Trans-Lake Washington Project
Washington State Department of Transportation
Sound Transit

MEETING SUMMARY

TRANS-LAKE WASHINGTON PROJECT
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND INDUSTRY, SEATTLE, WA
OCTOBER 25, 2000 - 1:00 TO 4:30 P.M.

WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, welcomed the committee and reviewed the agenda. No changes were made. The purpose of the meeting is was to discuss and agree on the results of the first level screening, as recommended by the Technical and Advisory Committees. The second level screening criteria would also be discussed and agreed upon.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Henry Paulman, TRUST, commented that the upcoming discussion is one in which tolls may be a key element. He urged the committee to recognize that I-247 prohibits tolling on existing roadways and left the initiative as part of the record.

Philip Grega, 1902 Second Ave, Seattle, spoke as a citizen concerned with transportation issues. He suggested that the committee consider the use of parking taxes to generate mode shifts as part of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) solutions.

REVIEW AND AGREE ON FIRST LEVEL SCREENING

Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, presented a graphic more clearly outlining the second level screening process and the two stages. No questions were raised about the graphic. He then presented the results of the first level screening. He explained again that the screening results have been evaluated modally. Referring to a summary chart, he said that those identified in blue came from the Trans-Lake Study Committee (TLSC) recommendations and those in yellow are recommended to be screened out. He briefly reviewed each of the highway and high occupancy vehicle (HOV) alternatives. The committee discussed the alternatives with the following points raised.

A1 – No Action

This alternative must be considered as part of the EIS. There was no discussion

HIGHWAY ALTERNATIVES

B1 – Minimum Footprint
B2 – HOV Lanes
B3 – GP and HOV Lanes

No significant discussion followed the briefing of the above four alternatives, each of which had received a 'yes' recommendation from both the staff and the technical committee. These alternatives were approved by the Executive Committee with no objections.

Dan Becker suggested that a double deck solution could add capacity and maintain a minimum footprint. If this is not a possibility, then the minimum footprint alternative should be redefined or renamed. Jeff Peacock stated that the intent of minimum footprint was that no additional vehicular capacity would be added.

B4 – GP Lanes

Points raised include:

- This alternative is inconsistent with other planning and work going on. It was explicitly looked at and rejected in the previous process. Including it would threaten hopes of compromise.
- It might be useful to leave it in as a separate element, so as to decide the relative benefits and impacts of additional GP lanes, and therefore be able to compare them to benefits of other alternatives. A discrete analysis of GP lanes benefits can not be deduced from the combination of B2-HOV lanes and B3-GP and HOV lanes, because the effects of combinations of GP and HOV lanes are not additive. It has been demonstrated that the adding an HOV lane to GP lanes increases traffic on the GP lanes.
- There would be some benefit in knowing what GP lanes accomplish discretely and separately from combination with other types of lanes.

The committee voted not to carry forward the 'yes' recommendation with only nine votes for the 'yes' recommendation, 7.8 votes against, and 1 abstention.

B5 – Bus and Vanpool only lanes

As a point of clarification, Jeff Peacock stated that for project purposes HCT is defined as a dedicated facility – a barrier-separated facility or a fixed guideway. B5 indicates only a paint-stripe separated facility.

Points raised include:

- There was some discussion about including B5 as an option within B2 – HOV lanes. Performance would be significantly different from an HOV lane so the project team felt it warranted separate evaluation.
- It may be less effective than B2 so it should not be considered.

- There is a Seattle City Council Resolution stating that no additional capacity into the city shall be added except as bus only or HOV. This alternative respects that resolution.
- Some felt it could be removed as long as it was analyzed as an element of B2. Others felt it should be studied separately, since it wouldn't get adequate analysis in combination.
- Most support HCT. If Sound Transit (ST) does not come to the eastside then express bus lanes could be of value. The option of having express bus lanes may be worth looking at.

The committee agreed to carry forward the 'yes' recommendation with 11 votes for the 'yes' recommendation, and 6.8 votes against.

