Washington State Department of Transportation

SDOT Seattle Department of Transportation

SR 520 West Side Technical Coordination Team
Work Plan Public Comment Summary

The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) convened a technical coordination team to consider design refinements and transit connections for the SR 520 West side corridor. In June, WSDOT asked key stakeholders and the public to provide comments on work plan topics for the technical coordination team. We received three comments from stakeholder groups and one comment from an individual. Below is a summary of the comments received.

Design Refinements

- Consider tolling as an option on Lake Washington Boulevard.
- Do not consider tolling as an option on Lake Washington Boulevard.
- Consider noise effects of design refinements, including roadway grades.
- Bicycle enhancements should be considered with traffic calming and pedestrian enhancement design refinements.
- Further explore origins and destinations of current and anticipated traffic as part of the evaluation of local street improvements.
- Consider improvements to 23rd Avenue so that it can absorb traffic from Lake Washington Boulevard.
- Consider design refinements at the Montlake Interchange that prioritize transit and HOV.
- Ensure that design refinements for the Arboretum follow the Olmsted legacy.

Transit Connections

- Consider transit connectivity from the Montlake Interchange to the Arboretum, not just to the University of Washington.
- Include wayfinding improvements and signage from transit stops to the Arboretum.
- Focus on encouraging fast, easy transfers from local buses to the bus rapid transit routes and the light rail station.

General

- Consider identifying and acquiring property for replacement and mitigation of property taken or damaged.
- Include consideration of environmental impacts and mitigation to the Arboretum.
- Focus on developing a corridor management plan, including demand management.
- Consider pollution and noise effects to the entire Arboretum area.

Julie— A ttached are the Arboretum Foundation's Comments and suggested changes to the work plan document you sent to us on June, 25, 2010. Our comments to your document are shown in red. These comments are the work of the Foundation's SR520 Committee—board members.

We appreciate the opportunity to have input on your work plan and to continue to stay engaged in your planning process on the SR520 Preferred Alternative.

ABGC has not met since you sent out this work plan, so I don't believe that that committee will be sending in formal comments. We have talked with several representatives from ABGC about this process, however.

Please let me know if you have any questions about our comments. I look forward to seeing your team at the ABGC meeting next week.

Design Refinements and Transit Connections
The following represents work plan topics that were brainstormed at the first meeting on Thursday, June 17, 2010.

Please review the topics below and submit comments to
comments must be received by Thursday, July 8, 2010

I-5/Portage Bay vicinity

A. Bike/pedestrian connections and amenities
- Identify key regional and local pedestrian and bicycle connections and corridors in the project area.
- Propose refinements to pedestrian/bicycle facilities and amenities.

B. Urban design and streetscape
- Evaluate and refine design for the I-5 overpass for urban design and traffic impacts.
- Refine design to improve the function and aesthetics of the Portage Bay Bridge.
- Inventory urban amenities (pocket parks and trees) and identify future status.

C. Roadway design and operations
- Identify protocols for managed shoulder operations on Portage Bay Bridge.

Montlake Vicinity and the Washington Park Arboretum – note that the previous work plan had the Arboretum included in the 'Montlake Vicinity'. The following general bullet points shall apply to the Montlake Vicinity and the Arboretum.

D. Arboretum—Traffic calming and traffic management plan –
This work item should include studying:

1. How tolling of Lake Washington Boulevard (LWB) may reduce the use of LWB as an access route to and from the SR 520 on and off-ramps,
2. The origins and destinations of current and anticipated traffic that occurs on LWB. With the knowledge of where traffic is coming from and where it is going, traffic calming measures and types can be chosen accordingly. One possible option would be to conduct a one day survey of all users on LWB.
3. The potential changes in traffic flow on LWB and 23rd/24th due to future traffic calming and traffic management measures.
4. Ways to improve and enhance the traffic capacity on 23rd/24th including the intersection at Madison and 23rd in order to ensure that the traffic removed from LWB can be absorbed by this major arterial. Possible WSDOT traffic engineers' suggestions included removing grassy planting strips to widen the road up to the library (to Lynn Street) and leveling the road to reduce the pitch.
5. How altering the timing of signals at vital intersections such as Madison and 23rd, and Madison an LWB might reduce traffic on LWB AND reduce queuing lanes at Montlake.
6. The effectiveness of adding signage at 23rd and Madison to direct downtown traffic to the Montlake intersection, not LWB.
7. The use of demand management as a way to lure people away from using LWB.
8. What the future traffic numbers will be on Boyer and Interlaken.

