing!)
- comment: Preserve the green space between Winslow and the east side of bridge--no construction taking in that space--and save the troll!
- comment: Don't put a walkway under the bridge; make no sense; no security.
- comment: Put bike lanes on the Aurora Bridge--so many people would commute to work by bike if we had a safe route in this corridor. The Fremont Bridge is dangerous for bikers because of traffic at the approaches.
- comment: The suspended bike/ped bridge seems like a magnet too crime to me.
- comment: The 99 Bridge: don't widen lanes, eliminate one sidewalk, that should be enough room for a center barrier (steel might be narrower than a jersey) the below-bridge walks will be a crime-haven.

Aurora Bridge: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: No ped walkway under bridge--too many problems; crime, suicide, etc. More bike lanes on adjacent streets; bikes and peds do not belong on what is essentially a "freeway" bridge is high speed traffic--at best, one side walk on ones side of bridge.
- comment: If you don't have the ped/bike walkway, please put in some emergency phones/buttons. How about video surveillance I do like it.
- comment: Keep sidewalk visible to traffic--no personal safety under bridge (6/10 mile)
- comment: Suspending bike/ped path is a BAD IDEA. 1. No visibility to motorists, no one to flag down if you have a problem. 2. Personal safety major concern--anyone could hide/camp down there 6/10 mile too long). 3. Height is too short--8' not high enough for bicyclists and I will feel even worse given length (6/10 of a mile). 4. Not wide enough--AASHTO standard is 12 feet min. for mixed bike & ped. 5. Must have bike lanes too/from this path to encourage use! Cannot force bicycles to use narrow sidewalks? 6. More bicyclists will use roadway...need to accommodate them there.
- comment: Increases in lane widths on bridge will only encourage motorists to drive faster. Should keep at least one sidewalk (west side probably) and lower speed limit while increasing policing/enforcement could still add barrier (it was done on Spokane St_ what you can do now---add share the road signs with bicycles, enforce existing speed limit, and sweep sidewalks on bridge.
- comment: Aurora Bridge ped "de-provements" a walkway beneath traffic will be both aesthetically and safety wise a bad choice. It will take away the "eyes on the street" that are there now. XXX a sidewalk out or place above roadway so peds and bikes can be safe/feel safe.
- comment: If we keep high sidewalks on the Aurora Bridge please provide ramps up to them at the four corners.

Aurora Bridge: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: My concern is the affect transportation improvements will have on historic properties and potential archeological resources. The information provided in your fact sheet may need to be updated if it's based on survey work conducted more than 10 years ago. Seems to me the Aurora Bridge should be eligible to the NRHP. I see the fact sheet is only Shoreline--what about Seattle! I think it would be valuable, even necessary, to develop a historic context on the development and growth of US 99. This will allow evaluation of structures and buildings as other than architectural. Some buildings may be eligible as representative of a particular historic theme, but be compromised, somewhat, architecturally. Archeological resources also need to be addressed.
- comment: The bridge project looks like it should be one of our top transportation priorities. I don't care where the sidewalk/bike route goes on a new bridge--as long as they are separated from fast traffic, and a center barrier is put into separate lanes.
- comment: Improve right turn onto Queen Anne, preferably by adding lane columns; big \$'s.
- comment: I read, with interest, the article "Fixing and 'accident hot spot'" in the 4 September 2002 Queen Anne News. I have resided on Queen Anne hill for fourteen years now, and our household commutes to and fro school in Lake City two times a day, five times a week, predominantly along the Aurora Bridge. It is also our road of Choice is we head north or south over the weekend or in the evening. First, I strongly support the installation of a divider in the median. I remember reading about Queen Anne Community Council member Mike Warren's son's tragic death on the bridge span. As someone who has also lost a family member in a preventable accident, I strongly support measure that will prevent others from having to learn to live with this sort of loss.
- comment: Don't love the "under the bridge" treatment for non-motorized users but trying to keep an open mind.
- comment: Suspended bike/pedestrian paths below Aurora Bridge road bed is safest most efficient. Separates incompatible traffic and makes more room and less risk/stress for motor and foot/pedal traffic.
- comment: Pedestrian and cycle traffic is very low on the bridge and could be accommodated in a single walkway. Traffic could be diverted to one side or the other at each end of the bridge.

Aurora Bridge: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: Aurora Bridge improvements should be first priority.
- comment: Re-consider cantilevering ped and bike lanes on deck level of Aurora Bridge.
- comment: Reduce Aurora Bridge to 5 lanes and add jersey barrier between northbound and southbound.
- comment: Third, I oppose the use of pathways below deck. No woman in her right mind would walk that deck alone...even if there are video monitors. While motorists above deck may have a safer drive, women below deck would face a constant fear of being raped, mugged, or murdered--no gain for citizen safety here. If the sidewalk is eliminated on one side only, and if a reversible middle lane (with barriers on each side) is created down the center of Aurora, then pedestrian traffic can be limited to one side of the bridge. A tall fence between the traffic and the pedestrian walkway will enhance the safety of the pedestrians vis a vis vehicular traffic and will better maintain the personal safety of pedestrians.
- comment: Pedestrian tunnel under the bridge = no safety.
- comment: Do not relegate pedestrians to under the bridge deck--too dangerous.
- comment: The proposed pedestrian bike path to be suspended from the sides of the Aurora Bridge is a huge expense for very little advantage. It is also aesthetically unpleasant.
- comment: Consider elevated fencing on sides and ends of bridge where overlaying residences to reduce bridge debris and jumpers.
- comment: Need three through southbound lanes onto bridge and southbound from N. 50th Street.
- comment: Need bike lanes to approach bridge both sites/both directions.
- comment: Locating ped. Facilities under the bridge could make Seattle the US suicide capital. Who would see who wants to jump! If bridge ped.. Path was safe--crossing south off the bridge is not!

Aurora Bridge: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: Widen to 70 ft; do NOT add peds and bikes underneath deck; keep current auto lane widths (city policy; do not add capacity for SOV's) add middle barrier to prevent head-ons; widen ped/bike lanes with remaining space/increase separation space between peds/vehicles.
- comment: Make bicycling on sidewalk safer across Aurora bridge. Like ideas of separated area for peds and bikes; if ADA accessible.
- comment: Would like a median but the proposal to put a walkway underneath would cost more than we would gain.
- comment: The problem is the on-ramp length, off-ramp length, and blind entrances/exits; not the posted speed limit.
- comment: Bikes are a very small percentage of Aurora bridge traffic. Don't give them road space. They can remain on one sidewalk; even if they walk their bike across. More pollution would be caused by slowing cars than saved by helping a few bikes.
- comment: I don't think it should be a priority to widen lanes on Aurora Bridge. If the reason is to allow cars to go faster; many drivers are already going 5-10 miles over the speed limit.
- comment: Seems to me the Aurora Bridge should be eligible to the NRHP.
- comment: Aurora Bridge retrofit--safety improvements should be done ASAP. Let's make safety a TOP priority.
- comment: Study temporary and long-term solutions to head-on collision risks on the Aurora Bridge. Study ultra-thin barrier capable of turning back vehicles veering into on-coming traffic. Study restructuring the bridge to retain walkways and provide permanent divider between on-coming lanes.
- comment: If you are going to drop the pedestrian/bikeway below the bridge, will you also be designing approaches to this walkway such that people will actually want to walk and bike along Aurora to cross the bridge?
- comment: How wide are these sidewalks? Shared use bike and ped. Should be at least 12 feet wide.

Aurora Bridge: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

comment: I am writing to comment on the proposed redesign of the George Washington Memorial (Aurora Avenue) Bridge as outlined in the mailer entitled "SR-99 North Corridor Study". One item that caught my interest in the proposed redesign of the George Washington Memorial (Aurora Avenue) Bridge is the relocation of the existing sidewalks to galleries suspended underneath the roadway. While this is a logical choice, I am concerned that because the new sidewalks will be both sheltered and out of the view of passing motorists (including police) that these new sidewalk galleries will become a haven for a variety of undesirable activities. The Fremont-Aurora-Wallingford neighborhood has been successfully combating street crimes such as prostitution and drug dealing. The last thing that we need in our neighborhood is a "mini-mall" to house these types of activities.

Thus, while I not only concur with, but support, your assessment that the Bridge's roadway needs to be improved as specified, I believe that these new pedestrian galleries are problematic.

Accordingly, my recommendation would be to redesign the roadway as specified and eliminate the pedestrian sidewalks all together.

comment: Thanks for the northbound right turn (except for transit) at north end of bridge.

comment: Exit-only lane (southbound) on bridge should be a high priority!!

comment: Restrict lane changes on Aurora Bridge.

comment: Good ideas will probably attract peds/bikes. Make it pleasing to the eye, but Don't let WPA for architect/artist trying to make his mark (can't afford that)

Aurora Bridge: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

comment: Natasha Sowers presented the scope and timeline of the SR-99 corridor study at the Ballard District Council last evening (the 11th). When describing the possibility of relocating pedestrians on a sidewalk under the bridge I asked about bicycles. Ms Powers noted that the city does encourage cyclist to use Dexter and Linden avenue for commuting and I can appreciate that. I just want to note that there are times when one is on upper Queen Anne or upper Fremont that Aurora/ the bridge just makes sense. When you are designing the side walk please remember that it will happen and to design the width, entrances and exits of the bike/walkway appropriately.
thank you
ps I think the relocation is a grand idea.

comment: I like Aurora Bridge proposal; much safer for both motorists and bikes/peds. I also like planted median (w/I assume, U-turns at intersections) north of Green Lake. This should also prove safer because of controlled left turning.

comment: I have some security concerns about the proposed lower sidewalk over the bridge. I would want 24/7 video surveillance and emergency phones installed on the walkway and bikeway.

comment: Strongly in favor of Jersey barriers on Aurora Bridge.

comment: We need more sight line to be able to access Aurora, northbound, at the north end of the Aurora Bridge. Couldn't Fremont be served by a drop lane like they do at King TV and Galer Street? Buses could be allowed to stop in the space between where the outside lane would turn off and the on-coming ramp could be a safe way to go north.

comment: Spill-over lighting on pedestrian/bike way on bridge could impact residents living under/adjacent to bridge. Consider isolating light affects.

comment: Consider sound abatement materials during planning to replace ambient bridge noise.

comment: I like the idea of eliminating sidewalks to accommodate lane expansion; the center median is definitely needed for safety.

Aurora Bridge: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: Think carefully about ped/bike--scale lighting underneath bridge-big issue for pedestrians and bicyclists. Please think about pleasant design and sand baffling; otherwise that is going to be one lout corridor.
- comment: If there is a suspended walkway under the bridge, it must be enclosed to dissolute suicide jumpers. Also, if there are two walkways, then one should be for biker only and the other for pedestrians only. Avoids conflicts.
- comment: Noise abatement during construction could significantly impact residents living under/adjacent to the bridge. (I.e. waterway #23 live aboards)
- comment: Study temporary and long-term solutions to head-on collision risks on the Aurora Bridge: study ultra-thing barrier capable of turning back vehicles veering into on-coming traffic and study restructuring the bridge for higher speed, lane separation at current center line.
- comment: 60-80 mph is fast enough.
- comment: Aurora Bridge ped "de-provements"--a walkway beneath traffic will be both aesthically and safety wise a bad choice. It will take away the "eyes on the street" that are there now. Cantilever a sidewalk out or place above roadway so peds and bikes can be safe/feel safe.
- comment: I have some security concerns about the proposed lower sidewalk over the bridge. I would want 24/7 video surveillance and emergency phone installed on the walkway/bikeway.
- comment: Ped/bike lanes under the bridge...looks like a good safety improvement.
- comment: Do not widen lanes beyond the Aurora Bridge to a consistent 12'. Rationale: There is no need to engineer this route to standards for 70 mph speeds.
- comment: Create a conceptual plan for restructuring the Aurora Bridge to retain walkways, while widening traffic lanes on the bridge to accommodate larger transit vehicles, and providing a permanent divider between on-coming lanes.
- comment: Median divider.....looks like a good safety improvement.

Aurora Bridge: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

comment: Look where the accidents occur before inventing the wheel again. Fix center median on Aurora Bridge.

Topic: Landscaping

Location: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

comment: Street trees inhibit business visibility, hide signs, ruin sidewalks and create shadows, offering shelter to prostitutes and drug dealers.

comment: Street trees have nothing to do with safety and inhibit business visibility.

comment: Street trees would pose more expense than they would aesthetically reward. As a company that worries constantly about overhead clearance, safety and visibility, we do not support creating further impediments on our most heavily utilized corridor.

comment: I have worked alongside other business owners on Aurora Ave to make this business/neighborhood the best we can, by working with the police department to remove drug dealers and prostitutes. We do our best to beautify this street by keeping own businesses up to standard, removing signs from telephone poles, litter control, etc.

comment: Both of these are nice, but our customers complain that they can't find us now. If you plant trees in front of our business, we will have more problems with people finding us.

comment: Install trees in existing median from Linden to N. 80th.

comment: Please plant the medians with trees where it makes sense! I.E. not needed for access, like N. 15th, Interbay.

comment: It does not seem prudent to plant trees in the median since the objective is to maximize the traffic lanes. Drivers need all the visibility possible, without distractions, for increased safety. Trees are nice, but no one seems to care about the erosion of walks, etc, as well as pruning/trimming. Agree, low growth only to afford maximum cross visibility. Safety is an issue and when hunting for address/business on the other side.

comment: Another issue of great concern to us is the possibility that you may plant trees along Aurora, and this would reduce the visibility of our business signs and actually increase the safety hazard along Aurora. Trees ruin our sidewalks, break sewer lines and offer shelter to prostitutes and drug dealers.

Landscaping: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

- comment: I can see adding some low vegetation to existing islands but not doing what happened to 8th Ave NW.
- comment: Planting trees along the street will disrupt visibility for people and drivers, in the fall we will have even more debris to contend with as the trees shed their foliage.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: All existing medians should be planted with low-growing shrubbery (ivy). Provisions for maintenance of planted medians must be considered.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: trees between 80th and 85th on the east side and west side should be removed to improve pedestrian and handicapped
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: The statistics involving pedestrian accidents as shown in Segment 5 (85th to 105th) and in particular in the area between 85th and 90th are a direct result of criminal activity. We cannot support the creating of landscaping schemes that would serve to conceal and foster criminal acts.

Location: **Landscaping: North (N. 110th St. to N.)**

- comment: Plan for putting in underground wiring.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: All existing medians should be planted with low growing shrubbery (ivy). Provisions for maintenance of planted medians must be considered.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: Any landscaping should be on the property side of the sidewalk including trees. WSDOT, AAMA, and SeaTran will work with property owners to answer their concerns regarding shrubbery.
- comment: Convert aurora Ave into something like el Camino de Raul (CA) Bay area; planted median, u-turns allowed at intersections.
- comment: Street trees are calming and there must be choices that are "safer" if struck by cars. Illegal activities could be addressed by emphasis patrols if need be.
- comment: Convert aurora Ave into something like el Camino de Raul (CA) Bay area; planted median, u-turns allowed at intersections.
- comment: Street trees have nothing to do with safety and inhibit business visibility.
- comment: Street trees have nothing to do with safety and inhibit business visibility. We encourage low, drought and traffic resistant shrubbery along Aurora, but big trees hide signs, ruin sidewalks, break sewer lines and offer shelter to prostitutes and drug dealers.
- comment: It does not seem prudent to plant trees in the median since the objective is to maximize the traffic lanes. Drivers need all the visibility possible, without distractions, for increased safety. Trees are nice, but no one seems to care about the erosion of walks, etc, as well as pruning/trimming. Agree, low growth only to afford maximum cross visibility. Safety is an issue and when hunting for address/business on the other side.
- comment: Concerned about trees in the median; attractive care of them is an issue. Too congested for the aesthetic gain.

Location: **Landscaping: General Location**

- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: Our experience with street trees has been mixed. While none of us is adverse to beautifying our street, we have experienced that street trees undermine and break sidewalks, cover up signs, and provide shelter and concealment in which criminals can conduct drug and prostitution deals. Because of our concerns regarding public safety, landscaping has to be kept back from the street edge to insure visibility both to vehicles and police. Any landscaping should be low and resistant to vehicle emissions. Ivy or some other low-growing shrubbery in existing medians will greatly enhance the environmental concerns regarding Aurora Avenue. The AAMA will encourage existing property owners or owners of property to be re-developed to provide landscaping on their property at the sidewalk line.
- comment: More than anything, please plant trees.
- comment: Do not put landscaped medians on Hwy 99! They are NOT maintained in Seattle.
- comment: As a pedestrian advocate, why doesn't WSDOT like trees along the roadways?
- comment: More than anything, please plant trees.
- comment: Public safety needs should not allow median blockage or trees and shrubs; shrubs block visibility for safety.
- comment: Provide for large canopy trees in the center median planter strips. Rationale: The visual impression of large trees slows vehicular speed.
- comment: Ped's like street trees. Please don't take them away.
- comment: We encourage low, drought and traffic resistant shrubbery along Aurora, but big trees hide signs, ruin sidewalks, break sewer lines and offer shelter to prostitutes and drug dealers.
- comment: Eliminate planting strips to acquire added width of roadways. Costly to maintain.