B6 - HOV Tunnel

The 'no' recommendation was approved with no objections.

B7 – New Freeway and Bridge

The 'no' recommendation was approved with no objections.

B8 – New 4-Lane Arterial Bridge

Points raised include:

- This is the only alternative that provides more general purpose capacity what we have and would increase cross-lake mobility without adding to the 520 corridor.
- Location of the new crossing was discussed - Sandpoint to Kirkland or closer to 85th and the I-405 connection.
- The Trans-Lake Study Committee didn't recommend it because of its potentially significant impacts on the environment and built communities on both sides of the lake. Neither the Advisory committee nor the Technical Committee recommended moving it forward. SR 520 would still need attention even if this alternative were passed.
- A suggestion was made for a new crossing alignment from Sand Point to 85th on the Eastside. It could be a backdoor into Microsoft, it could serve as an arterial, and a tunnel could be constructed as a mitigation measure while addressing Endangered Species Act (ESA) issues. Property takes might be fewer than with an expanded SR-520. A response to this suggestion was that the Technical and Advisory Committees should take a look such an option before being recommended by the Executive Committee.
- This alternative would take vehicles off freeways, since it would be an arterial. It could enhance reliability by providing another corridor for travel.
- Travel demand would require three lanes in each direction.
- The feasibility of an arterial in the already heavily congested Sand Point – UW corridor would be severely limited. Kirkland is also looking at changes that will limit the number of cars that drive through the downtown area.

The committee approved the 'no' recommendations, with only three members in favor of a 'yes' recommendation.

B9 – Close SR 520 Interchanges between I-5 and I-405

The possibility of closing select interchanges will be considered as an option within other alternatives. The 'no' recommendation was approved with no objections.

B10 – Modify HOV Operations

The 'no' recommendation was approved with no objections.

B11 – Lane Conversion

The 'no' recommendation was approved with no objections.

HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT (HCT) ALTERNATIVES

Jeff Peacock briefly described the High Capacity Transit (HCT) alternatives. The committee discussed the alternatives with the following points raised for each alternative.

C3 – Mid-Lake Corridor (between SR 520 and I-90)

Jeff Peacock explained that the Technical Committee gave this alternative a 'yes' recommendation since it connects major population centers in the area. With the current discussions and uncertainty of HCT on I-90, the connection with the Sound Transit Link light rail line and potential need for system balancing, and the potential that the existing downtown Seattle tunnel may not have the needed capacity, the Committee felt there would be some merit to understanding this alternative better. Sound Transit also would like to look at the alternative more closely.

- Looking at the long term, it might be a good thing to consider this corridor across the lake, especially if there will be perpetual problems with I-90 and SR-520. There may also be technological problems with putting HCT on either of the bridges.
- Sound Transit would also have another option to reshape its long-range vision.
- A suggestion was submitted to consider the SR-522 corridor and its potential for two HCT lanes.
- There were seven objections to approving this recommendation.
- This doesn't seem like a realistic option. There are no natural corridors connecting the two downtown regions. The distance between downtown Bellevue and SR-520 would be easier to bridge. Handling traffic through the University District would be easier than creating a new corridor.
- There is not enough information to definitively screen out the alternative. A compromise position could be to recommend further analysis and have staff return with a more detailed recommendation.

The Technical Committee suggested looking at this alternative to the level of detail of the Study Committee. The project team will do additional analysis and bring it back to the Executive Committee for further consideration

The committee decided to postpone a decision on C3 until more information is received in February.

C4.1 New North Lake Corridor: Sand Point to Juanita/Kirkland
C4.2 New North Lake Corridor: Madison to Kirkland

The 'no' recommendations were approved with no objections.

TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM) / TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT (TSM) /LAND USE AND OTHER ALTERNATIVES

Jeff Peacock briefly described each of the alternatives and the Technical and Advisory Committee recommendations.