- Identify appropriate traffic calming treatments for Lake Washington Blvd. – Tolls should be considered traffic calming measure. Since LWB is a park historic boulevard, signage and other design elements need to be reviewed by the members of the Arboretum and Botanical Garden Committee (ABGC).

• Assess baseline conditions and key elements for a traffic management plan for the Arboretum, including desired traffic volume and speed objectives –The assessment should include Madison, 23rd/24th, the timing at vital intersections and the future traffic on Boyer and Interlaken as mentioned earlier.
• Identify traffic calming, pedestrian enhancement, and traffic demand management measures – again, special consideration should be given for LWB., a park facility. Please be specific about possible tolling options.
• Assess potential High Occupancy Toll (HOT lanes) lane ramps at 24th Avenue East - The Arboretum Foundation's emphasis continues to be on evaluating traffic studies data and making appropriate changes to the roadways for the most effective traffic mobility without conecting ramps to LWB.

E. Bike/pedestrian connections and amenities – including the Arboretum.
• Montlake Interchange: Identify pedestrian pathways through intersections and in and out of the Arboretum and refine intersections to facilitate maximum pedestrian and bicycle movements and safety.
• Identify key regional and local pedestrian and bicycle connections and corridors in the project area, including through Montlake and to East Madison Street.
• Propose refinements to pedestrian and bicycle facilities and amenities, including bicycle ports

F. Urban design/streetscape
• Montlake Interchange: Enhance streetscape with use of improved lighting, signage, landscaping, etc.

E. Lake Washington Boulevard: Enhance streetscape with use of improved lighting, signage, landscaping, etc. Ensure that the planning for these elements is kept in the Olmsted design vocabulary.
• Inventory urban amenities (pocket parks and trees) and identify future status.
• Identify urban design amenities to ensure safety, perhaps including lighting and cameras.

G. Turning and queuing/channelization
• Montlake Interchange: Explore eliminating one of the two lanes at the westbound off-ramp.
• Montlake Interchange: Review turning movements and queue storage lengths at the 24th Avenue E and Montlake Boulevard intersections.
• Montlake Boulevard: Refine channelization on Montlake Boulevard from 23rd Avenue E to NE Pacific Street using detailed traffic modeling results. The Arboretum Foundation SR 520 subcommittee would like the opportunity to review the traffic modeling methodology before the study is initiated in order to ensure that all of our traffic questions will be addressed by this study.

H. Transit priority and HOV lanes
• Identify transit connections to HOV lanes.
• Montlake Interchange: Consider transit movement and signal operations through the interchange.
• Montlake Boulevard and Pacific Street: Identify potential transit priority pathways and treatments along both regional and local transit routes.
• Montlake Boulevard and 23rd: Identify the preferred alignment and operation of transit/HOV lanes on Montlake Boulevard, including on the second bascule bridge.
• Evaluate options to connect future LRT (or transit-only lanes) to the U-Link station.
• Assess signalization at intersections for transit priority and for pedestrians and bicycles – We should encourage the use of the Arboretum for bicycle traffic. This would be one way to get increased numbers of people into the park, provide safe travel for the bikers AND avoid the need for a bike lane on 23/24th.

I. Bus stop locations
• Montlake Interchange: Identify preferred bus stop locations and design
• Montlake Interchange/Lid: Design the bus stop locations on the Montlake lid to facilitate easy and safe pedestrian access and meet the needs of transit service providers.
• Ensure quality of existing and future bus stops, including safety, reliability, and ease of connections.
The Arboretum Foundation would like to make sure that there are suitable biking and walking routes and paths from transit to the Washington Park Arboretum. Signage/Wayfinding improvements from transit to the Arboretum must be included in the transit plans.

J. Transit connections: Montlake Interchange/Lid includes bicycle connectivity on the lid into the Arboretum for a future bike route, not just into Montlake and the UW.
• Ensure an adequate base level of midday service between UW/Montlake and the Eastside with closure of the flyer stop (and seek service commitments).
• Assess opportunities for Montlake-based passengers to access eastbound and westbound buses to and from downtown Seattle and Eastside locations.
• Improve connections for local bus service.
• Evaluate opportunities for grade separation for bicycle and pedestrian crossings.
• Evaluate the proposal for a Link station south of the Montlake Interchange.