Topic: Median

Location: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

comment: Double westbound at Whitman and Bridgeway is not acceptable. We want a median on Bridgeway and a pedestrian refuge at the intersection

.Location: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

comment: Please extend physical barrier begun @ N. 85th and continue it up thru N. 88th. Signage will be inadequate.

comment: A meeting will be held of business owners and property owners in the area of 85th to 90th to discuss if there should be additional median treatment or if the suggestion of right-turn only signs should be installed at 88th (northbound) and at 86th, 87th, and 88th (southbound) as well as a study if Nesbitt Ave should be re-opened to 2-way traffic or remain as it is currently configured.

comment: Medians: The C-curb limiting left turns to signalized intersections located between Green Lake and 85th Street was added in the late 1940s. The Jersey barrier located between Battery Street and Green Lake was added in the mid 1970s prohibiting all left turns for nearly 5 miles. Most of the median north of 85th Street is now 55 years behind the Green Lake section!

Location: North (N. 110th St. to N.)

comment: Temporary low-cost fix; put sign printed on cement dividers "do not cross here, use signalized crosswalk" Crossing pedestrians are a highway hazard.

Location: General Location

comment: Traffic is so bad; police/emergency use medians. If trees in median, emergency vehicles couldn't use it.

comment: Medians are fine.

comment: No median.

comment: Medians on 99 encourages drivers to go into neighborhood and go around the block.

comment: Medians are a great idea--I'll feel safer driving! They work well in downtown Lake City.

Medians: General Location

comment: Please add a median to SR 99 with trees and other greenery. Pavers are not enough!

comment: Let's put the medians in now to improve safety. They work on Beacon Hill, and will make the SR 99 corridor a more attractive living and business environment.

Topic: Miscellaneous

Location: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

comment: Power poles and trees should be removed from clear zones or protected with guardrail. Timber light standards should be replaced with breakaway poles. 1. Denny Way
2. Broad/Mercer/Roy 3. Queen Anne Drive/Dexter Avenue 4. N 38th/N 39th Streets 5. N 46th Street 6. N 62nd/N 66th Streets/Woodland Place/West Green Lake Way.

comment: Do not widen Aurora to three thru lanes.

comment: RE: general regional traffic mess. If we combine the rebuild of the viaduct, the remodel of the bridge, and other project, could SR 99 = I=5 corridor or at least a part of it through the downtown corridor? Say, come back to its present route off the ship canal, or just South of it. Leaving around the I-90 mess? Lots of vacant industrial land there now.

comment: Add 4th north yield signs.

comment: Need sign on Aurora Bridge saying "Fremont" to turn off at end of Bridge.

comment: We need better signs telling people to turn off for Fremont; at the end of bridge, northbound, and at N. 38th southbound. This would help diminish turns into residential neighborhoods.

comment: Southbound Aurora Avenue from Greenlake to the aurora Bridge always has a major traffic stop-and-go during the morning commute. It's like there is always an accident there! Although adequate pavement width exists for 3 continuous lanes, paint stripes reduce the number of lanes to only 2, with painted merging lanes replacing this necessary 3rd lane. (These merging lanes probably work well when the traffic is actually moving, but during the morning commute, they are the congestion problem). Maybe this segment of Aurora needs to be widened to accommodate the merging lanes BESIDE instead of REPLACING this potential 3rd continuous lane? Could this 33% improvement in capacity be done in addition to the bigger projects being considered? It would certainly be quicker and probably be comparatively cost-effective.

Miscellaneous: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: Study restoration of pedestrian and vehicular traffic connections in the South Lake Union/Queen Anne/Uptown urban center area where Seattle's street grid has been severed by SR 99. (Galer Street (bike/ped only). This project is funded. Construction has not begun, Aloha Street (all traffic), Valley Street (all traffic), Roy Street (bike/ped/westbound vehicular traffic). This is an element in the Potlatch Trail Conceptual Plan and in the Queen Anne Neighborhood Plan and the South Lake Union Plan.
- comment: Aurora High Accident Corridor from Denny Way to N. 50th Street is not in need of a BIG DIG, but does need location specific improvements that can be done within dollars.
- comment: Need sign to say "Fremont" at southbound turn pocket. Now just identified as "38th". Also needs to be more visible.
- comment: We need better signs telling people to turn off for Fremont: at the end of the Bridge, northbound, and at N. 38th southbound. This would help diminish turns into the residential neighborhood.

Location: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

- comment: I approve of the goals on the project but please do not impact Woodland Park or any residences.
- comment: At this point in time, Aurora Avenue is a vibrant, highly functional business and residential area of Seattle, dependent on ready access. Please do not dictate cookie-cutter modifications that will seriously disrupt the business access and visibility, increase traffic in adjacent neighborhoods, and destroy the balance between efficient travel corridor and successful business center that Aurora is today.
- comment: Need City of Seattle to define zoning impacts that may be necessary to implement plan. (i.e. up zone where right of way expansions are required.)
- comment: No widening! We want slower traffic, wider roads, higher speed, less safety 74-110 bus lanes in peak. Planted median, street trees, 59-74 full time bus lanes, both directions, 50-59 full time
- comment: Our property, as well as most of the properties on Aurora, are owner/occupied or owned by small investors. Traffic revisions that negatively impact these property owners will reduce the overall tax base and economy of our area.

Miscellaneous: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

comment: Signals: There are 16 signals in this corridor. The signal progression works quite well during the southbound peak. I have often hit all 16 signals green. Of the 16 signals, seven fall at the 500 blocks (i.e. 7500, 8500, 10500, 11500, 12500, 13500, and 14500) and are therefore evenly spaced at the recommended 2640 foot spacings. Of the remaining nine, five fall at the 1000 blocks (i.e. 7000 Ped., 8000, 9000, 10000, and 13000) and are therefore evenly spaced to the previous seven but at the less desirable 1320 foot spacings. The remaining four should be eliminated: 77th Street, Green Lake Way, Evergreen-Washelli, and Home Depot and restricted to right turns. All our of these signals are within 200 yards of one of the 500 block signals. The Home Depot driveway should connect to 115th Street. The cemetery on the east side already has a driveway on 115th. The cemetery driveway on the west could possibly be relocated to hit SR 99 at 115th or relocated to its 125th Street frontage (pending grave locations).

comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study:90th street turn signal should be re-configured to allow east/west left turns and north/south left turns to be demand activated.

comment: The other day I was detained during rush hour around 7 am on SR 99 by a loading school bus with its stop sign extended and one afternoon around 4 pm by another. Both were between N. 85th and N. 105th Streets. It seems to me these school buses could have used Linden or Stone Avenues and not stopped traffic on the second busiest north-south highway in north Seattle.

Location: **North (N. 110th St. to N.)**

comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: Cemetery light should remain demand-activated.

Location: **General Location**

comment: Traffic Calming: Don't do it! This is an intercity highway and needs to maintain a fairly high speed (50 mph).

Miscellaneous: General Location

- comment: I have an idea or two for long term development along SR 99. Future redevelopment should front on Linden or Stone Avenues ("backage" roads). Development conditions should include dedication of SR 99 frontage within 75 feet of the centerline (current right-of-way is typically 45 feet from centerline). An additional 40 feet should be dedicated along frontage within 500 feet of major intersections with large turning movements (i.e. 85th, 105th, 130th, 130th, and 145th) to allow for future single-point urban interchange ramps. Limited access should be established along these redeveloped parcels. Most non-signalized intersecting streets should be vacated as redevelopment occurs, ideally limiting access to SR 99 to every ½ mile (section lines and quarter lines).
- comment: Please give priority to transit, pedestrians, and bicycles, trees and noise reduction. Letting people drive as fast as possible is a low priority. Parking should be paid for by users, not taxes.
- comment: Overall recommendation for the study to emphasize safety, including pedestrian safety. Several aspects of the Study related to vehicular lane width, sidewalks, trees and vehicular speeds seem to be counterintuitive with regard to pedestrian safety.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: The Aurora Avenue Merchants Association (AAMA) has already considered many of the issues involved in this Planning Study in our February 1998 Aurora (Highway 99) Plan, which was approved by the general membership of the AAMA.

The Aurora Ave (Highway 99) corridor in the north end of the City of Seattle between 65th and 145th is fronted by over 495 businesses. The history of the area, beginning in 1884 with the development of Oak Tree Cemetery (Everegreen-Waschelli), spans 117 years. Many businesses in the area are operated by second-, third- and in some cases fourth-generation owners. BUSINESS IN THE AREA DEPEND ON AUTOMOBILE AND PARKING AVAILABIITY TO THE GREATEST DEGREE OF ANY AREA OF SEATTLE.

Miscellaneous: General Location

Maintaining the economic vitality of Aurora Avenue must be balanced against any planning wish to decrease the role of the automobile. Our goals in preparing the Aurora Plan were to acknowledge Aurora's regional role as a major mover of traffic north and south and to balance that with the Aurora business corridor's huge contribution to the economic vitality of the City of Seattle.

How many times have you decided to take Aurora because I-5 is too congested or because you heard on the radio "I-5 is jammed, take Aurora." The mobility along Aurora is a major concern to us because if traffic does not move along Aurora, drivers will look for a "faster route", which then disperses traffic out into the neighborhood streets.

If mobility along Aurora were the only role that Aurora played, we would not have to be concerned with anything other than maximizing the number of vehicles that could travel through the corridor, however from 65th to 145th there are over 500 businesses offering goods and services who MUST maintain access to stay in businesses. These businesses serve a regional as well as city-wide customer base and generate more tax revenue than Seattle's downtown core.

Because we have to balance the interests of these businesses with the regional mobility that Aurora offers, our Plan has set goals to maintain conditions that both benefit businesses and keep traffic moving while at the same time attempting to protect our adjoining neighborhood streets.

comment: Need to serve the disabled and low income residents and workers in the best way possible.

comment: Information and presentation requested about all transportation issues in area, including Elevated Transit.

comment: Regional Importance: The regional importance of this corridor across the Lake Washington Ship Canal is second only to Interstate 5. Many of the vehicles traversing this corridor travel ten or fifteen miles on SR 99 rather than use I-5. I-5, which was built with 90% federal funds, is to be used for defense, interstate, and interregional travel. Local intercity traffic should use separate facilities if possible. SR 99 was built nearly seventy years ago and served all four of these travel types until the completion of I-5 through North Seattle about thirty-eight years ago.

Miscellaneous: General Location

- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: Development has progressed for over 100 years along Aurora Avenue, during which time zoning and street design criteria have changed many times. The resulting street design and street frontage conditions along Aurora vary greatly depending on when the adjacent property was developed. Since we are working with an already built environment, attaining uniformity of sidewalks, driveways, landscaping and side street access would be highly impractical if not impossible. We feel that Aurora (SR 99), as it currently exists, serves its dual functions of mobility and business district admirably and that only minor improvements to our street are needed.
- comment: Keep working to make driving undesirable. Get people to walk, bike and bus more. Cars are dinosaurs. Get the auto companies to pay for these improvements. After all, they are the ones who largely dismantles the public transit system in the first place, and they sure didn't (and aren't) paying for our roadways.
- comment: There are six automobile bridges across the Ship Canal with a total of 34 traffic lanes. It has been 41 years since any lanes were added. Four of these bridges have draw spans. Only the I-5 bridge and the George Washington Bridge (SR 99) have fixed spans. Only the I-5, SR 99, and 15th Avenue NW crossings are somewhat modern highway routes.
- comment: The study area should extend from Battery Street to Everett Mall Way/Evergreen Way and consideration should be given to re-designating Evergreen Way/Rucker Avenue as a State Route to Everett Avenue, thence Marine View Drive (SR 529) to I-5 at Steamboat Slough.
- comment: I have recently read quite a bit about WSDOT's plans for Hwy 99, and about the Aurora Merchants Association's opposition to these plans. I am writing to let you know that the surrounding neighborhood residents DO support your plans to improve Hwy. 99. Bicycle lanes, bus lanes and medians would be welcome additions to the avenue. Beautification projects would help the street lose its stigma of an unattractive, crime ridden area, and it would encourage more residents like me to shop on Aurora. The Merchant's Association seems only interested in their profits, and not the safety or attractiveness of the Aurora corridor. I realize that this issue has been debated for quite a while now, but I am a new resident in the lower Piney neighborhood, and I wanted to make my voice clear.

Miscellaneous: General Location

- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: In Conclusion, the Aurora Avenue Merchants Association supports all improvements to Aurora Avenue that preserve or advance business access and traffic mobility. The Aurora Avenue merchants Association opposes changes to the street that decrease mobility, including dedicated bicycle lanes, dedicated bus lanes, and additional lights and pedestrian crossings. We also oppose alterations to the street that negatively impact businesses, such as elimination of two-way left-turn center lane segments, severe limitations to driveways into businesses, and removal of parking during non-peak hours. The Aurora Avenue Merchants Association will work with WSDOT and SeaTran to advance both the mobility and business prosperity of Highway 99 through its north Seattle corridor.
- comment: Left turns: Left turns to and from SR 99 could easily be limited to the existing signalized intersections if sufficient width is provided on the trailing sides of the intersections for U-turn movements. I have seen a more drastic approach to signalized left turns in New Jersey and Michigan: there are none! Left turns from the highway to the signalized cross street are accomplished by making a right turn followed by a left turn into a U-turn half-moon to go the desired direction. Left turns from the signalized cross street are accomplished by traveling beyond the highway intersection and then making a left turn into the same U-turn half moon as above. This results in a two-phase signal and places all the slower traffic movements in the right lane leaving the left lane(s) for the through traffic.
- comment: Need to stop thinking about auto. Congestion; the focus should be on making sure people and goods (no matter what mode they are using) have good access to homes and businesses. Bus lanes are great. Maybe let trucks use them.
- comment: Increasing lane widths is wrong; as you know or should. Any time a road is constructed to appear bigger/wider/straighter, it's on the signal to go faster. Wider lanes equals higher design speed. Aurora doesn't need faster drivers. This widening is now the solution to drivers in 6-7 wide vehicles being unable to drive within 10 foot lanes.

Miscellaneous: General Location

- comment: This comment is not about the north corridor but about the transportation problem in general. We feel that in spite of all the adverse comments in Times and PI and other media, the monorail is the best solution to our difficulties (opponents seem to be determined to defeat it in spite of general approval of monorail by grassroots people).
- comment: More curb bulbs and bus bulbs.
- comment: We need to look at bike lanes, lowering speed with timing of lights; more cars will com through. Put stop bars 20 feet from stop lights to help with XXX crasher more curb bulbs and bus bulbs.
- comment: Would like to see rail transportation to parallel Aurora; aware that this used to be the old Interurban trolley line.
- comment: I think curb-to-curb distance is wider on Lake City than Aurora.
- comment: Increasing lane widths is wrong. As you know, or should, any time a road is constructed to appear "bigger/wider/straighter", it sends the signal to go faster. Wider lanes equal higher design speed. Aurora doesn't need faster drivers. This widening is not the solution to drivers in 6' to 7' wide vehicles being unable to drive within 10 foot lanes.
- comment: If funding is not available to include all components of the needs, including transit, then the study should be abandoned until proper funding is available. This is a pathetic tactic that WSDOT has been using on virtually every project for years and years. Our community should vigorously oppose this study as another sham for increasing auto traffic at the expense of our quality of life, with no recognition of the transportation needs of our community.
- comment: The August 10 Soapbox article about a plan for Aurora Avenue shows that businesses still want the public to suffer and to pay in the form of increased congestion, for "the two parking spots in front." In this instance, merchants, who should understand that the congestion causes loss of business, are fighting proposals that would reduce that congestion, namely, no parking 7-9 am and 3-6 pm, reduced left-turn opportunities and a bus-only lane. Here is a proposal that should be pursued: have the Aurora Ave. Merchants Association buy properties at intervals along the road from N. 65th St. to N. 145th St for parking.

Miscellaneous: General Location

The merchants could charge for parking, giving a rebate to customers who use it to access local businesses. In other words, put their money where their mouths are.

