

I-084-001

MR. BURKHART: I'm Dick Burkhardt, the transit advocate for south of Seattle that works with Sierra Club and many other groups. And I come at this from -- not as a neighbor, but to look from a bigger picture. And I agree with Seattle Mayor Mike McGinn. We need to take climate change seriously now. We can't just have goals for the future, say "We'll do something then." When we have the opportunity right now, we need to do it.

It's not just climate change. I've also been studying the oil situation, and we're in the period of peak oil. In 10 years, we're probably going to have gas \$10 a gallon, and then it's going to go up from there. The result of that is that all of these growth projections that we've been hearing are not going to be operative. If we're serious about climate change, we cannot have the projected growth. And in any case, peak oil won't allow it.

I-084-002

So the consequence of that is: We oppose the A-Plus with the Arboretum ramps; support the modified A where, instead of starting with HOV lanes, we start with very separated transit-only lanes and don't plan to add more lanes later on for LRT. Right now, plan for LRT in the future.

In what's called the HOV lane, make that transit BRT lane, not bus-only transit in the future; maybe both; and then retain the transit Flyer stops at Montlake. But the transit Flyer stop should be in-lane stops, not -- no bypass lane, and that would actually make them work with a much smaller footprint.

In addition, to make the transit work on the Montlake Boulevard

I-084-001

Comment noted.

I-084-002

The HOV lanes that are part of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project would allow for the near-term implementation of bus rapid transit, as called for in the SR 520 High-Capacity Transit Plan. The SR 520 High-Capacity Transit Plan, which was endorsed in 2008 by the state, King County Metro Transit, and Sound Transit, found that until at least 2030, demand for transit in the 520 corridor could be satisfied by bus rapid transit that runs in HOV/transit lanes—complementing Sound Transit's East Link on I-90. At the same time, the plan acknowledges that after 2030 significant increases in cross-lake travel may warrant dedicated high capacity transit facilities in both I-90 and SR 520. Therefore, the new SR 520 bridge and associated interchanges will be built in a way that allows the structure to accommodate a two-way light rail line or busway at a future date.

Regarding the suggestion of making the HOV lanes transit-only upon opening the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project, ESHB 6392 specifies that the HOV lane will be available only for vehicles with 3 or more passengers. This assumption was evaluated in the Draft EIS, SDEIS, and Final EIS, and has been shown to result in free flow operations in the HOV lane with bus service levels near 600 vehicles per day. Therefore, traffic operations in the SR 520 HOV lanes would provide similarly improved travel times and reliability for transit whether the lanes are dedicated for transit or also allow carpool use for vehicles with 3 or more people. The State's HOV lane operations policy would be used to identify when the HOV lanes' operational thresholds were met and when an adjustment to the occupancy requirement would be recommended. Because ESSB 6392 specifies the HOV lane vehicle occupancy of 3 or more people, the State would need to request legislative approval to make any modifications. Further, making the lanes transit only would not

I-084-002

and 23rd, we need transit preference on those for buses: Single preference, maybe transit-only lanes, things like that.

And so I think this is one way we can actually get serious and do things now. Thank you.

(End of comment.)

have reduced their footprint.

One of two options for future addition of light rail in the corridor, if the regional decision to add rail were made and funded, would be to convert the HOV/transit lanes to light rail. The other option would be to add light-rail only lanes. A decision to add light rail would need to be planned and programmed by regional land use and transit agencies, funded by a public vote, and evaluated in its own environmental analysis. Section 2.4 of the Final EIS provides further discussion of how the project can accommodate high capacity transit.

Regarding Montlake Freeway Transit Station design and the comment's suggestion of in-lane stops, the State and transit agencies coordinate on a regular basis to determine the best design for the freeway transit station stops to ensure safety for transit patrons and people driving on the highway. The basis for the design comes from the State design guidelines, and there are no "in lane" stop designs for highways in the State guidelines. Bus stops cannot be located in the SR 520 travel lanes for safety and operational reasons. Thus, additional width is needed for freeway transit station stops. With all of the SDEIS design options and the Preferred Alternative, the Montlake Freeway Transit Station would be removed to minimize the width of the freeway through the Montlake area, which could be reduced by up to 40 feet with removal of the station. Please see Attachment 8 to the SDEIS, Range of Alternatives and Options Evaluated, for a discussion of how and why removal of the Montlake Freeway Transit stops was considered. Although the Preferred Alternative removes the Montlake Freeway Transit Station, transit connectivity would be improved on the Montlake lid with additional bus stops and enhanced access between neighborhoods and to the Eastside. Chapter 8 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) provides updated information regarding the effects of removing the Montlake Freeway Transit Station, and the subsequent transit facilities, rider connections, and bus stops on the

Montlake lid. Also see Section 2.4 of the Final EIS regarding how potential future light rail could connect with the University light rail station.

The new bascule bridge that is part of Option A and the Preferred Alternative would create lane continuity between the Montlake Cut and the SR 520 Montlake interchange, which would improve traffic operations compared to the No Build Alternative, and the Preferred Alternative would provide continuous HOV lanes on Montlake Boulevard between SR 520 and NE Pacific Street. Further, since the SDEIS was published, WSDOT, in collaboration with the City of Seattle, King County Metro, and Sound Transit, has evaluated transit signal priority in the Montlake interchange area. Chapter 6 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report describes the changes in traffic volume and operations on the local streets in the Montlake interchange area with the Preferred Alternative. Chapter 8 describes the effects of the Preferred Alternative on transit service, facilities, ridership, travel times during a.m., p.m., and off-peak periods, and rider connections.