K. Phasing: Second bascule bridge
• Develop a phasing plan for construction of the second bascule bridge and identify specific measures—including traffic management plans for the Montlake corridor and bicycle and pedestrian mobility enhancements—that could be implemented in interim phases.
• Evaluate how the phasing plan for the second bascule bridge would affect the alignment and operation of Montlake Boulevard, both prior to and during the construction of a new facility across the Montlake Cut.
• Evaluate how phasing plan would accommodate bicycles and pedestrians prior to a new facility across the Montlake Cut.

Other topics
L. Noise reduction strategies
• Explore options for noise reduction and mitigation on the west side - including the entire Arboretum.
Noise reduction needs to include a comparison of noise walls effectiveness vs. cost and aesthetic impact, quiet pavement, and a study of reduced speed across the Arboretum (similar to the proposal for the Portage Bay segment).
• Evaluate removal of the I-5 lid, including potential noise and pollution reduction strategies.
M. Health Impact Assessment
• Review recommendations from the 2008 Health Impact Assessment to determine if there are related design refinements that may be beneficial. Now that the APE has been expanded to include the entire Arboretum, possible pollution impacts etc must be taken into consideration for the whole Arboretum.

N. Corridor Management Plan
• Develop a corridor management plan for transit/HOV lanes, including ITS.

O. Traffic management: other neighborhoods
• Evaluate the potential for an area beyond the Arboretum—including Madison Park, Montlake, 23rd and Madison, and North Capitol Hill—to be covered by a traffic management plan; identify key elements that may reduce traffic impacts of closing the Arboretum ramps. This last work item is essential .

• Consider traffic management plan impacts to transit and transit corridors.

Topics to address if time allows
• Assess bike and pedestrian route connectivity during construction, including I-5 and Montlake.
• Identify impacts to transit during construction.

Comments on the SR 520 Technical Team Work Plan July 8, 2010

Representing the Ravenna Bryant Community Association

SR 520 WESTSIDE SEGMENTS

I-5 to Portage Bay Bridge Vicinity —AGREEMENTS-within the announced SR 520 Preferred design .(4/29/10)

-

1. **OMISSION** New SR 520/I-5 HOV/BUS Express lane exit/entrance ramps are major long planned improvements to increase the speed/reliability of SR 520 Transit Service. *Ramps should not be built hat preclude future two-way Transit/HOV use from and to SR 520 from and the I-5 Express Lanes*
    - **-Future SR 520 Interchange Revisions planned for I-5 at Roanoke should not preclude planning for future HOV connection, two-way, all day, to and from SR 520/I-5 Express Lanes.**

2. **I-5 Lid should be part of planned future upgrades of I-5 at the SR 520 connection, and not included in the SR 520 Project. All new Bicycle paths related to SR 520 need new comprehensive Signage to connecting nearby Bike/Ped/Trails and/or the city Park system. (**Costs should be reasonable and within project budget.)

3. During the 520 Mediation WSDOT Bridge Staff said that the **Portage Bay Bridge design** could be improved and costs reduced through a Bridge Design Competition. (Estimated Savings was $100 M.) Bridge Dimentions-100' wide, 6 lanes, plus merge space at Montlake Blvd. for On and Off Ramps, with center Landscaped Divider.

4. Grade of SR 520 to and from I-5 from Portage Bay Bridge should be designed to prevent freight trucks changing gears causing increased nighttime noise to nearby residents. Apply Expert Review Panel's Noise reduction recommendations to reduce traffic noise to adjacent communities and water users. -Preserve and enhance Bagley Viewpoint. Review Delmar Drive, & 10th E. Lids, with neighborhood approved plans for landscaped designs.

Other Issues:

- --During construction there should be no use of Montlake Playfield or Trail areas for construction materials, storage of equipment, etc.
- --WSDOT Project/Contractor Agreements on noise, hours of work limitations, etc.
- --Seek recommendations from Noise Consultants for noise baffling improvements to reduce noise from SR 520 for pedestrians, water users and adjacent homes and community facilities.