- comment: The outlook in the Outlook article is the concern what road changes might do to businesses. I sympathize with the businesses; however, I always remember the roads brought businesses, not the businesses bringing roads.
- comment: Not personally convinced that alcohol use is a big factor (more inclined to accuse most motorists of what I call the "windshield mentality")
- comment: Highway 99 should eventually become a limited access highway along its entire length through the city of Seattle. The sooner this can be completed, the better, however much can be accomplished by just deciding that this will eventually happen. New construction should not be allowed closer than a set distance from the road. Much of the newer construction recently has been large stores with large parking lots. These lots already allow plenty of space to widen the road or create a frontage road to the freeway as necessary. Land which has structures that would need to be removed to create a freeway should be purchased as they come to market, and a time set when they must be sold to the government under eminent domain. Until the freeway is built, purchased lots should be converted into parking, and parking banned in all lanes of the existing highway at all times. Even if a freeway is not built, right turn lanes should be added as necessary, allowing all three lanes along much of highway 99 to be used for through traffic. Fewer properties would have to be purchased vs. constructing a limited access highway.
- comment: I also think Hwy 99 is a good route for a monorail or light rail.
- comment: (September 30, 2002 letter): RE: Provide additional signage for vehicle and non-motorized access. Provide type and exact locations where additional signage for both vehicle and non-motorized access will be placed. Prove any Federal, State or City studies, regulations, etc. that support your position that additional signage promotes safety.

Miscellaneous: General Location

- comment: The state law says the following distance for vehicles should be one car length increase for each ten miles per hour increase. Do you really believe seven car lengths is correct for 70 mph? My belief is that the following distance should be based upon centrifugal force, that the 70 mps would be more like 10-20-40-80-160-320-640 car lengths. How else could some of the gigantic crashes occur, they compounded by some lack of vision.
- comment: Unimpressed by wider travel lanes for vehicles.
- comment: Something I have been thinking about for some time is the possibility of turning Hwy 99 into a freeway. It is already a limited access road from Green Lake south to the West Seattle Freeway. I realize the challenges would be many in increasing road capacity north of Green Lake, but it seems tome that the only good long term solution is to turn Hwy 99 into a freeway. Seattle plainly needs two freeways, especially considering the bridge and downtown bottlenecks. I don't know how the city and State share responsibility for such a project, but I know these kind of projects happen elsewhere, and they buy the property, tear down the buildings and just do it.
- comment: In order to have excellence in highway design, they must be built in my generation. Cut and cover systems with fume/pollution control built in. Presently it remains excellence in my grandfather's highway design. Seattle I-5 (1970) Highway 99 (1950) Excellence in avoiding highway design maybe. Build two lane interchanges with no loops or chicanes. Design truck routes, city center by passes, interchanges, and interstate by passes. That would be excellent design dude. Highway 99 should be a cut and cover with pollution/fume control and a few ball fields on top. Highway 99 was the freeway before we were born, and I resent the encroachment of both business and communities that has rendered it a useless neighborhood arterial. This region's original freeway is now a low speed neighborhood arterial..with Seattle police playing the role of the seals at the Ballard Locks, this route is far slower than it could, and should be. Take back 99, Give it back to Seattle. Get out of the way, Seattle. No more sophism, by sophist, practicing political sophistry. Take it back and tie it in with I-5. Close non-essential agencies if need be.

Miscellaneous: General Location

- comment: Deceleration and Acceleration Lanes: These turn out lanes on Aurora look like a good idea but Seattleites seem to have a problem getting up to speed and merging with traffic. You will see the sideswipes and rear end accidents relocated to these new segments.
- comment: My concern is the affect transportation improvements will have on historic properties and potential archeological resources. The information provided in your fact sheet may need to be updated if it's based on survey work conducted more than 10 years ago. I see the fact sheet is only Shoreline--what about Seattle! I think it would be valuable, even necessary, to develop a historic context on the development and growth of US 99. This will allow evaluation of structures and buildings as other than architectural. Some buildings may be eligible as representative of a particular historic theme, but be compromised, somewhat, architecturally. Archeological resources also need to be addressed.
- comment: Roadside development: Future roadside development should not typically be permitted within 75 feet of the centerline of SR 99 or within 150 feet of SR 99 within 660 feet of major intersections to allow for future widening and single point interchanges. The Growth Management Act seems to require adjacent development to occur right up to the property line or utility easement line and requires a minimum building height of 35 feet or more. This is unfortunate for SR 99 and other arterials as future widening will be faced with demolishing multi-story development.
- comment: (September 30, 2002 letter): Additional Requests: 1. Provide breakdown of total costs of all "near term" improvements. 2. Provide breakdown of all total costs of "long-term" improvements. 3. Provide breakdown to show costs that City will pay and in which locations City will provide any funding. 4. Provide breakdown of all costs Metro will pa and in what locations Metro will provide any funding. 5. Provide breakdown of all costs State will pay and in what locations State will provide any funding. 6. Provide breakdown of all costs Federal Government will be asked to fund and in what locations Federal Government through any funding will be asked to pay.

Miscellaneous: General Location

7. Provide breakdown of all costs for "near term" improvements to SR 99 (Battery Street Tunnel to 145th) that will be funded by State Grant applications, including each grant requested or planned to be requested and designation and location of which agency from which that grant is received or expected to be received and location where each grant will be used. 8. Provide economic loss data for installation of lane restrictions, crosswalks, additional security lighting, signage, left-turn pockets and median treatment. Separate all economic loss data by location and source (Federal, State, City or otherwise.) 9. Provide economic improvement data after installation of lane restrictions, crosswalks, additional security lighting, signage, left turn pockets and median treatment. Separate all economic improvement data by location and source (Federal, State, City or otherwise). During the course of this study and meetings held with our association, we do not feel that any of the above information has been given to us except in "general" statements that say "399 accidents in this location, 25% rear end accidents, 22% driveway related accidents, 9% were angle accidents, 7% sideswipe accidents" This information if provided by the Washington State Department of Transportation has not been given to us nor has it been available for our perusal. Please provide this Association with the accident data used to determine SR 99 between 65th and 145th as a "dangerous highway." Thank you for your cooperation in these matters and your willingness to assist us to understand the necessity for these suggested changes to our portion of SR 99 so that we may in turn report them to our Board and General Membership.

comment: My name is Lisa Dunn and I'm on the Greenwood Community Council. We appreciated the presentation you and others made to us about possible changes to Aurora Ave. We have been trying to link with other Community Councils to find common ground in our response about the project but find this a difficult time of year to get folks together. Can the final stud be delayed until sometime next February or March so we have time for adequate input? That would also give up time to go over the study documents. I appreciate your help in this manner. I can only assume that Aurora Merchants Association will not have a problem with a delay so that may work out for all.

Topic: Mobility

Location: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: Anyway to improve routes off the south end of the bridge to cut down on backups into traffic on 99?
- comment: The objective is to get all vehicles to their destination or off Aurora ASAP. Best done by making all move more smoothly, not just one favored set. This should be a transportation engineering issue, not social engineering.
- comment: I would like to see SR 99 fully converted to freeway from Winona Ave to Denny southward. Businesses could be moved north of 85th, and there would be regular interchanges at Broad, Mercer, S. end of bridge, N.45th, Green Lake Way, N. 65th, and Winona.
- comment: You are re-routing traffic queues to a new location.
- comment: For safely moving increased vehicle traffic it might do well to consider improving parallel routes, such as Linden Ave or Fremont to the West and Stone to East. Widen these streets, eliminate traffic "circles" and place strategic stop and yield signs. It's a fact the auto is here to stay and even with improved transit system people will still use their cars.

Location: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

- comment: 85th; congested between I-5 exit to Aurora and west is tremendously congested. I live on Stone; use my street to get around the congestion.
- comment: 50th to 72nd St. doesn't need three lanes northbound, since the volumes are lower and its downhill.
- comment: No HOV lane in entire Green Lake area.

Location: North (N. 110th St. to N.)

- comment: Convert one lane in each direction to BAT or HOV.
- comment: You would lose 2 lanes if you convert lanes to a BAT or HOV. This is a failed concept which keeps the whole road full longer.
- comment: Change bus diamond lane to allow vehicles; always looks empty; space could be better used.
- comment: The symbol for "transit only" lanes should be different from HOV lanes. Many look at the symbol and assume it means high occupancy vehicle.

Mobility: North (N. 110th St. to N.)

comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: traffic flow should remain the same both northbound and southbound.

Location: **General Location**

comment: Too much traffic on 99--need to get there quickly; I live two blocks from 99, can barely use it.

comment: Aurora would be the perfect thru fare on which to put the elevated transit system. The route which the "experts" are now suggesting is too disruptive and nowhere effective enough. They have rejected suggestions for an ETC along I-5. (Quote "but people could be killed going out on the freeway to catch the monorail!") It would also make a nice W. Seattle connection on the revamped viaduct.

comment: 99 is just fine if there is a delay or congestion concern attention to correct it should be in reducing out of city traffic (Lynnwood, Everett, etc. to north). Without such traffic the city roads, etc., work efficiently.

comment: Keep in mind that SR 99 is a major, intercity route. During peak hours (especially PM) it is faster to travel SR 99 from south Seattle to Marysville (via Evergreen Way, Pacific Street (2 blocks) Marine View Drive, and the SR 529 Bridges than to travel I-5). Please design all long-term improvements for the 85th percentile speeds.

comment: Need dedicated HOV lanes at least in peak direction during peak commute times. Faster bus service attracts more riders.

comment: I am opposed to any restriction on speed as traffic now flows, not as posted traffic flow, dedicated lanes, left turns. This road is one of only two thru arterials in this area, and making it 3 x 3 x 1 for all traffic at 50mph is what you owe to the 1,000's of people who must use it daily. Build the monorail, if you want to reduce traffic--overhead! This is a working road, with big signs, motley buildings, etc. Beautification will always be mitigated--use this money on something worthwhile, that will have an impact.

comment: How about switch able traffic lanes on some sections of Aurora; although traffic cannot be separated with a barrier, capacity can be diverted to the greatest load demand.

Mobility: General Location

- comment: Feel no need for all day bus lanes; most people use busses during rush hour.
- comment: Southbound 99 traffic backs up when the I-5 express lanes are not open to southbound traffic.
- comment: I think that Aurora should be turned into a freeway, buy out the businesses and would make the person writing blue comments happy since he is pro SOV and anti-transit/pedestrian.

Topic: **Non-Motorized**

Location: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: Bikes must be allowed/able to turn left from Aurora Bridge to Whitman. This is a commonly used route by bicyclists. Bicyclists must be able to access Aurora Bridge sidewalk from Bridgeway, left to Fremont Way N. and bike lane to Bridgeway N.
- comment: Pedestrians: I question the need for sidewalks on SR 99 between Battery Street and Winona. Do the pedestrian travel desire lines across the Ship Canal really go from hilltop to hilltop or simply between the hilltop on the Queen Anne side and the bottom of the hill on the Fremont side? The Fremont Bridge is a much shorter span and friendlier to pedestrians.
- comment: A bicycle lane/path could run alongside, preferably following Interurban trail route.
- comment: With the new deceleration and acceleration lanes, traffic will be speeded up; more safeguards will be needed for pedestrian safety at associate cross-walks.
- comment: It would make a whole lot more sense to locate an overpass where people would actually use it, and where you would prevent rape, robbery and assault. The urban trail is a nice idea, but the REALITY is the people of the Aloha Inn who have a dangerous commute which could be made safe with immediate access to the other side of the highway. Can you do anything to help us? Can you put us in touch with people doing the study? I would surely hate for such a great amount of taxpayer money to be wasted on a nice idea, when the need of working people (yes, our residents work) is ignored.
- comment: For some years now, there have been on-again, off-again plans to build an overpass across Aurora to complete the urban trail from Elliott Bay to Lake Union. It is most aggravating to us that this underpass would be at Garfield Street, exactly as far south of our building as the Dexter Way underpass is north. That walk would, for us, be around a blind corner right next to the woods, in a spot where no one would hear you scream. Two of our male residents have been beaten up and robbed right there. So far, state politicians have been deaf to our pleas to move the overpass closer to our building.

Non-Motorized South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: Efforts should be made to accommodate additional vehicular traffic on northbound Dexter Avenue (due to southbound Aurora exit at north Queen Anne detour). The existing bicycle lane has inadequate width for parked car doors and for the large number of cyclist (and associated passing). Improvements can include removal of curb side parking on the east side of Dexter where impacted, which would widen the bicycle lane.
- comment: Study restoration of pedestrian and vehicular traffic connections in the south Lake Union/Queen Anne/Uptown neighborhoods where Seattle's street grid has been severed by SR 99. Galer Street (bike/ped only.) This project is funded but not constructed. Aloha Street (All traffic). Valley Street (All traffic). Roy Street (bike/ped east/westbound, vehicular westbound). The Roy Street underpass is an element of the Potlatch Trail Conceptual Plan (City of Seattle, Margo Polley, Seattle Center Transportation/Parking Office.) The underpass is an element of both the adopted Queen Anne Plan and the South Lake Union Neighborhood Plan. Attention should be paid to the location of a possible, new Battery Street Tunnel portal resulting from a proposed lower level Battery St. Tunnel as an element of the Alaskan Way Viaduct replacement project.
- comment: Where are the bike lanes? Need bike lanes under 99 at N. 38th and across to/from Aurora bridge (sidewalk now).
- comment: How can a ped crossing at Galer Street not be ADA? (I like it but WSDOT told me no way)
- comment: Need safer pedestrian cross-walks.
- comment: Bike lanes have no business on Aurora, except for the proposed new lower sidewalk/bike lane on the bridge--bicycles should be shifted to north/south streets on the east and west sides of Aurora.
- comment: Broad St., Mercer St, and 99 are all unfriendly to pedestrians, bicycles, and the handicapped. To solve this problem, you need to extend the Battery St. tunnel north to Valley St. The tunnel works well. An extended tunnel will work even better by opening Valley St. and Roy St to cars, pedestrians, bicycles and handicapped across 99.

Non-Motorized South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: We really need more pedestrian crossings between E. Queen Anne and West Lake area with all the new development around there such as the proposed Galer Street Crossing. Would also be great to have ped. Crossing between Denny and Roy though the ideal long-term solution may be to bury that stretch of Aurora.
- comment: Improve east-west pedestrian corridor Bridgeway-N 38th-Fremont Way. Focus on pedestrian crossings, refuge islands, and planted medians.
- comment: As a bicyclist, I am concerned about increasing traffic volumes on Dexter Ave, a primary bicycle route. As a driver, I am not enthusiastic about lengthening the route from north of the Ship Canal to N. Queen Anne. Also believe some traffic will be diverted to the congested area near Denny Way.
- comment: Study pedestrian walkways and potential for continuous pedestrian walkways on both east and west sides of Aurora Ave flanking Queen Ann Hill and on other segments of Aurora.

Location: **Central (N. 50th St. to N.)**

- comment: Crosswalk at N. 68th to Greenlake needs improvements. In particular--the signal should change more quickly during non-rush hour times (it is dangerous and annoying to be stuck standing by this 6 lane highway) also the median should be made safer.
- comment: One thing you did not mention is that there is already an existing pedestrian underpass at 79ths, which was closed some years ago. I'm not sure if it was for vandalism, tagging, or safety. If you're serious about underpasses you need to find out more why this one was closed and if it should be re-opened. If you can't keep existing ones open, why build new ones?
- comment: Pedestrian safety along the corridor needs to be a key concern, especially if Metro is increasing their service. Don't listen to the AAMA--they are shooting themselves in the foot. If the ped. Environment along this corridor was better, their businesses would be thriving.

Non-Motorized: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

- comment: The Feb 2, 2002 SAC minutes indicate that there is a high accident rate involving congestion and pedestrians at or near that particular intersection. I have to frequently cross North 90th and Aurora Avenue/SR 99 at that location in order to get to North Seattle Community College and Northgate destinations as a pedestrian. A pedestrian/bike bridge crossing Aurora Avenue/SR 99 would probably speed up traffic and minimize automobile accidents. Staff input to the SAC indicate that pedestrians are often hit by cars even though they have a walk light. Please consider installing a pedestrian and bicycle bridge at 90th and Aurora Avenue/SR 99.
- comment: How about a pedestrian improvement at N. 68th crossing from Piney ridge to green Lake. Maybe a bridge or a median.
- comment: Aurora is not a bicycle street.
- comment: In light of the findings of your study's presentation to the Stakeholders' Advisory Committee minutes on Feb 2, 2002, I would like to suggest an off-grade, pedestrian/bike East-West bound crossing bridge at Aurora/SR 99 and North 90th Street.
- comment: The current light at 77th will either be removed or made into a pedestrian activated light in order to relive traffic flows onto 77th St eastbound. Pedestrian movement in the area may not need this light since there currently are two lights (80th and Winona) within a 2/3 block area. However, the expertise of Seattle Transportation Engineers will be of enormous value in this area as to whether the light remains or becomes pedestrian activated.
- comment: Consider pedestrian bridge N. 80th St and Aurora Ave. According to your accident data summary, traffic conditions warrant it. Even with pedestrian walk light, cars still hitting them.
- comment: North of Winona I suspect that a large part of the pedestrian activity is simply to get to and from the bus stops. If all of the bus stops were located immediately downstream of signalized intersections (not 400 feet beyond like the Fred Meyer bus stop in Shoreline), there would be fewer attempts to cross SR 99 elsewhere.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: At 95th, the dead end street consider pedestrian underpass, if approved by SeaTran.