D1 – Increase effectiveness / investment in TDM

Nona Ganz, City of Kirkland, pointed out that the Advisory Committee asked to separate land-use into another alternative D2, and asked for clarification. Jeff Peacock stated that the initial work done with land-use should be understood independently of other demand management strategies.

The 'yes' recommendation was approved with no objections. The alternative will be combined, however, with other alternative options.

E1 – Passenger Ferry
E2 – Arterial Connections

The 'no' recommendations were approved with no objections. Ferries will continue to be studied independently of the Trans-Lake Project. The arterial connections will be looked at as part of the design of each interchange area. Neither will be carried as separate alternatives.

DISCUSSION AND AGREEMENT ON PROPOSED SECOND-LEVEL SCREENING CRITERIA

Jeff Peacock presented an overview of the effectiveness criteria for second level screening as presented in the Technical Memo regarding Alternatives Analysis – Draft Screening Process and Criteria.

The committee discussed the proposed criteria with the following points noted:

- An analysis should be carried out on total transit ridership rather than just on the study area transit ridership.
- There is a need to distinguish between total transit ridership and new transit riders, in order to see the modal shifts.
- Forecasting on transit ridership should be further into the future.
- Are the bands of uncertainties in the projections or specific points?
- Though there will be ranges and some errors in projections, errors will be consistent across all the predictions.

The changes recommended by the Technical Committee on the second level screening criteria for effectiveness were presented as follows*:*

- Use trend analysis including an interim date such as 2010, as well as 2020
- Add person miles and person hours traveled.
- Include system continuity <u>and</u> connectivity for the transportation systems (freeway, arterials, and HCT)
- Reference compatibility with plans <u>and</u> projects in the region. Delete specific reference to Sound Transit Long Range Vision

Lorie Parker presented an overview of the environmental impacts section of the second level screening.

The committee discussed the proposed criteria with the following points noted:

- Recreating the connectivity for people and look at ways to get land back to the region should be more fully considered, rather than just consideration as impacts.
- Mitigation is an inherent part of the project. It should be included as an positive effectiveness measure.

The changes recommended by the Technical Committee on the second level screening criteria for environmental impacts were as follows*:*

- Analyze environmental impacts <u>and</u> the extent to which the alternative may require additional measures or strategies to avoid, minimize, or mitigate environmental impacts.
- Analyze the seriousness <u>and</u> probability of environmental impacts.
- Add habitat connectivity to wetlands / shorelines.
- Strike ‘qualitative’ analysis of air quality for quantitative analysis.

Jeff Peacock presented an overview of the costs criteria for the second level screening. The committee discussed the proposed cost information with the following points noted:

- 2020 numbers are to be used through the second-level screening. 2030 numbers will be used in the environmental impact statement (EIS). Discrete capacity and demand will be known, and the remaining capacity can be determined based on those.

- The Advisory Committee suggested discussing HOT lanes. A separate right of way (ROW) for HOT lanes to work is more straightforward for operation as a barrier-separated facility, though it can be done on a stripe-separated facility.

The changes recommended by the Technical Committee to the second level screening criteria for costs were presented as follows*:*

- Add 'public and private' to capital costs and eliminate the specific reference to private costs.
- The Study Committee also talked about 'next cost' concept. Since number projections beyond 2030 are not reliable, a description of remaining capacity in that 2030 will be provided.

The committee agreed to carry forward the second level screening criteria with no objections.

COMMUNITY DESIGN WORKSHOPS

The community design workshops were announced as follows:

November 15 – Montlake Area, Montlake Community Center
November 16 – Portage Bay / Roanoke/ Eastlake area, Museum of History and Industry
November 29 - Eastside, west of I-405 area, First Presbyterian Church, Bellevue
November 30 – Eastside, east of I-405 area, North Bellevue Senior Center, Bellevue

All four meetings have identical formats: 1-5:30 p.m. – workshop for invited community members, and 6 – 8 p.m. open house for the community.

EARLY ACTIONS UPDATE

Daryl Wendle, Parametrix, and _____, WSDOT, presented a status report on the progress of the early actions requested by the Study Committee. The next update will be in two to three months.