Montlake Vicinity

1. **Refine/Improve SR 520 Interchange Area Preferred Design—**Overall focus should be on creating a Transit Friendly, Sustainable, Integrated, Multimodal, Tolled, SR 520 Corridor including a long term Corridor Management Agreement (CMA), with Performance measures that focus on achieving desired outcomes /results of the major west-side SR 520 elements. Emphasize strategies for moving people and goods in energy efficient modes. Annual CMA reports will be presented to the relevant Community on the selected SR 520 Performance and Outcomes to be **monitored. (More Info on CMA at the end of Comments)**

2. New Parallel **Montlake Bascule Bridge**. -Result- two 3–lane Bridges with shoulders for safe and friendly two-way bike lanes, using increase in capacity)—for Transit, Bikes and Peds. New bridge design must be Complementary to original existing historic Bridge.
3. Improve the Signage and Lane Channelization on Montlake Blvd. for traffic entering East or Westbound Ramps to SR 520. Outcome is a design to stop drivers from barging and changing lanes, particularly close to the entry ramps.
4. Widen Montlake NE/NE Pacific St. intersection only if needed for Transit preferential priority lanes and traffic lights, and to encourage fast, easy transfers from local buses to the BRT routes and LRT Station.

5. Westbound Transit off-ramp, with a local bus stop near or on to Montlake Blvd is needed. Exiting Transit into the northbound center lane in the vicinity of the Montlake Blvd/Pacific St. intersection, with Transit priority controlled traffic light for left turn from Montlake Blvd.to Pacific St. NE. Study the need for a parallel lane for vehicles turning to the South.
6. Seamless Connections the Bike and Pedestrian lanes on the Montlake Bridge to the SR 520 Bridge East/West, Burke Gillman Trail, the Arboretum and other trails, with adequate signage.

7. Bus priority/controlled left turn lane green light at the Pacific St. N.E. Blvd./Montlake Blvd. N.E. to LRT Station transfer-point/BRT bus stops. (Note: METRO and Sound Transit Bus Routes either return to Eastside or to West-side service routes.)
8. Former Freeway level *east and west "flyer bus stops are relocated to a new enlarged proposed Montlake/Mohai Lid , with a reduction of 520 Freeway footprint width by 70'*. There is a need to buffer noise from frequent Bus stops, at this new location, adjacent to homes.

Arboretum Area

1. **Arboretum through traffic *is reduced with no reconstruction of SR 520 freeway exit or entry ramps. (Preferred Alternative Design* Reduces SR 520 footprint within historic park, unique 1st Class Wetlands, ESA fish passage, near Native Cultural Areas and protected ecosystem and wildlife habitats. Major step to renewing this historic park from the damage incurred from the construction of the 1963 520.**

2. **But this will be a major daily trip change for the many existing 520 ramp users that will need alternatives.** Transit proponents are also concerned about transferring too many vehicle trips to Montlake Blvd E, due to the ramp closures. Some SOVs will divert to I-90 temporarily, as long as it has no Tolls and SR 520 does. Many Transportation Demand Management tools and new public awareness information must be developed to encourage revised routes or use of alternative modes of transport.

3. **Warning--**No state law or legal precedent supports the implementation of SR 520 vehicle Tolls in a City park (**Arboretum**) and return of Toll funds to the Park Budget, as a compromise for rebuilding the 520 ramps into the Arboretum. There is No Public Support for this proposed option in order to pay for Arboretum mitigation, and as a trade-off to allow reconstructing the SR 520 ramps in and out of the Arboretum, with the projected significant increases in the vehicle traffic thru this historic Seattle landmark. *Please do not consider this mitigation option.*

-

4. With no replacement of SR 520 Arboretum on and off ramps there can be safer pedestrian crossing of the Blvd. to the Japanese Tea Garden and other park areas and new safer bike/ped routes. Alternate driving routes and traffic calming proposals are needed and **are important to implement this positive change**.

Sound Transit LRT Station Area

1. -**Support for New Ped/Bike Overpass to and from LRT Station over Montlake Blvd. NE.**
2. A depressed/covered intersection at Montlake NE/Pacific St. NE. intersection needs careful reconsideration. North enders know that this city intersection is stalled out most weekdays all-day. It is second in the number Transit routes that pass in to the Seattle CBD, with over 500 buses daily. It could become a worse major choke-point than it already is for northeast users and community residents. Because of the Sound Transit LRT station, Transit must have priority at this major intersection, with increased incentives for new Transit/HOV use by current auto users. (Suggest a designated pick up area for HOV to pick up certified riders, like in San Francisco.