Non-Motorized: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

- comment: (September 30, 2002 letter): Install pedestrian crossing improvements to improve safety at 95th and 140th. We request statistics or studies from any Federal, State, City or other entity that supports the safety improvements planned for 95th and 140th including but not limited to the following: 1. How many people cross at those locations? 2. How will this crosswalk improve safety? 3. What is the criteria for necessitating the installation of a crosswalk?
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: the pedestrian activated light at N. 77th should be eliminated.
- comment: Please upgrade pedestrian crossing signal around N. 70th and SR 99 to actually work when you push the button.
- comment: I do a lot of walking so I like sidewalks and curbs. You feel safer and puddles are less of a problem. Trees are fine but space considerations would likely mean it's not possible in many places and would be quite restrictive in others. If you have room, fine.
- comment: Consider pedestrian bridge on 90th and Aurora.
- comment: The necessity of some sort of pedestrian crossing treatment in the vicinity of 95th or 96th will be discussed with the AAMA based on its discussions with affected business owners and again expertise of Seattle Transportation Engineers and WSDOT engineers. There is no definite acceptance of any so called pedestrian "island" treatment at this time, however it may be decided by all parties that this option is acceptable or it may be decided that a pedestrian activated signal is the answer.
- comment: I don't like mid-block crosswalks at all.

Location: **North (N. 110th St. to N.)**

- comment: Since N. 130th and Aurora is noted as a high accident intersection, suggest placing a signal on the north side of the pedestrian overpass since the overpass obstructs the view of the signal to southbound traffic.
- comment: I worry about possible underpasses in Shoreline in Shoreline the North Seattle segments. There need to be VERY well lit, wide enough, and aesthetic enough to be both safe and aesthetically appealing.

comment: Bicycles do not belong on Aurora at all.

Non-Motorized: North (N. 110th St. to N.)

comment: Pedestrian under passes are unacceptable for safety reasons; this is an active drug/prostitution zone.

comment: Put in proper drainage and pervious, continuous pedestrian walkways with a curb cement barrier for safety from traffic, especially north of 85th to 145th.

comment: What happens to bikes if you replace right lane with BAT lanes? Right now, bikes can ride in right lane sections. BAT would force bikes into middle lane. There is not always a good alternative route--as some times bikes are going to businesses on Aurora. Don't sacrifice bikes! (Look what happened on Lake City Way) Where are bikes in your diagrams?

comment: Please, please increase the time for the "walk" signs on N. 145th, especially the light going across aurora. I have to run at full speed and still cannot make it before the red hand. Drivers get furious and I'm afraid one of us pedestrians will get hit or shot. The cars turning from N. 145th onto Aurora, only see the red hand. If the first car-driver is looking they will see the walk sign blink on and off--but no one else does. It is so bad for all of us; surely the time could be increased. Elderly people, disabled or slow really get verbally abused. It is frightening and can upset one for several hours. Most all pedestrians walk sign lights need to be increased up and down Aurora.

comment: There will be further discussion regarding the current crosswalk at 140th as to whether it will become pedestrian activated, remain the same, or such other improvements as may be agreed upon to assist east/west pedestrian crossing at that location.

comment: In your plans, do not remove the 130th Street pedestrian Aurora north overpass extending form corner side of Olympic Lincoln business to shopping center on the eastside of Aurora. It is used constantly by pedestrians to cross the very busy intersection. If people in wheelchairs want to use this, make it more wheelchair friendly. Please do not remove this overpass.

Location: **Non-Motorized: General Location**

- comment: Study intersections for new pedestrian overpasses in North Seattle to facilitate transit riders and other pedestrian crossings of Aurora Ave. (such as N. 145th, N. 140th, N. 135th, N. 125th, N. 105th, N. 95th, and N. 85th)
- comment: Add curb bulbs at intersections: a narrower Aurora would be much easier and safer for pedestrians to cross. Also, it's appearance and friendliness would improve.
- comment: Crosswalks and pedestrian ways need to be updated and provided with better warning and signalization. If traffic will be moving faster and better the existing pedestrian ways need to be identified better. Preferably with general lighting and activated strobe light signals similar to the City of Kirkland's. Dexter Ave North is in need of this already especially in poor visibility conditions.
- comment: Business owners need to get a grip. Some customers use buses, hate cars, want to shop without risking life and limb.
- comment: Several at the meeting made the point about barriers to peds crossing Aurora. Naturally I echo their concerns. One of the points raised concerned traffic signals and/or pedestrian activated traffic signals/walk lights. This is a sore point for me even among my friends at the City of Shoreline. Generally speaking, I believe pedestrian activated signals should carry more priority in the transportation scheme. Lights that "sense" a break in the traffic do little good because peds without sense or sensory impairments can identify breaks themselves. Ideally the ped activated signal will immediately set the DON'T WALK sign in the other direction to flashing and cycle the light for ped movement. Because peds in a crosswalk have right of way until the crossing is complete (and because the plan for Aurora will no doubt include median ped refuges), the amount of time given the WALK sign need not be so long as currently used. In fact, even for motor vehicular traffic, I commonly hear gripes about the long light cycles. The time is ripe for Seattle/WSDOT to experiment with shorter light cycles.
- comment: Give us ped/bike level lighting not just tall, overhead lighting for cars.
- comment: Please make it easier and more pleasant for people using the bus or walking.
- comment: We need to look at bike lanes, lowering speed so with timing of lights more car's will move through.

Non-Motorized: General Location

- comment: Can we have fewer drive-in pharmacies, banks, etc, and more businesses with inviting entrances for pedestrians. We need an interesting environment to walk in.
- comment: Congestion on Aurora results in higher speeds and higher volumes on parallel local streets, I.e. those I typically walk along or across. Therefore, improve capacity on Aurora, make my walk across Linden, et al pleasant plus safer.
- comment: Bicycles do not belong on Aurora at all.
- comment: Bicycles: A bike route should be established along Westlake to the Fremont Bridge and then north along Stone Way to Green Lake, under the SR 99 underpass north of Woodland Park, up Linden Avenue to 85th, and along the Interurban ROW from 85th to Colby Street in Everett. Bicycle facilities along SR 99 should be minimal considering the proximity to the Interurban ROW and the speed of traffic.
- comment: Bike lanes have no business on Aurora except in the proposed new lower sidewalk/bike lane on the bridge; bicycles should be shifted to N/S streets on the east and west sides of Aurora.
- comment: Require pedestrian right-of-way lighting. Often lighting fixtures that illuminate the Aurora traffic lanes provide poor or no light for pedestrians.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: Development patterns indicate that the number of residents in neighborhoods bordering Aurora will increase in the coming years. While many of these residents will chose to own and use cars, many are likely to be careless, choosing to walk, bicycle or take a bus. While pedestrians must have access to both sides of Aurora to take buses, Aurora is a state highway on which traffic mobility must take precedence. In-filling of sidewalks will improve pedestrian mobility. Additional crossings for pedestrians should be limited to one per five-block segment of street and be configured as an underpass, if feasible. Sidewalk in-fill and reconfigurations should improve pedestrian access. Because of the already limited right-of-way, street furniture should be at the discretion of property owners. Again, because of the constricted right-of-way, bicycle use of Aurora should be discouraged. Stone Way and Linden Avenue offer safer and less congested routes for bicycles.

Non-Motorized: General Location

- comment: Improve pedestrian safety features at the Aurora intersections which the SR 99 North Corridor Study has identified as in High Accident Zones or as High Accident Locations.
- comment: Recommendation that some State dollars support the construction of pedestrian facilities in the SR 99 North Corridor.
- comment: Please improve safety along Aurora. It is unsafe, dirty and basically a highway. I live 4 blocks away yet never go there to shop or eat. I prefer Greenwood since it is more pedestrian friendly. Please add a median to SR 99 with trees and other greenery. Pavers are not enough!
- comment: Any chance that pedestrian, bike lanes or streets just off Aurora instead of right along it?
- comment: Keep pedestrians off the roadway--pedestrian overpasses can save lives and facilitate traffic flow.

Topic: Other Safety

Location: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: My concerns are accidents at the corner of Aurora Ave N. and N. Allen Place caused by southbound vehicles turning from Aurora to N. Allen Place; compounded by EXTREMELY FAST traffic merging southbound to Aurora along Piney Way N. from N. 46th (limited visibility, too high speed). This fast merging traffic usually fails to yield for pedestrian crossing at N. 45th and Phinney Way N.
- comment: Need light on Bridgeway to allow 2 lanes west movement.
- comment: Rebuild southbound off to Queen Anne; totally unsafe as is.
- comment: Jersey barriers cause pedestrians to be stuck in middle of highway--scary! Where will officers come from city and county?
- comment: Aurora from Denny to N. 50th is a very safe route "if" you fix or close the substandard conflict points.
- comment: Response to "Need sign "Fremont" which used to be on the bridge." Do not need sing "Fremont". It would only bring additional traffic to an already over burdened area owing absurd construction on both sides of Fremont bridge, destroying the character of the neighborhood.
- comment: Again, SR 99 N/S is fantastic and I support all suggestions; save Raye Street where I need to learn more. Please encourage your staff to give some consideration to improvements of SR 99 at Denny S southbound related to left turn to Denny. The back up today seemed so extensive as to raise my concern that driver safety was a serious issue when backed up so far.
- comment: Recommend near term fix to 7 leg I-5 use removable barriers for fire access and eliminate turn-arounds.
- comment: We need more sight line to be able to access Aurora. Northbound at the northern of the Aurora Bridge. Couldn't Fremont be served by a drop lane like they do at King-TV and Gayler street? Buses could be allowed to stop in the space between where the outside lane would turn off and the on-coming ramp could be a Safeway to go north.
- comment: N. 38th and Aurora needs better sighting onto Aurora northbound.

Other Safety: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: Planned zoo improvements that increase travel demand on N. 46th and on N. 50th should be accounted for, and needed improvements to these arterials that cross under SR 99 should be made.
- comment: Do not eliminate signal at Green Lake Way; it is needed.
- comment: Need sign "Fremont" which used to be on the bridge.
- comment: Zoo area has no accidents, so that widening should be done last.
- comment: Aurora High Accident Corridor from Denny Way to N. 50th St is not in need of a BIG DIG, but does need evaluation specific improvements that can be done within.
- comment: Please improve signage on Bridge southbound to show right turn at sharp angle; warn of slower traffic.

Location: **Central (N. 50th St. to N.)**

- comment: Consider making curb lane wider on one side versus another depending on bus volumes and accident data.
- comment: RE: time signal East/West at 90ths. It's too short for the volume of East/West traffic and wait for the next light is so long, even if no North/South traffic is on Aurora, so people run the yellow/red lights to get across.
- comment: The traffic light situation at 90th which is of concern to us all is to be studied to see if it is possible to install signalization that will allow only left-turns in all directions with a newly installed signal (i.e. to discover what traffic delays, will be the result of this action). There also may be other suggestions for treatment of this intersection based on expertise of both Seattle Transportation Engineers and WSDOT engineers.
- comment: I was walking on the eastside of Aurora along N. 80th St and N. 85th St and was thinking how terribly crowded those trees are. There's barely enough room for one person. Good example of wrong trees.
- comment: Make red signal at N. 70th/Aurora work faster--people are jaywalking because it's too slow.
- comment: Stop light at N. 95th would be great!

Other Safety: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

- comment: Curb lanes need to accommodate bicycles. If you remove parking, the bikes will have to take the entire lane. Need to add "share the road with bicycles" signs. Tell motorists that bikes have same rights to road as other vehicles.
- comment: N. 77th is an important light for bicyclists. It's a main east-west route for cyclist. It's one of the few lights they can use without being run over.
- comment: Unfortunately, I cannot come to this meeting due to other commitments, but there are a couple things that worry me about the direction that this is taking and I want to make sure that they get voiced. First, the intent of much of the solutions that are presented seem to be to "increase capacity and improve traffic flow". Safety keeps being mentioned in the narrative, but it's always in the context of more and better traffic flow. To me, this implies more cars and, I suspect, faster movement of the traffic. I actually think this is the opposite of what needs to happen, particularly between Winona and the Aurora bridge (which isn't hardly mentioned in the recommendations as far as I can see). I've lived in the Greenlake area for 15 years and commute via Aurora almost every day. In the last few years, the road has turned into a virtual freeway (or racetrack depending on which section you're on at the moment). Traffic flow between the two points mentioned above (and actually all the way to the Battery Street Tunnel and points south) is basically 50-55 mph minimum unless there's a traffic jam! Drivers are increasingly aggressive, particularly in the drag race starts that occur at the traffic lights at Winona and the pedestrian crossing at Greenlake. When I walk to the lake, I'm terrified of the drivers screeching southbound around the curve just south of the old Twin Teepee's site. I typically stand behind the light pole on the opposite side of traffic flow just in case one of the seemingly infinite Andretti family loses control of their vehicle in their haste to get wherever it is they're going. On the northbound lanes, it is nearly as bad coming down the hill from the zoo and I think it is only a matter of time before someone flies over the embankment and plows into a crowd of Greenlake pedestrians (the last incident resulted in a dead park bench and nothing worse, but I think that was just a warning...).

Other Safety: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

THIS IS A RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD and is not an appropriate place for a ??? Limited access highway. Aurora was never meant to handle the volume of traffic that it now does and certainly, the designers weren't planning for the aggressive drivers we have today. I think that there should be drastic measures taken to choke down the traffic flow from Winona to at least the south side of the zoo. Possible solutions could include: 1) Installing a couple of extra traffic lights (there's no rule saying a light has to be at an intersection, just put them up to keep the speeds down). 2) An automated unmanned speed traps with a strictly enforced (24 hours a day) 35 mph speed limit (and no 5 or 10 mph over the limit fudge factor). These are used quite successfully in some localities around the country. I understand that these ideas will raise a lot of hackles in both the commuter

ranks and the business community. Commuters will complain about added commute time and businesses will complain about customer access. However, adding another mile or so of low speed roadway to the current commute isn't going to hurt anyone too much. It might add a couple extra minutes to their commute, but big deal. I use this commute too so it will affect me as well and I know what the effect will be. On the positive side, it will make the Greenlake portion of Aurora a much safer and more pleasant place to work, to travel through and to live in.

comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: street lights appears adequate.

comment: I am very concerned that the WSDOT and the City of Seattle will recommend changes to this multi-purpose corridor that may or may not improve safety but will have inappropriately negative effects on Aurora's businesses and on the residents who live in the neighborhoods closely surrounding the Aurora corridor.

Location: **North (N. 110th St. to N.)**

comment: Make sure that curb lane railings can stop a bus.

comment: West side of Aurora near Rite Aid; 125th and 130th, newspaper boxes block view; can't see to merge. Need to look at this for site lines.

comment: Improve all signals N. 125th to N. 145th.

Other Safety: North (N. 110th St. to N.)

- comment: Another thought I had concerns future interchanges at a few locations. The signal at North 130th Street currently backs traffic through the signals at North 125th Street, Home Depot, and North 115th Street (3/4 mile) on a near daily basis and, when Interstate 5 has a blocking accident, all the way to Woodland Park. Not only is this an inconvenience to the motorist, it also creates a lot of stopped traffic for turning vehicles to squeeze through only to be clobbered by transit lane violators and traffic in the two-way turn lane.
- comment: Create litter pick-up/communication system to get a "scooper truck" to pick up big items on roadway like tree limbs and dead critters.
- comment: Smaller backups occur at North 85th Street, North 105th Street, and North 145th Street. The accidents can be prevented by only allowing left turns on protected signal phases and placing a raised median with no openings between signals. There is little that can be done to reduce the backups that has not already been done short of grade separations. PLEASE seriously consider a grade separation at North 130th Street and give some consideration to grade separations at North 145th Street, North 105th Street, and North 85th Street.