The committee discussed the Early Actions update with the following points noted:

- Signs indicating congestion on I-405 may help motorists make changes to routes.
- The University District traffic study by the City of Seattle is also being considered in the scope of early actions work.

UPCOMING TECHNICAL WORK PROGRAM

Jeff Peacock summarized the upcoming work program, including:

- Analysis of the feasibility of tunnels and tubes.
- Development of a better understanding of the mid-lake HCT crossing
- Exploration of HCT technologies

- Full development of the community design process – first round in November and second round in February.
- Combination of modal into multi-modal alternatives in the early spring
- Implementation of a federal Transportation Service and Community Preservation grant of $420,000

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE AND ACTION ITEMS

- November 8, 2000 Executive Committee meeting is no longer needed.
- Next Executive Committee meeting - January 10, 2001.
- Dates for 2001 will be scheduled and distributed.

Action Item:
Post the early actions update on the project website.

MEETING HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- First Level Screening Evaluation Results - Tech Steering Cmte Review Draft with comments, Oct 12, 2000
- Technical Memo - Alternatives Analysis - Draft Screening Process and Criteria, Oct 16, 2000
- Summary of Technical Steering and Advisory Committee Input to First Level Screening, Memo - Oct 16, 2000
- Alternatives Selection Process - graphic
- Second Level Screening Criteria - presentation to Executive Committee
- Community Design Workshops Factsheet
- Early Actions Memo

MEETING ATTENDEES

Committee Members

Present	Name		Organization
	Becker	Daniel	City of Medina
	Berry	Jeanne	Town of Yarrow Point
	Cairns	Bryan	City of Mercer Island
	Conlin	Richard	City of Seattle

Crawford	Jack	Sound Transit Board
Davis	Aubrey	Washington Transportation Commission
Earling	Dave	Sound Transit Board
Edwards	Bob	Puget Sound Regional Council
Fong	Gene	Federal Highway Administration
Ganz	Nona	City of Kirkland
Gehrke	Linda	Federal Transit Administration
Grigsby	Daryl	City of Seattle
Horn	Jim	Washington State Senate
Ives	Rosemarie	City of Redmond
Jacobsen	Ken	Washington State Senate
Marshall	Connie	City of Bellevue
Martin	George	City of Clyde Hill
McConkey	Fred	Town of Hunts Point
McIver	Richard	City of Seattle
McKenna	Rob	King County Council
Murray	Ed	WA State House of Representatives
Noble	Phil	City of Bellevue
Okamoto	John	WSDOT - NW Region
Pflug	Cheryl	WA State House of Representatives
Sullivan	Cynthia	King County Council
Taniguchi	Harold	King County Department of Transportation
Wills	Heidi	City of Seattle

Committee Alternates

Present	**Name**		**Organization**
	Asher	David	City of Kirkland
	Bowman	Jennifer	Federal Transit Administration
	Drais	Dan	FTA
	Carpenter	Trish	Town of Hunts Point
	Creighton	Mike	City of Bellevue
	Demitriades	Paul	City of Medina
	Dye	Dave	WSDOT - NW Region
	Fimia	Maggi	Puget Sound Regional Council / King County Council
	Hague	Jane	King County Council
	Hughes	Gary	Federal Highway Administration
	Jahncke	El	City of Mercer Island
	Kargianis	George	Washington Transportation Commission
	Paine	Thomas	City of Redmond
	Rourke	Philip	City of Clyde Hill
	Rutledge	Steve	City of Yarrow Point
	Switaj	Ed	City of Seattle
	White	Bob	Sound Transit

Other attendees

Project Team
Rob Fellows, WSDOT
Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill
Pat Serie, EnviroIssues
Jeff Peacock, Parametrix
John Perlic, Parametrix
Daryl Wendle, Parametrix
Amy Grotefendt, EnviroIssues
Paul Hezel, EnviroIssues

[PJH]