3. ***(J Last Item). Evaluate proposal for a Link Station south of the Montlake Interc***hange. A state Legislator included this directive in order to get enough votes to pass it in the last session, but has nothing to do with what Sound Transit has planned. Sound Transit has an adopted North Link Plan for the U of W LRT station that does not include another southern station . It is projecting less Construction Revenue for this North LinkCorridor, due to the economic downturn. During the North Link planning process the Montlake neighbors were very opposed to any Tunnel vents or other potential LINK community impacts south of the Lake Washington Ship Canal. Sound Transit staff member (Greg Walker) should be asked to update the Workgroup on this issue.

4. Phasing Montlake Bridge—What Does This Mean? Opponents would like no new parallel Bridge. If phasing delays the Ped/Bike Transit improvements that are needed in the current tight 4 lane bridge, with 6 and 7 lanes leading to it then it should be rejected.
5. No widening of Montlake Blvd. northward toward the University Village area, or on Pacific Street, except for improved Transit service.

6. Plan for safe Bike/Ped path to connecting city trails and bus connections using the existing "sidewalk grid" to access new Bus stops within communities, the Arboretum, south Lake Washington Boulevard, and to and from the east/west north side of SR 520 Bike/Ped lanes.

7. **<u>Omission</u>- During the SR 520 Mediation process the NOAA representative identified potential replacement properties for any 520 related property taken or damaged. Potential sites should be pursued now during the economic decline, before costs rise, and meet a city of Seattle Initiative 42 to replace property taken <u>by a major public project. Work Plan needs to include this issue.</u>**

8. **Comment<u>: Work Plan's lack of adequate SR520 Public Process</u>-** Knowing that the 520 Workgroups were required after the SEIS, many of us commented in the SEIS process that the next step should be open to Mediation members. In addition, under the <u>State Open Meetings Act</u> any public decisions should be made in an open and inclusive process, with adequate information relating to the alternative west-side design changes, impacts, costs, compatibility with future transit, BRT/HCT, traffic projections and other changing conditions and/or relevant information. **<u>There should be a Work group website with the Notice of meetings, Agendas, locations, times available to all, at least to those who were active SR520 Mediation group members</u>**.

<u>SR 520 Integrated Corridor Management Agreement- CMA</u>

WSDOT has not, and the proposed Work Plan does not define the long range Westside **<u>SR 520 Corridor Management Agreement. If included it could</u>** integrate all multi-modal plans, Tolling, and monitor adopted policies and decisions relating to the corridor operations, information, the health impact plans, energy conservation, future changes in urban land-use from auto-dependent development to increased transit-friendly urban development. The Agreement findings and results, would be based on desired objectives adopted by the transportation agencies, adjacent cities and major employers would be reviewed and updated regularly to adjust to changing conditions and to keep SR 520's overall performance sustainable. .

NOTE : I was involved in the 1997-2002 as a member of the Translake study. At the time we suggested WSDOT seek a $850,000 Federal Grant to improve our knowledge and develop strategies for improved management of urban multi-modal state Corridors, to help prevent the need in the future for expanding existing capacity or adding new parallel corridors SOV capacity. WSDOT received the Grant, completed the "TEEM" study on new transportation demand management polices/programs and monitoring the results over time. I think of it as being similar to a Transportation Corridor Performance Audit, except it continues from year to year to report its Findings to the owners, users, adjacent jurisdictions, major employers and the public and to recommend adjustments in the various Operations, Tolling, Modes, TDM programs, Information systems, Incident Management, changing Land Use, in order to improve the Corridor performance to keep it **sustainable** over time. After the TEEM study was completed it was passed on the PSRC's TDM Staff to implement. Their PSRC Regional 2040Plan update and the Transportation Management Program includes a new SMART Corridor's program, with the I-90-SR 520 together, as thecross-lake corridor included in this new program..

The PSRC's Corridor Management Program is the new Transportation Demand Management Tool. It is partly the result of the SR 520 Translake and WSDOT "TEEM" Consultant study with WSDOT staff led by Jean Mabry who has now retired. The 2000-2002 study examined the benefits of <u>Managing the Performance of Major Multi-modal Urban Corridors</u>.