Location: **General Location**

- comment: Also favor flashing yellow turn lights. If I came to a left turn lane too late to trigger the left turn arrow, I hate having to sit through an entire cycle when there is NO traffic!
- comment: At signals with pedestrian crossings, reduce the lag time between the pushing of the button and the changing of the signal. Pedestrians are in a very uncomfortable and unsafe position while waiting for the light to turn. They are subject to the noise, fumes, dust and other pollutants of the passing cars. If it is raining, they can be doused by the spray of passing vehicles. And they are extremely vulnerable to an errant vehicle, or one that has been sent askew by a collision. Long delays at crossings motivate people, particularly the young, to cross against the red light, which is very dangerous on SR-99, given the high vehicle speeds, the width of the highway, and the visual clutter of the street, which make it difficult for drivers to see a person on the road, even in daylight and good weather.

Other Safety: General Location

- comment: How are ADA needs being addressed? Will this project bring the walkways up to code? It is also important to correct the sloping driveway aprons so that sidewalk users can maintain level ground. This is key for many populations besides ADA including stroller pushers, grocery cart pullers and sidewalk bicyclists. Same goes for well-placed curb cuts.
- comment: Regulate the night lighting of Aurora businesses. The lighting of many gas stations, car lots and other businesses is excessively bright and glaring. Such lighting diminishes the ability of drivers to see objects, including pedestrians, bicycles and other cars. And contrary to business owners concerns for night security, excessive brightness can diminish security, as bright light is a bad guy's friend: everyone is too blinded to see him lurking in the shadows.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: Public safety was a fundamental and pervasive principle guiding us while we structured the Aurora (Highway 99) Plan. Those who merely traverse Aurora while heading to their homes may think that street trees and shrubbery will improve the environment, but those of us who work on Aurora and interact with the street recognize that openness, visibility, and good lighting are critical to counteract the criminal element that also occupies the street.
- comment: Put stop bars 20 feet from stop light to help with multi crashes.
- comment: Maintain the present vehicular capacity of SR 99 North.
Rationale: Vehicular speed kills pedestrians. 35 mph limits will provide maximum capacity for this route and is acceptable for pedestrian safety. Pedestrians struck at 45 mph suffer 50% fatalities.
- comment: Turn lanes are needed to improve safety and ease congestion on SR 99 N route to improvements at the major intersections where it is feasible.
- comment: We need more safety improvements for pedestrians along Aurora--it's a dangerous route for drivers and especially for walkers. Let's put in wider sidewalks where there are sidewalks and new sidewalks where there aren't any yet.

Other Safety: General Location

- comment: Work on E-W streets at signals to increase north 5 green time and stop the high number of re-collision. Must be less costly to add lanes E-W plus turning lanes than to put BAT lanes on Aurora.
- comment: Please improve safety along Aurora. It is unsafe, dirty, and basically a highway. I live four blocks away yet never go there to shop or eat. I prefer Greenwood since it is more pedestrian friendly.
- comment: (September 30, 2002 letter): RE: recommend additional securing lighting along SR 99 and its under crossings. Identify where security lighting will be placed including under-crossing locations.
- comment: Lighting is key. Need good lighting at crossings, above sidewalks, and under-bridge corridor. Make it so people want to walk.

Topic: Parking

Location: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: 39th to 50th bus-only parking at southbound.
- comment: Parking 50th-46th southbound already impacted by zoo overflow. Need to restrict "active space" Control further congestion for residents.
- comment: I am glad you are considering eliminating southbound parking during the PM peak. Please consider Saturday and Sunday too.
- comment: N. 38th to N. 50th: no parking proposal. Only if you add a bike lane (6 foot min). Current parking lane is wide. We allow bikes. Very important on northbound. (up hill)
- comment: Eliminating parking from N. 38th to N. 50th is a very good idea.
- comment: I just do not see the same problem with removing southbound parking that all the businesses do. As it is, it's a hazard to park in those lanes anyway and I hope the businesses deal with their parking concerns other ways besides opposing the parking restrictions.
- comment: I am glad you are considering eliminating southbound parking during the PM peak. Please consider Saturday and Sunday too. Southbound 99 traffic backs up when the I-5 express lanes are not open to southbound traffic. The 85th percentile free flow speeds exceed 35 mph. There should not be on-street parking at these speeds.
- comment: No parking removal northbound.
- comment: I understand the merchants concerns about parking but the restrictions being proposed should not impact the businesses that much. As most of them are during peak hours, eliminating parking from N. 38th Street to N. 50th is a very good idea.

Location: **Parking: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)**

- comment: The majority of our retail customers park on the street directly in front of our door that is right on the aurora sidewalk. If our on-street parking is taken away we will certainly lose business as a result of the inability to recognize an area to pull over and park, especially as most purchases are quickly in and out. Though we do have parking available on our lot, it is not easily seen from the road. WE acknowledge the necessity to have our on-street parking convert to commuter/transit lanes at 3 pm each day, however we cannot find justification to completely eliminate this important access to our facility during the majority of the work day. The majority of the buses we see go by between 10 am and 3 pm are less than 1/3 full. We are also an agency for Pence truck leasing. If we lose the lane in front of our building we would also not have the ability to perform "after-hours drop" or "weekend" capability for our customers. This would result in more rental trucks up to 25' in length being parked in various residential areas for no purpose.
- comment: Don't take away our on-street parking on Aurora....
- comment: I do not have enough parking as is, to remove the parking lanes would only add to this problem for me and many other businesses on Aurora Ave.
- comment: The prohibition of on-street parking on Aurora. The businesses along Aurora have already accepted the prohibition of parking at peak hours to help move rush-hour traffic through in a safe and timely manner. To create a bus-only lane all day makes no sense at all.
- comment: On Greenlake around N. 110th St, no business can sustain itself on 2-3 parking spaces on Aurora; their business would be better off relocated. Consider perhaps 1 out of 3 or bladed off and converted to a parking lot, limited to use by patrons of that block's remaining businesses many barely survive now and would probably welcome a "buyout" to move. Plus, many are quite frankly, eyesores and bad attracters. North Aurora needs a change; it could host attractive businesses by eliminating the seedy atmosphere. Look at East Madison approaching Lake Washington; Aurora could do it too.
- comment: How will the loss of parking on the west side affect the parking on the side streets adjacent to Aurora (we already have problems with business travel parking on residential streets adjacent to Aurora)

Parking: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

comment: I'm very pleased with the study. I support adding afternoon peak hour parking restrictions southbound. Morning hours should be extended by at least one hour. Short term, an easy fix is to eliminate the one parking space between N. 84th and N. 85th southbound; it forces an awkward merge for buses when someone is parked there and the buses back up traffic into the N. 85th Street intersection. Flow would be greatly improved for the cost of a single parking space.

comment: I understand the merchant's concerns about parking, but the restrictions being proposed should not impact the businesses that much, as most of them are during peak hours.

comment: Parking MUST not be removed on SR 99 in the N. 80th to N. 105th corridor.

comment: Another concern I have is that we may lose customer parking on Aurora during non-peak hours. WE have already lost it during rush hours and I can understand the reason for that but non-peak hour parking is crucial to our customers.

comment: Parking along Aurora Ave will remain as currently configured with the "peak hour" restrictions remaining.

comment: On-street parking elimination on Aurora. I will lose business if my customers can't park along Aurora. We have already compromised, not having parking during rush hours so that traffic can move more freely. During non-peak hours, our parking capacity is crucial to our survival.

comment: (September 30, 2002 letter): All Modes (regarding) Southbound pm peak parking restrictions between 110th and 72nd to increase capacity and improve traffic flow. We request statistics, studies or regulations from any Federal, State, City or any other entity that supports peak parking restrictions. 1. What is the criteria that triggers this decision? 2. Please disclose which businesses are expected to suffer economic impacts as Southbound PM peak parking restrictions are instituted including any studies or regulations e they Federal, State or City that support your position. 3. Please disclose percentage of economic losses expected to be distributed to businesses in this location due to peak hour parking restrictions.

Parking: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

4. Please provide any Federal, State, or City studies regarding pedestrian accidents that are caused by not allowing parking on a heavily traveled highway by placing pedestrians in an "un-safe" environment, next to that heavily traveled highway.

comment: We are a contractor with the City of Seattle Fire Department for uniforms and footwear. As a part of a negotiated labor contract, the firefighters are able to come into our store to pick up their uniforms while on duty. Most of the time, the firefighters come into our store to pick up their uniforms while on duty. Most of the time, the firefighters come to the store in a fire truck. The only place they have to park is on the street. If they are not able to park on the street, we would most likely lose some or all of this business. This would be a problem for the firefighters as well.

comment: I'm very pleased with the study. I support adding afternoon peak hour parking restrictions southbound. Morning hours should be extended by at least one hour. Short-term, one easy fix is to eliminate the one parking space between N. 84th and N. 85th southbound. It forces an awkward merge for busses when someone is parked there and the busses back-up traffic into the N. 85th Street intersection. Flow would be greatly improved for the cost of a single parking space.

comment: Parking is fine but not for rush hour traffic.

Location: **North (N. 110th St. to N.)**

comment: Parking along Aurora Ave will remain as currently configured with the "peak hour" restrictions remaining.

comment: Don't take away our on-street parking on Aurora. I will lose business if any customers can't park along Aurora. We have already compromised, not having parking during rush hours so that traffic can move more freely. During non-peak hours, our parking capacity is crucial to our survival.

comment: People park where sidewalk should be all along Aurora by St. Vincent Store.

comment: Is any consideration being given to creating parking garages along 99? Might mitigate impact on business community and on residents?

Parking: North (N. 110th St. to N.)

comment: Enforce no-parking before 9 am on Aurora southbound. Hazardous to buses and cars in curb lanes which should be CLEAR during peak hour.

Location: **General Location**

comment: My concern in particular is parking on Aurora. As a merchant of 25 years, parking on Aurora (street parking) is vital to my business. Any plan which would reduce or eliminate street parking would be very detrimental to business.

comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: Limited street parking exists along Aurora. Much of this parking serves small businesses that have no on-property parking. These small businesses, at a cost to themselves, have agreed to extend peak hour parking. These small businesses, at a cost to themselves, have agreed to extend peak hour parking prohibition from 3:00 to 7:00 pm to facilitate traffic movement. These small businesses, therefore, are surviving on parking availability during the day and their existence will be jeopardized if day-time parking is eliminated.

comment: I'm concerned about residential parking on side streets adjacent to Aurora if business parking is eliminated or reduced or restricted on Aurora.

comment: My concern in particular is parking on Aurora. As a merchant of 25 years, parking on Aurora (street parking) is vital to my business. Any plan which would reduce or eliminate street parking would be very detrimental to business.

comment: Parking on 99 during certain hours of the day is fine; during rush hour, we shouldn't have parking.

comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: Parking and the availability of parking is essential to success of any business area. Even in so-called pedestrian shopping areas, without nearby parking a business will not survive. To pretend differently does not face nor accept reality. Historically, the goods and services offered along Aurora Avenue have been auto-oriented.

Parking: General Location

Even if transit availability or pedestrian or bicycle customers increased by 10%, the fact remains that 79% of the customer base for businesses along Aurora Avenue will be derived from the use of an automobile. If this study concludes that mobility requires removing parking from Aurora at all times then it must provide alternative parking to the businesses along Aurora in public parking lots. It is crucial to maintain existing or better parking conditions to support a viable business atmosphere, which in turn is crucial to the economic vitality of the City of Seattle.

- comment: Removing parking will put businesses out of business or encourage people to park on residential streets.
- comment: I think we should get parked cars off of our major thoroughfares. These are some of our only north-south corridor; they should be used for transportation, not car storage. If we get innovative, we can solve the transportation problem and parking problem, and provide real alternatives to driving SR 99 everyday.
- comment: Let's remove as much parking as possible from Aurora and make them bus-only lanes.
- comment: Study restoration of street parking on segments of Aurora Ave. which will improve the pedestrian environment.
- comment: Parking: All parking should be eliminated on SR 99 if possible. At the very least, parking should be prohibited at any time, even Saturdays and Sundays, that the traffic typically drops below level of service C. Currently there are two "billboards" parked along the highway across from Home Depot. One is a plumbing pickup truck and trailer with an advertising reader board. The other is a trailer with a shed on it advertising sheds. Both of these are unsightly and block pedestrians and bicycles. Just south of the cemetery is a moving van company that parks its trucks along the curb on one side of the street and moves them across the street to the other curb twice a day to avoid the no parking hours. The method used to switch sides of the road is to make a big U-turn across all 7 lanes!

Parking: General Location

comment: The right lane of each side of Aurora should be for parking only. Currently, drivers switch into the right lane where it is clear, then merge back into the middle lane when a parked car is encountered. This encourages frequent lane changes and passing on the right. Generally, those performing such maneuvers are the more aggressive drivers.

Conversion of the right lane to parking may allow enough room for sidewalk improvements. The parked cars themselves provide a safety and noise buffer for the sidewalk. Additionally, continuous street parking would encourage small businesses to locate on Aurora, without the necessity of providing expensive off-street parking. One of the reasons Aurora is such a hideously ugly and pedestrian unfriendly road is the acres of parking lots on either side. It is often a long walk in unpleasant conditions from one business to the next.

comment: If on-street parking is removed, street improvements on side streets should be made so more organized and greater capacity of parking is available. No reason not to use the adjacent streets for parking that's one of their functions.

comment: If on-street parking remains, need to restrict time to 1 hour or 2 hour stay weekends plus nights, manage vehicles "camped out" on Aurora impacting safety. Prime example is Handy Andy.

comment: I'm concerned about residential parking on side streets adjacent to aurora if business parking is eliminated or reduced or restricted on Aurora.

comment: Where possible, get added roadway space by removing parking.

comment: My tenants will lose business if their customers cannot park on Aurora. There is presently no parking on Aurora during peak hours. However, during non-peak hours, my tenant's parking capacity is crucial to their survival.

comment: The 85th percentile free flow speeds exceed 35mph. There should not be on-street parking at these speeds.

Topic: Raye/Halladay

Location: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

comment: Signage/flashing yellow warning that there is a 90 degree turn at Raye Street.

comment: Look at alternative access to Seattle Country Day School.

comment: The Dexter exit alternative will cause more accidents than the current "queue" situation on the bridge routing traffic through a neighborhood and several intersections has a higher probability of accidents; car bike; peds, then the current set up. Use traffic lights on Raye a light on indicator board on the bridge, etc, putting thousands of cars on Dexter is not the answer plus, more cars will go through Fremont to access N. Queen Anne.

comment: Do not close exit to Queen Anne, it would only extend congestion down to Dexter, add 4 stoplights to an already tough commute. Queen Anne will be highly outraged at being shut off.

comment: An article in the Sept. 4th queen Anne News indicates that your organization is considering traffic changes to avoid accidents at the southbound turn-off from the Aurora Bridge. I suggest that one or two warning signs might do quite a bit of good. The turn is unexpectedly tight for a driver not familiar with the intersection, and also the occasional backed-up ramp can catch traffic on the southbound mainline by surprise. A sign reading "exit speed 10 mph" or the like and perhaps another reading "right lane subject to backups" might help avoid trouble. Restricting the main southbound traffic to the two left most lanes might be considered. At two points north of the bridge the main traffic is in two lanes, so any new bottleneck should be tolerable. Such restriction would also make southbound turns onto Aurora safer and easier. Implementing these suggestions (or some variant) might solve the "accident hot spot" without the necessity of redirecting the existing traffic pattern.

Raye/Halladay: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: We have reviewed the proposed alternative to the existing southbound exit to Halladay-Queen Anne Drive, a one-half-mile dog leg route utilizing Taylor, Lynn, Dexter, 6th Ave, Halladay to Queen Anne Drive. At this time, QACC opposes the adoption of the alternative southbound exit. We feel that the safety risks at the City's intersections on the dog-leg route would be equal to those risks that are generated by cueing in the southbound right lane on the Aurora Bridge at traffic peaks as vehicles are lined up to exit into Queen Anne Drive. Reasons for our opposition include: predictable congestion caused by combining both traffic entering and exiting Queen Anne via the narrow, steep 6th Ave N.; difficulty making the left turn onto Dexter, a 300 degree movement; the half-mile added distance for vehicles exiting SR 99 N to Queen Anne. QACC recommends that WSDOT and SDOT first study and implement revisions and improvements at the intersection of Fourth Ave N. and Queen Anne Drive. The goal would be to relieve the peak hour bottleneck at this seven-way intersection. The result should be to reduce cueing of vehicles in the southbound lane of the Aurora Bridge. This intersection is addressed in section QAT8 of the Queen Anne Neighborhood Plan. QACC urges WSDOT to study the feasibility of utilizing a system of electric signs to calm vehicular traffic on the Aurora Bridge southbound at peak traffic hours in order to reduce rear end accidents as vehicles cue to exit at Queen Anne Drive. We hope that these measures can be taken prior to the projected closure of the Fremont Bridge for reconstruction of the approaches.
- comment: The closure of this exit will be a great mistake. There are hundreds of cars that use this exit daily. Making these cars exit at Dexter St then circle around back north, stop at the sign near Canlis and then sit in an even longer line at the intersection of Queen Anne Dr. and Raye St would make a bad situation even worse.
- comment: Look at 4th Ave coming up hill one-way to Country Day School.
- comment: Consider dedicated curb lane at Halladay exit to exit only.
- comment: Need signage improvements at Halladay and Raye Exit.
- comment: Can you look at other access off SR 99 to upper Queen Anne?
- comment: Can we look at peak hour shut-off of the intersection?