<u>Recently a New GMA Local and County the PSRC's SMART Corridor Monitoring Program Complement the above study.- The</u> <u>changes in the new state 2010 GMA Administrative Rules 365-196-430, in the **Transportation Element**-provide a Guide for the Implementation of the state's **Growth Management Act** for local cities and counties "Transportation Element" **which are complementary to a new the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan's new PSRC's SMART CORRIDOR program.**</u>

<u>The new GMA rule</u> <u>includes a requirement that cities and counties they have transportation and land use elements that contain the "estimated impacts to state owned transportation facilities' and changing results from land use assumptions, to assist in monitoring the performance of state facilities and to plan improvements for the facilities, and to assess the impact of local land use decisions on state owned transportation facilities."</u>

<u>It states "the purpose is to reflect the level of service standards for state highways in the local comprehensive plans and to monitor the performance of the system and to evaluate improvement strategies to facilitate improved coordination between local, county and state transportation programs,</u>

<u>The 2010 state GMA administrative Rules and the newly 2010 adopted PSRC's 2040 Plan are a major steps forward to enable the actual Monitoring of the overall multi-modal Performance of SR 520/I-90, together as "the major "Cross-Lake corridor" through a new program called "**SMART Corridors, with Robin Mayhew as the PSRC Staff member.**</u>

WSDOT, the city of Seattle and the Transit agencies need to work together with PSRC SMART CORRIDOR study staff as they begin to collect data from state, regional transportation information sources, in addition to and revised suburban land-use patterns that are more transit supportive. Information on the Transportation Operations, Tolling and alternative Modes including Transit/HOV's, TDM and CTR programs.

Working together to compile a relevant overview of important indicators for the rebuilt SR 520 Corridor's to improve its overall performance, The new SMART Corridors program needs to be Incorporated into the SR 520 Work Plan and Staff support of PSRC's efforts will monitor SR 520 and I-90's modal objectives and future outcomes, including increased people-moving performance and long term sustainability, to meet SR 520/I90 Operational, Modal Goals and adopted regional land- use development Objectives.

****

WESTSIDE SR 520 Corridor Agreement OUTCOMES/RESULTS

1. Sustainable transportation systems/corridors and projects must be cost-effective, and moving toward a fuller cost-accounting that reflects the true social, economic and environmental costs and ensures that the SR 520 users pay an equitable share of the costs.
2. Do no harm. Restore damage and impacts from building in 1963 the existing SR 520, by meeting the requirements and the application of NEPA, SEPA;, protecting parks and open space under the FHWA "4f" requirements; Federal Endangered Species Act; Clean Air and Water Acts; using "Best Management Practices" in removing polluted storm water from the surrounding lands and waters and abiding by the original Treaties to Protect the Tribal Fishing Rights; and protecting navigation and recreational users.

3. Enhance SR 520 accessibility, fast, cost effective Transit Services and Routes during construction and in the future through well-planned reconstruction for safely moving people and freight.

4. Reduce the overall impacts of SR 520 on adjacent and surrounding communities during and after construction from noise, promote green urban aesthetics and reduce visual impacts, complete streets and plan to reduce the impacts of SR 520 on adjacent city arterials.
5. Minimize the use of energy, reduce the overall emission of greenhouse gases, reduce reliance on private vehicles and support a paradigm shift away from past highway planning policies that "predict and provide" to new policies that support policies to "**manage and price" our transportation to become sustainable systems.**
6. **No HOT lanes. Keep the Corridor Sustainable over time, to prevent having to construct another bridge across Lake Washington for cars in the future. Once HOT lanes are opened WSDOT will never be able to return the space for HOV and Transit, and the SOV should not be encouraged to but its way into a faster lane at any time of day.**

7. As stewards of the surrounding environment, we have a continuing responsibility to make sustainable choices for personal movement and consumption, and to minimize physical, environmental and biological stress, staying within the limits and regenerative capacity of our overall ecosystem, and respecting the habitat of all relevant species, especially humans.

Final Comment: SR 520's reconstruction has evolved over the years into a new opportunity to build for the future, not the past. We need to become more aware that we live in transformative, "game-changing times" for transportation when we are coping with how to reduce trips with gas-driven vehicles to reduce our state's 50% contribution's GHG emissions and using vehicles that are fueled using scarce and expensive foreign energy, to move around.

Right now it is difficult to make predictions about the future direction and use and delayed Federal Transportation Funding policies to support SR 520's funding gap and support increased funding for operations of local and regional transit systems. How people will adjust to any new fund limits or options to enhance our movement, or new opportunities for moving around differently, is also an unknown. Changes in our transportation modes will change how and where we live and these new changes for new regional SMART Corridor like SR 520/I-90 will influence national, state and local transportation policies programs, growth and land uses in the future.

To the 520 Technical Work Group:

The following are comments about "ESSB 6392 - Draft":

D. Arboretum --

.

.

. Identify traffic calming, pedestrian (ADD: and bicycling) .....

ADD P. Identify property to be provided as replacement for parklands and wetlands taken.

July 8, 2010

Julie Meredith,PE
SR 520 Program Director
SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program
Washington State Department of Transportation
600 Stewart Street, Suite 520
Seattle, WA 98101

RE: Design Refinements and Transit Connections
Team work plan -- ESSB 6392

Dear Director Meredith:

This letter responds to your request for comments on ESSB 6392 Draft, Design Refinements and Transit Connections Technical Team Work Plan.

Expand Corridor Management Element of Plan

The plan needs to develop a blueprint for a Corridor Management Agreement. The discussion on page 3, paragraph N, Corridor Management Plan, mentions only of the elements, "plan for transit/HOV lanes, including ITS." During mediation, the University District Community Council urged that the Corridor Management Plan take the form of an intergovernmental agreement; and that it include in addition to the usual subjects of WSDOT agreements (such as construction of the facility, maintenance, coordination of operations, incident management, surveillance and enforcement, emergency evacuation, and municipal uses of right-of-way) off-site elements, e.g.

programs for promoting transit, shuttle services, carpools, and ride-sharing;
coordination of multiple transportation modes;
information sharing technology;
traveler information;
educational programs; and
land use policies oriented toward transit.

The current technical work plan barely scratches the surface of the subject. The Federal Highway Administration website contains documents and technical memoranda that are helpful in preparing such an agreement.

Advance Acquisition for Mitigation

The technical team should be working on identifying and acquiring property for use for replacement and for mitigation

of property taken or damaged. The draft environmental impact statement 4 (f) Statement was totally inadequate. The representative of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration supplied a list of potential sites to the mediation panel and he recommended acquisition before prices rise. Early acquisition assists in compliance with Initiative 42 of The City of Seattle, which requires replacement in kind.

Arboretum

The discussion of E. Bike/Pedestrian connections and amenities and/or D. Arboretum -Traffic management should have a bullet point on the proposal of the Friends of the Japanese Tea Garden for a pedestrian overpass from the Tea Garden to Azalea Way and the main section of the Arboretum.

The categories should call out environmental impacts and mitigation to the Arboretum. Some elements, such as F "urban design amenities.. including lighting" may have adverse impacts." Often, "lighting" is interpreted as meaning more luminosity. However, in the Arboretum setting, darkness at night benefits the ecology. The lake shore north of MOHAI is currently a favored spot for viewing the night skies, especially for uncommon astronomical phenomena. The designers should be encouraged to consult with Dark Skies Northwest for their recommendations.

Under G, queuing/channelization, none of the two lanes at the westbound off-ramp to Montlake Boulevard East should be eliminated if that would require a wider or longer holding lane through East Montlake Park or McCurdy Park or if it would increase travel times for transit. The two lane configuration allows northbound traffic to use the northerly lane and to make right turns from the ramp to Montlake Boulevard East or to make them simultaneously with the left turning southbound traffic; and it lets the southbound traffic use the southerly lane at the signal to make left turns. If both lanes are combined into a single lane, the signal interval for off-ramp traffic may have to be extended and additional holding lane space provided. Neither impact is desirable.

The Workgroup should include representation from the Board of Park Commissioners as part of, or in addition to, the City of Seattle. The Park Board is the voice of the citizenry in the City's management of its park and recreation system. Its views often differ from those of the City Council, the Mayor, and the Superintendent of Parks and Recreation. Seattle's citizens love its parks and are very protective of them --- more so than their politicians --- and that perspective needs to be considered.

Direct Community Input

All meetings should be open to the public and citizens invited to attend, especially those who participated in mediation; minutes should be kept and posted on the internet; and comment invited. Allowing the public to observe without speaking enables them to write letters and e-mails and provide comment to the representatives. Starting the meetings with a period for public comment would assist communication. It is far better to hear complaints and suggestions at this time rather than have them come in to the federal permitting agencies later in the process.

The University District Community Council has opinions on the Rainier Vista plan of the University of Washington and the reconstruction of the intersection of Montlake Boulevard N.E. and N.E, Pacific Street, the maintenance of transit services during construction; access to the Waterfront Activities Center and other issues. It would like to be consulted. Regularly briefings should be made to the City-University-Community Advisory Committee (also known as "CUCAC").