Raye/Halladay: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: Make 4th Ave one-way northbound and close additional 2 approaches.
- comment: Don't remove south bound exit from Aurora Bridge to Queen Anne. 1. Makes motorists drive way out of their way to use Dexter or Roy. 2. Increases congestion on Dexter (crossing 2 left turns). 3. Crossing introduces conflicts between bikes and motorists on Dexter. 4. Increases congestion on Queen Anne Drive/Raye (under Canlis). Which is already bad for motorists and bicyclists.
- comment: We are responding to the current study with proposed options to occasional back-ups on SR 99 for traffic heading south, turning west onto Queen Anne Drive. Although we were unable to attend the October 24th meeting, we live several blocks away. Any changes will have direct impact on our daily travel routes. We are strongly opposed to one of the proposed options: the closure of this exit! It will transfer lengthy and time-consuming back-ups to already congested alternate routes. Instead, may we suggest alternate ways to make this a safer exit such as: 1. More prominent signage starting mid-way on the Aurora Bridge and just before the sharp right turn to Queen Anne, 2. An "exit only" right turn lane for exiting traffic, which allows a clear entry and better visibility for cars entering onto SR 99 from QA going south and 3. Flashing yellow divider bumps starting mid-way on the bridge to the right turn exit between the two westerly lanes, thereby highlighting attention to the upcoming exit.
- comment: Prior to the DOT removing access routes to/from Queen Anne, more actions should be made to increase the safety of existing roads. For example: re: southbound traffic exiting onto Raye. Large signs should be made re: oncoming exit and inside lane should be made into an exit lane only 1/2 way across Aurora Bridge. Entering/exiting SR 99 from Canlis Restaurant. Signage should be increased informing upcoming exit and inside lane be made an exit only road 1/4 mile from Canlis.
- comment: Widen and utilize "soft right" access from Queen Anne Drive onto 4th Ave N (northbound). "One way" access for Raye Street, Nob Hill Ave N, and 4th N (on north side). Deceleration lanes off SR 99 for North and southbound exits...acceleration lanes for both north and southbound on-ramp access to SR 99.

Raye/Halladay: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

comment: We live in the area affected and would like to be kept informed of any proposals and decisions regarding traffic in the area. We DO need an access to Aurora-North and South.

comment: Open up trees at Raye Street for better visibility.

comment: If the traffic is re-routed to Dexter, a number of bottlenecks will occur.

First, southbound bicyclists and vehicles on Dexter will either have to stop to allow Aurora traffic to merge onto Dexter at Dexter Way, or will have to cope with vehicles darting out between breaks in the traffic flow. I think this will greatly diminish the safety of cyclists using Dexter to get to town. This problem will re-occur as traffic turns left onto Sixth Ave North to gain access to the Aurora Bridge underpass next to Canlis. Since Dexter has a middle turn lane on this expanse of the road, Queen Anne bound motorists exiting Aurora may well monopolize the turn lane, thus backing up traffic on Dexter by northbound Dexter motorists also wishing to go to Queen Anne.

Second, I oppose the closure of southbound Raye Street exit. I think that there are other less drastic ways to address the problems posed by that intersection, and I think that the rerouting of traffic onto Dexter will just add new problems. A less drastic way to address the problem begins with the recognition that Aurora, southbound, is two lanes as it approaches the bridge span. At the beginning of the bridge, it expands into three lanes as traffic from Fremont Ave North merges onto Aurora. By keeping Aurora to two lanes for the expanse of the bridge, and by designating the far right (or western most) lane on the bridge span as a merge and right turn lane only, the problems created by back-up at the Raye Street exit can be mitigated. Alternately, the right lanes in both directions could be designated right turn only lanes from the Denny Street tunnel to the north end of the bridge span.

Raye/Halladay: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

Finally, the traffic on the Sixth Ave N underpass is already horrific during rush hour. By doubling the load of the underpass, I suspect traffic will back-up onto northbound Aurora at the Halladay Street exit. The traffic off of northbound Aurora does have the right-of-way, and this will aggravate the commute of those re-routed from southbound Aurora onto the underpass via Dexter. This routing will be even more congested when there are delays at the Fremont and/or Ballard bridges or when there are events at Seattle Center. It is vital to recognize that Aurora serves as a critical surface street as well as a state route. Better monitoring of vehicle speed will also mitigate accident prone areas or "hot spots."

comment: I have a great concern with the proposal to eliminate the Raye Street exit (SB off of Aurora Bridge) and then divert this traffic to the Dexter Way exit. This will result in a 900% increase in driving distance (1/10 mile vs. 1 mile) pulse will all of this additional traffic to an already congested Dexter Ave N. single lane road. This is a very poor solution for the residents of Queen Anne needing to exit the Aurora Bridge southbound, as well as those living and driving north of Dexter Ave N. Please refocus solutions to the root cause of the problem of not just creating a different problem. Thanks, Cameron Strong.

comment: Proposal for Improving SR 99 Aurora Bridge Off-Ramp and Queen Anne Drive/4th Ave N. Intersection. Situation: The seven-way intersection at Queen Anne Drive and 4th Ave N is unmanageable. Traffic gets backed-up onto southbound SR 99, Eastbound on Queen Anne Drive, as well as occasionally all the way back to Northbound SR 99. Cause: Seven-way stop sign, heavy traffic exiting SR 99 (North and South), heavy traffic exiting Queen Anne Hill for SR 99 North and South, traffic to and from Seattle Country Day school, and foot traffic before and after school.

Raye/Halladay: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

Proposal: The following streets become ONE-WAY: 4th Ave N, north of Queen Anne Drive (drive down the hill towards SCDS) becomes one-way northbound; Nob Hill Ave N. extension (aka Queen Anne Dr. N) at 4th Ave N. becomes one-way southbound; and 5th Ave N. extension (aka Raye Street) at Queen Anne S=Drive becomes one-way eastbound. A traffic light is installed at Queen Anne Drive and 4th Ave N with cross walk and smart sensor technology to control the flow of traffic on: Queen Anne Drive (east end west of the intersection), Raye Street (east of the intersection); and 4th Ave N (south of the intersection). The traffic light will have a dedicated green light to each of the four streets (the other three streets would have a red light) as needed to enable congestion to be relieved in critical areas (SR 99 off the Aurora Bridge, for instance). Therefore, anyone with the green light would be able to turn onto any of the seven streets without worrying about oncoming or cross traffic.

comment: I heard recently that someone was pushing for the closure of the right hand exit to Queen Anne at the south end of the Aurora Bridge after his son was killed at that location. I believe this is a drastic overreaction to this situation. I live on Queen Anne and this traffic revision would cause a lot of grief for a lot of people, including myself. I do think it is a dangerous spot, though, and that lesser actions could be taken to alert motorists to possible dangers. Instead of closure (at such a big cost and expense), why not consider installing warning lights and signage visible for the south-bound traffic flow (say perhaps from 150 yards out) that a dangerous slow-down may exist in the right hand lanes and to proceed with caution? I believe that this solution would be more appropriate than the extreme measure of closing the exit.

comment: Any construction or traffic diversion in Raye St/Dexter should be coordinated with the Fremont Bridge retrofit. (the Fremont bridge project might take up to a year). Traffic to Queen Anne that wants to avoid construction or the Dexter Route will try to divert through Fremont; if this happens during the Fremont Bridge retrofit, it will be a disaster.

Raye/Halladay: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: I we were adamant about re-routing motorists to Dexter, we need a bike/ped path off the bridge down to a new bike/ped route off of Westlake. Dexter is a very busy bike corridor now, with many bus/bike and car/bike problems. Adding more volume to a city-approved bike corridor seems bad, but at the very least how about an option: stairs from the ped/bike level on the bridge down to Westlake.
- comment: Very clever to leave the street trees off of the cross-section drawings and you wonder why we don't trust WSDOT.
- comment: As a resident of Queen Anne living on Raye Street, it concerns me that DOT is considering changes to this vital link between our community and a major north-south transit corridor. I would like to know what improvements the Dot seeks to make, and what specific steps are in mind to reach these goals. I should hope that the DOT is seriously contemplating the needs of our community before taking action that would increase traffic congestion in this area, or, simply move congestion to another location on Queen Anne.
- comment: I strongly oppose your plans to "fix" the intersection of Aurora and Raye Street. Please reconsider this change! This sounds like a terrible idea to me. I have lived just up the hill from that intersection for almost 16 years, and my husband and I use it daily. If a simple right turn is turned into the Rube Goldberg detour you describe, it will take a lot longer than 4 1/2 extra minutes if there is any traffic at all, and it will make it impossible to give anyone directions to our home if they are coming from the north. After the southbound exiting cars go "all around Robin Hood's barn" to get back to the underpass under Aurora, they will have the pleasure of merging with all the northbound traffic exiting by Canlis. This is already a major backup during rush hour--this idea will make it much worse. Everyone will be backed up in one line, instead of two. It will take forever to get to the north side of Queen Anne! This will be a total disaster for our neighborhood! It will also be more difficult to enter Aurora going southbound without the exiting traffic to run interference for those entering. If traffic is traveling too fast southbound on the Aurora Bridge, have you ever considered using signs on the bridge to warn drivers about the sharp right turn coming up and the resulting slower traffic? (This reminds me of the preference for traffic circles over stop signs; why not try the simpler and cheaper solution first?) The intersection of Aurora and Ray Street is busy, but it actually seems to work quite well.

Raye/Halladay: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

I hope that our scarce tax dollars will not be used to make our lives more inconvenient and difficult. Please don't fix something that is not broken!

- comment: I would cut through Fremont if the Queen Anne drive exit is closed--just adding to the over-crowded Fremont Bridge.
- comment: Very smart to leave the (non-existent) trees off the drawing. The non-median doesn't have them and the new median should only be wide enough to provide safety barrier (prevent head-ons) and not for a beautification project along this limited stretch of precious road width.
- comment: I strongly object to the closing of the Raye Street southbound exit on Aurora and routing all the traffic onto Dexter Avenue. If this study is a projection of future traffic demands, as an arterial Dexter Ave will also experience similar traffic increases at the same time as people avoid travel on Aurora. This traffic would be diverted across traffic through three traffic signals. The back-up of cars on Aurora will then be duplicated at each subsequent stop sign along the re-route past residences and apartment buildings that already have difficulty entering traffic during heavy volumes. Basically during these time entering resident traffic would be limited to a one-way direction. Dexter Ave also has bicycle lanes which add to the traffic hazards,
- comment: Diverting Queen Anne traffic to Dexter will have a huge impact on that neighborhood and street, particularly for the many bicyclists who use the bike lane on Dexter, how are you going to mitigate
- comment: Absolutely oppose taking away the Queen Anne exit. There will be a neighborhood sacrificed on a population headed to downtown. Believe that it should be an exit only lane (to reduce
- comment: I was at the last meeting concerning the possible closure of Raye St. exit from 99. One idea I heard was to limit the 7-way intersection east of the Raye St./99 exit, limiting this to a 5-way intersection. This idea sounds noble but for the majority of us that travel through this intersection daily I believe just eliminating the two streets will prove to have too small an impact on the traffic to be noticeable. Avoiding traffic accidents at or near the Raye/99 exit might best be solved by having a turn only lane on the north and south-bound lanes for approximately 100 yards before reaching this intersection.

Raye/Halladay: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

This would impact a few rush-hour and game-bound motorists, but these motorists are already impacted when they have to slow down for the exiting motorists. For a cost effective solution the concept of right-turn-only lanes seems to be very cheap compared to purchasing land, rights-of-ways, redesigning and constructing new roads. Also the right-only-turn lanes can easily be reversed back to the present traffic pattern. I'm a Queen Anne resident who commutes through this area twice daily.

comment: Make the right, southbound lane across aurora Bridge an exit-only lane onto Raye. Would make entry onto 99 Southbound from the same intersections safer. Do the same exit-only/entrance-only lanes in front of Canlis in the opposite direction. Also, better signage and tree trimming to improve visibility at SR 99 and Raye. I'm not sure a stop light at the 7-corner intersection will reduce transit time through the area.

comment: Closing the right turn at the South end of the bridge to Queen Anne will supply transfer problem from Aurora to Dexter. You will only move the bottleneck and send a lot of money to do it. It will result in Dexter and 6th Ave N. into holding pens for Queen Anne bound traffic.

comment: Exit only lane southbound on bridge should be high priority!!!

comment: The bike lanes on Dexter are designated as the route to downtown by the city. They are heavily used often requiring bikes to ride into the lane of traffic and traffic moving into the center turn lane--no more traffic on Dexter and no lights. They will not help bike commuters.

comment: I am very opposed to diverting or limiting access to Queen Anne off SR 99 northbound or Southbound at Raye Street or Canlis location. Forcing traffic heading South on Aurora to move over before the Raye Street exit would allow cars to enter Aurora more

comment: Raye Street/4th Ave N. Intersection signalization: I do think that signalization would help considerably in the near term. I also like the elimination of some of the streets which connect to this intersection. I think you could easily reduce the intersecting streets to four by eliminating access from the downhill portion of 4th Ave N road. This would keep the traffic pattern cleaner without infrequent and confusing access of traffic from the north.

Raye/Halladay: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

comment: The proposed changes to this exit have many serious and detrimental consequences for the neighborhoods east and west of Aurora, all drivers, traffic patterns and our environment. If one traveling east on Raye to enter Aurora Southbound, will no longer have the spacing to enter quickly moving traffic as vehicles exit west onto Raye Street. Either way, a backup of cars will increase west along the Queen Anne Drive Bridge creating more congestion and frustration. The other challenge for this approach is backup for the "Dexter diversion"--when competing to enter the line and are caught in a standstill and unable to safely enter traffic flow southbound. Those with a Queen Anne destination now are being forced to Dexter creating a huge negative impact on that community. It is more than just inconvenient with added time and distance, it is DANGEROUS. You are forced to cross southbound Dexter traffic to go northbound, merge into northbound traffic, only to have to cross southbound traffic again to head up to the Canlis area. Neither of these crossing points have any form of traffic regulators (lights, stop signs)--not that anyone accustomed to using those areas would be pleased at their addition or need for them. Heading toward the Canlis area the impact is on drivers who only wanted to head north onto Aurora. Traffic will be so backed up on Raye and underneath the bridge that northbound Aurora traffic will be effected, even if the destination isn't Queen Anne. All of the extra distance just adds to travel time and distance, congestion, extra gas use, more pollution, impossible during snow/icy conditions and no improvement to life. We need every available access to Queen Anne. Closing the Raye St. exit only burdens other streets already heavily traveled. Traffic flows both North and Southbound will be much more severely and adversely impacted with this proposed detour.

comment: As a long time resident (15 years) of Queen Anne Hill and frequent user of the exit/entry onto southbound SR-99 from Raye Street, I am aware of the congestion and dangers of this process. However, I think the idea of closing this exit/entry and requiring people to exit further south and access QA via Dexter is not a solution. I am in favor of the idea of making the southbound lane of SR-99 access the Aurora Bridge into an exit (right turn) only lane, which would make it safer to turn off and to enter Hwy 99 at Raye street. Also, some mechanism to facilitate westbound traffic on Raye would ease the traffic congestion at the 7-way stop.

Raye/Halladay: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: I oppose closure of Raye Street as exit for southbound traffic from Aurora.
- comment: Look where the accidents occur before inventing the wheel again. Fix Raye Street and Canlis on-ramp.
- comment: Also need light at Bridgeway to help left turns; like at N. 46th.
- comment: One idea I heard was to limit the 7-way intersection east of the Raye St./99 exit, limiting this to a 5-way intersection. This idea sounds noble but for the majority of us that travel through this intersection daily I believe just eliminating the two streets will prove to have too small an impact on the traffic to be noticeable. Avoiding traffic accidents at or near the Raye/99 exit might best be solved by having a turn only lane on the north and south-bound lanes for approximately 100 yards before reaching this intersection. This would impact a few rush-hour and game-bound motorists, but these motorists are already impacted when they have to slow down for the exiting motorists.

For a cost effective solution the concept of right-turn-only lanes seems to be very cheap compared to purchasing land, rights-of-ways, redesigning and constructing new roads. Also the right-only-turn lanes can easily be reversed back to the present traffic pattern.

I'm a Queen Anne resident who commutes through this area twice daily.

- comment: Need "free" lane to get on northbound at Bridgeway. The ramp works, you just cant see far enough for the speed of the traffic.
- comment: We need better, SAFER northbound access to SR 99 from Bridgeway. We need signal control at Bridgeway for those exiting SR 99 northbound at that location.
- comment: Exit-only lanes north and south off 99. Make 4th North one-way north (north of Dexter Ave)
- comment: Put underpass or tunnel on Ray Street "underneath" the 7 way stop.

Raye/Halladay: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

comment: Routing southbound Aurora traffic going to Queen Anne onto Dexter creates congestion all along this route. Re-distributing accidents and congestion. Dexter handles considerable bicycle and auto traffic. Making it difficult to exit residential drives and turn across traffic the back-ups of autos on Aurora will be repeated at each signal this traffic must negotiate along the new route. 3 signals with the new xxx& xxx lanes of traffic will be speeded up--more safeguards will be needed for pedestrian safety at crosswalks.

comment: I am writing regarding the Raye St. off ramp on SR 99 and the concurrent issue of accidents near Canlis on the other side of SR99.

At the very informative presentation at Seattle Country Day tonight, several issues were raised surrounding the need to fix the seven way stop where Raye meets 4th North.

Since the two tiny streets include almost no traffic it will probably make no difference if you make them one way.

Since Seattle Country Day gets out between 3 and 4:30, it is unlikely that making 4th North north of the intersection into a one way street will alter traffic flow during the time of peak problems, 5 - 7 pm, but this assumption should be tested.

Instead, please consider a light at the seven way stop that includes pressure pads to detect when the backup is about to reach SR99, either from the southbound or northbound directions. When those pads are triggered, adjust the lighting sequence to clear those lanes first to prevent a backup on to SR99. The pads should be placed to clear the lanes, permitting sufficient space for those exiting to decelerate and not rear end the back of the row of backed up cars on Raye.

Only if the traffic light system combined with the pads fails should other alternatives be considered.

If additional remedies are needed, please look into making the right-hand lane of SR99 going south coming off the Aurora bridge into a right turn only lane for some portion of the bridge to permit more gradual deceleration prior to exiting.

Raye/Halladay: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

I understand this does not address the problem of accidents next to Canlis, but I don't think any of the proposed solutions address that issue without acquiring the land from the Howard Johnson's to create the new lanes.

At the session, it was mentioned that signage is inexpensive. Please consider more signage for those traveling in both directions, perhaps even adding poles on the Aurora bridge is more signage is needed than the existing lampposts can support. The signage should address the tightness of the off ramps, the potential for backups that come close to the end of the off ramp. If possible, could the signs suggest that those heading south and not getting off at Raye move out of the right hand lane even if it is not made mandatory?

comment: Eliminating right turn at S. end of Aurora Bridge will cause more accidents because people will have to turn left at Dexter. Always more dangerous even with light.

comment: I agree with the following proposed solution possibilities relative to the traffic congestion problem at the 7 Corners area on the northwest part of Queen Anne Hill: 1. The Aurora Bridge has 6 lanes. Immediately designate the far right (southbound) lane across the Aurora Bridge as "Right Turn Only". This is an inexpensive "interim" solution to reducing the risk of accidents for those entering 99 southbound from Raye. 2. Create a separate turnoff lane at the south end of the Aurora Bridge so southbound traffic turning off on Raye St. would not congest the Aurora Bridge traffic. 3. Since approximately 75% of the traffic exiting the Aurora Bridge on Raye St. continues westbound, create a direct bypass for this traffic, so it does not have to stop at the 7 corners. 4. Another aid to the problem would be for the city to allow, during certain times of day, exiting traffic from Seattle Country Day School to use the lower part of 4th Avenue North (currently designated Local Traffic Only). If these solutions were implemented (focused on the root cause of the problem), it would eliminate creating other unacceptable problems associated with the current SR-99 Proposal. The DOT's proposal could significantly decrease the quality of life in our neighborhood.

Raye/Halladay: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

comment: It has come to my attention that there is a meeting coming up to discuss the southbound exit off the Aurora Bridge onto Q.A. I understand the DOT's solution is to have southbound traffic exit Aurora further south, so southbound traffic would have to exit onto Dexter, turn left, and double back under Aurora to get to north Queen Anne. I believe this to be an inappropriate solution to our traffic problem. In my experience it is always helpful to have the community drive the "solution" to a problem in its community. We live here, pay taxes here and ultimately we are the ones impacted, negatively or positively by your decisions. This detour is not an acceptable solution. The QA Community Council has opposed this plan, and a number of us have written letters. Please seriously consider this solution: Some neighbors of ours, believe the "root cause" of the traffic congestion problem is the 7 Corners area (which includes Raye St) and have proposed the following as an alternative: 1. The Aurora Bridge has 6 lanes. Immediately designate the far right (southbound) lane across the Aurora Bridge as Right Turn Only". This is an inexpensive "interim" solution to reducing the risk of accidents for those entering 99 southbound from Raye. 2. Create a separate turnoff lane at the south end of the Aurora Bridge so southbound traffic turning off on Raye St. would not congest the Aurora Bridge traffic. 3. Since approximately 75% of the traffic exiting the Aurora Bridge on Raye St. continues westbound, create a direct bypass for this traffic, so it does not have to stop at the 7 corners. If these solutions were implemented (focused on the root cause of the problem), it would eliminate creating the other unacceptable problems created by the current SR-99 Proposal.

comment: Since approximately 75% of the traffic exiting the Aurora Bridge on Raye St. continues westbound, create a direct bypass for this traffic, so it does not have to stop at the 7 corners. If these solutions were implemented (focused on the root cause of the problem), it would eliminate creating the other unacceptable problems created by the current SR-99 Proposal. I'm hopeful these "better" solutions to the real problem can be incorporated into SR 99 from Queen Anne easier, that will help backups everywhere.

comment: Create a separate turnoff lane at the south end of the Aurora Bridge so southbound traffic turning off on Raye St. would not congest the Aurora Bridge traffic.

Raye/Halladay: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: The Aurora Bridge has 6 lanes. Immediately designate the far right (southbound) lane across the Aurora Bridge as "Right Turn Only". This is an inexpensive "interim" solution to reducing the risk of accidents for those entering 99 southbound from Raye.
- comment: The 7-way stop is an efficient regulator most hours of the day, and it is technologically cheap. Plus, it encourages courtesy, a traffic virtue we could use more of.
- comment: Your statistics don't support shutting down the southbound exit off the bridge.
- comment: The proposed new off ramps/on-ramps are also a good idea, if for no other reason than safety, let alone traffic flow.
- comment: Routing southbound Aurora traffic going to Queen Anne onto Dexter creates congestion all along this re-route--redistributing accidents and congestion. Dexter handles considerable bicycle and auto traffic, making it difficult to exit residential drives and turns across traffic. The back-up of autos on Aurora will be repeated at each signal. This traffic must negotiate along the new route. 3 signals.
- comment: Situation: The seven-way intersection at Queen Anne Drive and 4th Avenue North is unmanageable. Traffic gets backed-up onto southbound SR99, Eastbound on Queen Anne Drive, as well as occasionally all the way back to Northbound SR99.

Cause: Seven-way stop sign, heavy traffic exiting SR99 (North and South), heavy traffic exiting Queen Anne Hill for SR99 North and South, traffic to and from Seattle Country Day school, and foot traffic before and after school.

Proposal: The following streets become ONE-WAY:

- Nob Hill Avenue N. Extension (a.k.a. Queen Anne Drive) at 4th Ave. N. becomes one-way south-bound; and,
- 5th Avenue N. Extension (a.k.a. Raye Street) at Queen Anne Drive becomes one-way east-bound.

Raye/Halladay: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

A five-way traffic light is installed at Queen Anne Drive, Raye Street, and 4th Avenue N. with crosswalk and smart sensor technology to control the flow of traffic on:

- Queen Anne Drive (east and west of the intersection);
- Raye Street (east of the intersection); and,
- 4th Avenue N.

The sensors would need to measure traffic load on each of the arterials approaching the intersection, and give priority to the most congested.

The traffic light will have a dedicated green light to each of the five streets (the other four streets would have a red light) as needed to enable congestion to be relieved in critical areas (SR99 off the Aurora Bridge, for instance). Therefore, anyone with the green light would be able to turn onto any of the seven streets without worrying about oncoming or cross traffic.

I believe that this would alleviate the traffic congestion at the intersection as well as backing-up onto north-bound and south-bound SR-99.

comment: Explore alternative (new) exits off southbound SR 99 to alleviate pressure on Raye St. exit.

comment: My only direct access to my home is from 99 southbound turning onto Raye Street then right at 4th North. I cannot have my only access taken away. I already have to drive through the neighborhood to get home. Any other way as my street is a Do Not Enter from the bottom. I do not feel like accommodating Seattle County Day. This is a neighborhood, not an express lane for SCD. They do not care about the residents or the commotion they cause. I don't want my street turned into the traffic congestion; it simply is not fair or right.

comment: I use the access on and off Aurora at the south end of the Aurora Bridge several times daily. The idea of blocking the southbound exit off of 99 onto Queen Anne seems to be a non-starter for me and one I would be opposed to making a change here, particularly at peak hours or move specifically in evening peaks.

Raye/Halladay: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: Access to the top of the hill is already overcrowded. Adding southbound traffic to northbound traffic coming onto the hill is beyond comprehension. I travel Aurora a lot. Southbound from the bridge to Raye, I've seldom been obstructed. Northbound is constant crawl. The only thing needed is a good flashing sign with the contour of the turn marked. Please don't maroon us. Making a better right turn lane to Raye would also help. A real trial of making the curb lane right-turn only on the Aurora Bridge to Ray Street and from aurora to Halladay should be tried. This would also make Aurora access safer from Raye to Aurora South and onto SR 99 North at Canlis.
- comment: Let Seattle Country Day School exit northward on 4th Ave N.!
- comment: Keep Raye Street Open--2-way.
- comment: I have a "great concern" with the proposal to eliminate the Ray Street exit and then divert this traffic to the Dexter Way exit. This will result in a 900% increase in driving distance (1/1th mile vs. 1 mile) plus with all of this additional traffic to an already congested Dexter Ave N. single lane road. This is a very poor solution for the residents of Queen Anne needingn to exit the Aurora Bridge southbound, as well as those living and driving north on Dexter Ave N. Please re-focus solutions to the root cause of the problem, and not just create a different problem.
- comment: The easiest and most cost effective plan would be making the far right-hand lane "turn only" for a certain distance north and southbound on SR 99 at the exit at Ray and Canlis. At the meeting tonight, 12-4-02, it seems the majority of the room favored this option. Others I've spoke to also favored this option.
- comment: Better solution--make right lane exit-only--doesn't reduce capacity and makes it better for cars entering as going out. And doesn't make it harder to get to Queen Anne.
- comment: The proposed new off-ramps/on ramps are also a good idea if for no other reason than safety let along traffic flow.
- comment: Explore making 4th North toward SCD's one way downhill, changing current one-way uphill designation for lower 4th North.

Raye/Halladay: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: Love the idea of directing Seattle Country Day traffic away from the 7-legged intersection. Make 4th one-way going north and re-route traffic to Dexter. Also, if you make access to SR 99 from Queen Anne easier, that will help back-ups everywhere.
- comment: Improve signage southbound before Raye Street exit to alert divert to turn at the severe degree of turn.
- comment: Bike lanes! Not sidewalks!
- comment: Do not close off ramp going south on SR 99 to Raye!
- comment: Please do not consider taking away the exit ramp to Queen Anne Hill from the south end of the Aurora Bridge. 70+ people attended to protect our exit ramp.
- comment: Right hand southbound lane on bridge should be exit lane for right turn on Raye Street. Should be ??? traffic signals at 6-way intersection to control flow of traffic. Right turn northbound by Canlis onto Aurora needs to be studied ?? there. Have many rear (end) accidents at that location. DEXTER AVE IS NOT AN
- comment: Do not close Raye Street exit. Please do have a mandatory right turn lane from Aurora Southbound to Raye Street.
- comment: We took a vote--all for yield signs on Halladay at 4th N. Absolutely not a traffic circle. On a hill can be ice. Accepted route--accidents statistics not accurate all know outsiders from short streets.
- comment: All proposals need to show bike/access/bike lanes. If the southbound exit off of Aurora Bridge is closed, must add bike lanes from sidewalk to 7-way intersection (Raye/Queen Anne
- comment: Queen Anne drive/6th, Raye must be widened to accommodate bicycles from Dexter up or under Canlis/99 to Queen Anne is already to tight now--and increased volumes would only make it worse for bicyclists.
- comment: Make 99 South between N. 38th on-ramp and Raye Street off ramp a merge/exit only lane.

Topic: Sidewalk

Location: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

comment: Eliminate sidewalks south of Green Lake.

Location: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

comment: My part of Aurora will probably never be a "pedestrian friendly" part of town. At night, we have our share of drug dealers and prostitutes. We need more street lights and police patrols. The costs far outweighs any benefit that we would receive by a more friendly sidewalk. The neighbors on either side of me are motels and a towing yard. I don't think that they are interested in walk in traffic either.

comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: sidewalks already existing should remain unchanged.

comment: The NW corner of Winona and Aurora is a tough corner for pedestrians. The sidewalk is cut back so cars and buses can turn off Aurora quickly. There isn't much curb for safety.

comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: Sidewalks exist on both sides of Aurora and should remain the same.

Location: North (N. 110th St. to N.)

comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: (eastside). Between 135th and 137th no changes; sidewalks already exists.

comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: (westside). Between 115th to 125th--we suggest 6-foot sidewalks with no landscaping. In area of 122nd (Les Schwab) sidewalks should be reconfigured to 6 feet.

comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: (eastside). Between 140th and 145th--we suggest 6-foot sidewalks with no landscaping.

comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: (eastside). 137th and 140th--we suggest in-fill sidewalks to match existing sidewalks.

Sidewalk: North (N. 110th St. to N.)

- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: (westside). Between 125th and 130th--we suggest 6-foot sidewalks with no landscaping. In the area of 125th to 127th (Lowe's) sidewalks should be reconfigured to 6 feet as they currently extend into the right-of-way.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: (eastside). Between 130th and 135th a very short segment of sidewalk missing--it should match existing sidewalks to the south including landscaping.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: (eastside). Between 116th and 130th we recommend 6-foot sidewalk with no planting.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: (eastside). Between 115th and 116th sidewalk to match existing Home Depot sidewalk excluding trees.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: (westside). From 130th to 135th--we suggest 6-foot sidewalks with no landscaping. Sidewalks at Starbucks and Wells Fargo to be reconfigured.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: Sidewalks already existing on east side to remain--any added sidewalks needed to conform to existing sidewalks.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: Sidewalks already exist on west side and should remain
- comment: Lanes should be more narrow; more room for sidewalks less land taken from development potential.
- comment: Response to "More sidewalks are a great thing but merchants have to help with safe walkways through their parking lots." Five to six feet wide is more than enough. Safety of the amenity strip is a cruel delusion.
- comment: More sidewalks are a great thing but merchants have to help with safe walkways through their parking lots.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: Pedestrian improvements should be improved sidewalk in-fill.

Sidewalk: North (N. 110th St. to N.)

- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: (westside). From 141st to 143rd--we suggest 6-foot sidewalk. Eliminate 3-foot planter at Holiday Inn on street side and replace with additional plantings on property side.
- comment: Recommendations of in-fill sidewalks, beginning on the west side of Aurora Ave between 130th and 145th as a beginning point with future recommendations of in-fill sidewalks on the east side of Aurora Ave in the same vicinity (135th to 145th). Said sidewalks to be in-fill only to accommodate already existing sidewalks but shall not exceed 6' with all planting area to be on the property side of the sidewalk so that visible access for public safety remains a viable option. Trees, if any, that may be required shall be on the property side of the sidewalk so that uniformity is common rather than a "hodge-podge" of landscaping that may drastically effect public safety aspects of this "Aurora Corridor".
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: (westside). From 135th to 137th--we suggest 6-foot sidewalk with no landscaping.
- comment: Provide for street tree placement between sidewalks and curb. Rationale: Unless all utilities are to be underground, there is no logical reason to deny street trees in the area of utility poles. Both poles and trees placed between the sidewalk and curb provide some protections to pedestrians, even when the parking lane is used for moving vehicles.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: (westside). From 137th to 141st--we suggest 6-foot sidewalk. On property at 137th, we suggest sidewalk be configured and planting to be allowed behind sidewalk (on property side).
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: In-fill sidewalks should allow pedestrian movement.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: Crosswalk at 140th to be changed to pedestrian activated signal, or at Sea-Tran's recommendation, an underpass.
- comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: (westside). From 143rd to 145th existing 6-foot sidewalk to

Location: **Sidewalk: General Location**

- comment: No sidewalks.
- comment: Put in walkways--continuous for pedestrians.
- comment: Sidewalks are not used much even when good. To spend money on sidewalks is a waste compared to other road benefits.
- comment: Sidewalks, Sidewalks, Sidewalks! Regular sidewalks physically set off from the road on or by real curbs!
- comment: Better side-walks are needed in some sections too.
- comment: Ensure that the utility posts are not placed in the sidewalk right-of-way.
- comment: Require developers to install at minimum ten foot wide sidewalks extending through the Aurora Avenue frontage of their property.
- comment: Do not narrow existing sidewalks from their current width.
- comment: Study pedestrian walkways and potential for continuous pedestrian walkways on both east and west sides of Aurora Ave.
- comment: Approve of sidewalk build out as private property is redeveloped.
- comment: Study the effects of sidewalk design on crime suppression. Criminal activity has been mentioned by WSDOT as a factor that the study cannot address. The lack of continuous sidewalks discourages pedestrians. Rationale: the Aurora Ave blocks which lack pedestrian traffic are favorable to solicitation for prostitution, curbside drug retailing, and other more violent crimes that accompany those activities. Prostitution spreads HIV/Aids, Hepatitis, and other diseases. Continuous, illuminated pedestrian facilities encourage a flow of lawful pedestrians and make crime suppression measures more practical.

Topic: Speed Limit

Location: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

comment: Even semi-trucks use Stone; they go too fast.

Location: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)

comment: Speed limit signs in the Green Lake area should be moved so their relationship with the pedestrian crosswalk makes more sense.

comment: At the crosswalk between 68th and 70th; it defies all logic that speed limit increases north of it rather than south; this is last pedestrian crossing until Denny.

comment: Implement photo radar operated by technicians, not officers. SPD obviously is not enforcing limit even north of Winona. Drivers go past my bus stop at 50 mph or more, and the right lane is the fastest.

comment: Traffic needs to be slowed down adjacent to Greenlake. Traffic flow averages 50-55 mph from downtown to Winona. Increasing flow with synchronized lights will add to this problem if speed enforcement is not part of this package. This is a residential area not a limited access freeway!!

Location: North (N. 110th St. to N.)

comment: Who enforces speed limits and wild illegal drivers? Sheriff or SPD? Some jurisdiction should enforce.

Location: General Location

comment: Don't be afraid to enforce speed limits. Slower=safest and quieter. Don't "be afraid" to keep right except to pass, especially when "pulling a train."

comment: Auto accidents are probably due to slow speed 10 mph-28mph on Aurora.

comment: Speed Limits: Speed limits should be revised to the 85th percentile free flow speed. In no case should a speed limit that falls below the 67th percentile or above the 90th percentile free flow speed be allowed to remain.

Speed Limit: General Location

- comment: Traffic Speeds: My observations (as a driver) of traffic speeds through this corridor lead me to believe that the 85th percentile speeds are 50 to 55 mph between Battery Street and Green Lake and 45 to 50 north of Green Lake when the signal progression is good and the parking prohibitions are in effect. I am fairly certain that the vertical profile of this corridor meets stopping sight distance for 50 mph (6" object method). The original speed limit from the old city limits at 85th Street to Rucker Street in Everett was probably 50 mph. It still is for six or seven miles between Meadowdale and Everett Mall Way.
- comment: One aspect of the article is that apparently a lot of people may believe increased speed will move more vehicles than at a lower speed. Fifty five years ago at the U of WA a professor mentioned to his class more vehicles would move at 22 mph on a road than any other speed. This might still be valid.
- comment: Actively enforce laws re: speeding, lights, reckless/aggressive driving during rush hour. Actively keep to right if you aren't passing and long open road is in front of you, and cars are collecting behind you.

Topic: Transit

Location: South (Aloha St. to N. 50th)

- comment: Move bus stop on 99 S. further south. (At Canlis?)
- comment: Recognize that traffic will compound in years to come and that new transit N-S access must be developed.
- comment: Recently, Metro transit did a survey to see whether we qualify for a bus shelter at the stop in front of our building. They determined that an average of 45 people use that bus stop each day. That would be at least 45 people who would use an overpass close to our building, for the return bus trips. There is no way that a daily average of 45 people would use an overpass at Garfield Street. I'll bet only a handful would ever use it. There are no businesses there on either side of the highway. Now, right next door to us, there are two nearly abandoned buildings, and I believe a modest sum of money could empty them quickly. Directly across the street are a set of steps which lead from Aurora down to a cul de sac of Crocket Street, which intersects with Dexter Way where a grocery is located.
- comment: Take the bus stop away from Canlis; put further south.
- comment: We are located on the section of the highway that is divided. It makes bus service to our building difficult and dangerous. We have to walk a couple of long blocks north to the Lynn Street stop to use the Dexter Way underpass to reach the northbound buses. The poorly lit walk is alongside abandoned buildings, woods where drunks and drug users live, and a business which routinely blocks both the sidewalk and parking strip with vehicles. Walking to the bus, I have been solicited for prostitution by men in cars. One of our female residents was raped in the woods next to that underpass when she was coming back from the bus, and our residents have heard gunshots down there.
- comment: Please put in a southbound bus lane between N. 46th at the Aurora bridge.
- comment: Bus #358; stop at Aloha Inn at Crockett.

Location: **Transit: Central (N. 50th St. to N.)**

- comment: If there are significantly more accidents in the northbound BAT lane than where there are 3 general traffic lanes, why in earth would you create the same problem southbound?
- comment: Provide some buffer between sidewalks and the street. This is important, since the curb lane north of North 105th Street may be a future Metro Transit BRT lane.
- comment: Provide convenient transit stops on Aurora to serve zoo visitors.
- comment: N. 95th St metro bus stop doesn't have a stop light; need one ASAP!
- comment: Don't take away general traffic capacity for unneeded bus lanes.
- comment: We don't need more bus lanes, the only time the buses are efficiently used is during commute rush hour, at other times, the buses are practically empty and loss of a general traffic lane will just create more general traffic congestion and lead to more road rage and accidents.
- comment: Another concern we have is that you will not take away general traffic capacity for unneeded bus lanes. At peak travel time the buses move a lot of commuters along Aurora, but the rest of the time, the buses are practically empty.
- comment: They wait until they can cross the curb lane (HOV marking) increasing jeopardy of being T-bones by someone coming up the HOV/BAT lane unimpeded.
- comment: Provide convenient transit stops on Aurora to serve zoo visitors.
- comment: Response to "Should be no opposition to BAT lanes SB N. 59th to N. 50th Streets since there are no businesses in this area." " Except that it removes 1/3 of the traffic carrying capacity and people wont merge from the curb lane--just watch." "However the curb lane disappears south of the 200.
- comment: Should be no opposition to BAT lanes SB N. 59th to N. 50th Streets since there are no businesses in this area.
- comment: Response to "Should be no opposition to BAT lanes SB N. 59th to N. 50th Streets since there are no businesses in this area." " Except that it removes 1/3 of the traffic carrying capacity and people wont merge from the curb lane--just watch.

Location: **Transit: North (N. 110th St. to N.)**

- comment: Congestion will not be relieved by converting an existing lane into a bus-only lane. Especially when there is only 1 bus route that goes up/down Aurora. For proof, just look at the congestion on N99 between N. 125th to N. 145th.
- comment: I see the problem being more one of more visible signage and better enforcement. The shoulder lane is considered by most as a carpool lane, not a transit only lane. I would tend to believe that only a fraction of all accidents in this area involve transit vehicles. Better signage would educate people of the restrictions. The next step should be better enforcement of the transit-only law. I see very few citations written for this infraction.
- comment: Transit Lane: The current transit lane between the cemetery and 145th Street is not marked correctly. The pavement is marked with diamonds rather than with "transit only." All intersections should have signs "Right lane MUST turn right except transit." Should this lane ever be reopened to other HOV traffic (it was previous to 1995) all non-signalized left turns must be prohibited in area with traffic backups. The worst place for this is 115th Street during evening rush hour. Many non-transit vehicle proceed through the intersection in the transit lane rather than turning right. Southbound motorists make left turns on a flashing amber light through stopped traffic in the northbound through lanes and get clobbered by transit lane violators. Perhaps there should be no permissive signal phase for southbound left turners during the evening rush.
- comment: Response to "Since there is an amount of opposition to bus improvements, then eliminate RT 358 totally and move resources to Rt's 5 and 16 instead." SUV's & elderly won't make U-turns in one motion. Not to mention trucks--where will they go---guess!
- comment: Don't take away general traffic capacity for unneeded bus lanes. I understand that buses move a lot of commuters along Aurora during peak travel time, but at all other times buses are practically empty along Aurora. There is no point in reducing general traffic capacity on Aurora to give precedence to empty buses.
- comment: Response to "Since there is an amount of opposition to bus improvements, then eliminate RT 358 totally and move resources to Rt's 5 and 16 instead." Very dangerous, most accidents are non rear-enders.

Transit: North (N. 110th St. to N.)

- comment: Response to "Since there is an amount of opposition to bus improvements, then eliminate RT 358 totally and move resources to Rt's 5 and 16 instead." Move time in sequence for U-turns due to traffic forged from 2-way lane.
- comment: Transit should be high priority, in particular the transit lane from 85th to 145th.
- comment: Response to "Since there is an amount of opposition to bus improvements, then eliminate RT 358 totally and move resources to Rt's 5 and 16 instead." Route 41 has it all over RT 358.
- comment: Response to "Since there is an amount of opposition to bus improvements, then eliminate RT 358 totally and move resources to Rt's 5 and 16 instead." We need a way to have bus riders not get stuck in SOV traffic, or they might prefer their SOV's.
- comment: Response to "Since there is an amount of opposition to bus improvements, then eliminate RT 358 totally and move resources to Rt's 5 and 16 instead." Policies overflow blocks east lane?
- comment: Since there is an amount of opposition to bus improvements, then eliminate RT 358 totally and move resources to Rat's 5 and 16 instead.
- comment: Response to "Since there is an amount of opposition to bus improvements, then eliminate RT 358 totally and move resources to Rt's 5 and 16 instead." Very dangerous, most accidents are non rear-enders.
- comment: Since there is an amount of opposition to bus improvements, then eliminate RT 358 totally and move resources to Rt's 5 and 16 instead.
- comment: The existing transit lane is the real accident problem. Feel that very few people actually use the lane as it is signed (i.e. they do not turn at the first access point after entering the lane).
- comment: Do not create BAT lane! If parking is to be eliminated, it should be for a general purpose lane. This will make cars better than a lane designated for ONE bus route running every 20 minutes. Several of us use the right lane now; in between cars. Taking 2 general lanes away only makes congestion worse.
- comment: If we get transit moving faster, more people will take it.

Transit: North (N. 110th St. to N.)

comment: If you really cared about safety on Aurora Avenue, you would remove the BAT lane northbound. It is a major cause of accidents and does not improve mobility in the least.

Location: General Location

comment: Street trees have nothing to do with safety and inhibit business visibility. We encourage low, drought-and-traffic-resistant shrubbery along Aurora, but big trees hide signs, ruin sidewalks,

break sewer lines and offer shelter to prostitute and drug

comment: People need to be made aware that this is a long-term vision. Bus service along Aurora is going to increase. Right now, there are not enough buses to meet demand between downtown and N. Seattle. Business owners who are pitted against Metro are effectively involved in a white collar/blue collar dispute. Working class people need a voice....and need access (fiscal and physical) to and from their homes and jobs. We have to prepare for the increased service, not fight against it.

comment: Also, BAT lanes reduce existing capacity (see WSDOT nine point letter) so lets eliminate them.

comment: No BAT lane; reduces capacity.

comment: Pleased to see bus shelters mentioned but as they are termed "select"; guess the AAMA is still opposing them.

comment: Position paper in regard to North Aurora (SR 99) Planning Study: In its current configuration, Aurora Avenue has only three lanes in each direction at the most. The current bus-only lanes that runs from 115th to 145th on the east side is actually the shoulder of the road, so it does not take away from the traffic capacity of the regular lanes. Any idea that a dedicated bus lane should be put on Aurora in either direction would cut traffic capacity by ONE THIRD. This does not improve mobility. Most non-peak hour buses traveling along Aurora are practically empty.

comment: Strongly support BAT lanes in both directions at least during the peak times.

Transit: General Location

- comment: Designating one precious lane on 99 for the sole purpose of a single bus route and right-turning traffic is an entire waste of money and a lane!!! If parking is to be limited, the lane should be opened to all. This is the only way to move cars!!! Several of us use the right lane now--in between parked cars. Taking it away only makes the problem worse!!
- comment: Designating one precious lane on SR 99 for the sole purpose of a single bus route and right-turning traffic is an entire waste of money and a lane. If parking is to be limited, the lane should be opened to all. This is the only way to move cars! Several of us use the right lane now--in between parked cars. Taking it away only makes the problem worse.
- comment: Creating a BAT lane for 1 bus route that runs every 20 min. is a complete waste of a lane and money.
- comment: BAT lanes will move a lot more people than allow the other lanes on Aurora once they are implemented. Let's get these implemented ASAP so we've got an alternative in the 99 corridor.
- comment: 2,100 feet of lane wasted.
- comment: Until bus headways are so frequent that the proposed BAT lanes are full of buses, it is a bad idea to have bus-only BAT lanes (I often follow the bus up the right lane to get past the drivers who insist on driving slowing the middle plus left lanes) requiring the cars to move from the BAT lanes for oncoming transit and otherwise make use of the capacity and at 25mph average and 10 min. interval, there is one bus every four miles.
- comment: Also, BAT lanes reduce existing capacity...see WSDOT nine point letter so let's eliminate them.
- comment: Need every 10 minute xxx on route 358 weekdays/Saturdays, 15 min. Sundays, but may not happen, thanks to xxxx council and their 40%/40%/20% split within King County, Seattle getting the smaller split and eastside/S. King getting more to run empty buses in the suburbs.
- comment: Regarding BAT lanes or transit-only lanes; what about people traveling north and south on Aurora who are not commuting to work? Such as shopping, etc....they need good traffic flow also.
- comment: Will there be more frequent buses if a BAT lane is proposed?

Transit: General Location

- comment: Why make extensive changes to traffic flow for one bus line and only 3,500 passengers each way a day? Improvements to facilitate 14,000 cars a day makes much more sense.
- comment: Instead of spending money on this project, spend it on monorail and rapid transit. Very few buses out there on Aurora N.
- comment: I understand that buses move many commuters along Aurora during peak travel time. During non-peak hours those buses are practically empty. General traffic capacity should not be reduced on Aurora in order to give precedence to empty buses.
- comment: We need 5 minute bus service on Aurora all day--everyday.
- comment: Don't take away general traffic capacity for unneeded bus lanes.
- comment: Is the TSC (or anyone) looking at signal delay grades? One of the high points from my work on Aurora in Shoreline was the group realization that roadway capacity and signal throughput could and should be measured in movement of people and goods instead of movement of vehicles. Is Seattle/WSDOT looking at devoting right of way to BAT lanes to free transit vehicles from most general purpose traffic?
- comment: Bus fare inequity. Riding downtown is one-zone riding N. the same distance or less is 2-zone. I find that annoying especially when I forget its peak hour.
- comment: A BAT lane will reduce capacity and lower LOS over existing 6-lane operations.
- comment: Looks like the BAT lanes will speed up my trip by bus on Aurora. We need BAT lanes on more streets in Seattle...how about 99 Lake City Way and one of the East-West Streets (50th or 45th)
- comment: People need to be made aware that this is a long-term vision. Bus service along Aurora is going to increase. Right now, there are not enough buses to meet demand between downtown and N. Seattle. Business owners who are pitted against Metro are effectively involved in a white collar/blue collar dispute. Working class people need a voice and need access (fiscal and physical) to and from their homes and jobs we have to prepare for the increased service, not fight against it.

Transit: General Location

comment: How will the BAT lane improve auto access to Aurora southbound from N. 50th St? PRCC plan seeks to encourage more access to Aurora N. 50th arterial rather than residential streets between N. 64th and N. 59th. Will BAT lane inhibit merge because there will be more congestion on remaining thru lanes?

comment: Could buses activate green lights for themselves?

comment: Where do bicyclists ride if there are BAT lanes? These exist on Lake City Way and bicyclists are forced to choose between riding in the BAT lane or the middle lane. Neither is a good choice. Don't make it worse for bicycles.