

Report

Facts:

Meetings:

7 between Sept 07 – March 08

2007 (4) September, October, November, December

2008 (3) January, February, March (2 days)

September 11, 2007

- Identified interests
- Produced Operating Protocols
- Selected an independent reviewer for tubes and tunnels

October 16, 2007

- DOT presented key points of data developed to date through DEIS process
- Community members talked about other work done to date –
 - Communities Forming Agreements on 520
 - City of Seattle, City Council Resolutions
- High Capacity Transit Plan Update
- Introduced the independent reviewer for tubes and tunnels: COWI, Casper Paludan-Müller & Poul Marnus Nielsen
- Discussed the Health Impact Study
- Discussed data needs to develop and select an alternative

November 20, 2007

- Update on Oversight Committee meeting
- Independent Reviewer/COWI draft report
- Developed a list of alternatives
 - A.** Redesign the draft EIS Montlake alternative to address Seattle City Council resolution elements and DEIS comments
 - B.** Redesign the draft EIS Pacific Street alternative in the draft EIS to address Seattle City Council resolution elements and DEIS comments
 - Ci.** Tunnel from the floating bridge to I-5 with no access points in Seattle (see COWI presentation for example)
 - a. Separate two-lane bus tunnel from the floating bridge to the light rail station; remains 50 feet below grade
 - b. Reconfigure I-5 to remove the weave – all entrances/exit on the right side
 - c. Use reclaimed viaduct land for a trail and park
 - Cii.** Tunnel from the floating bridge to I-5 with distributed access points (see COWI presentation)

- D.** Retrofit the current four-lane bridge with a separate two-lane tunnel for transit to the light rail station (separate structure across the lake and then a tunnel from the floating bridge, same as Ci)
 - a. Extend the on ramp at Montlake, eastbound, to create a collector lane that merges traffic onto 520 after the arboretum; remove the eastern arboretum on ramp and create a new on ramp at the arboretum closest to the current off ramp that moves traffic into the collector lane
 - b. Retrofit
 - i. jacket columns and fill with cement
 - ii. Secure the draw span (close) to remove the weak point
 - iii. Remove jersey barriers and concrete sidewalks to lighten the bridge to create wider lanes and allow the floating bridge to ride higher in the water
 - c. Cantilever a bicycle/pedestrian lane
 - d. Add aluminum barriers
 - e. Phased – phase I retrofit; phase II bus tunnel
- E.** A submerged exit/entrance just west of the floating bridge under Union Bay that surfaces at Pacific Street
- F.** Second Montlake cut bridge – design should emulate and reflect, but not copy historic bridge
 - a. T intersection for buses exiting 520 with a separate turn lane
 - b. Signal timing prioritized for buses
 - c. Extend the turn lanes for buses from Montlake onto Pacific
 - d. Designate lanes for bus and through traffic
 - e. Remove ramps in the arboretum
 - f. Raise the roadway over Foster Island for access beneath
 - g. Lid at Montlake, used partially to create turn pockets
- G.** Tunnel and Viaduct – tunnel from the floating bridge under the arboretum with a viaduct through Portage Bay
 - a. Interchange – TBD
 - b. Viaduct – apply Seattle City Council resolution elements to design
 - c. Access ramp from Madison Street
- H.** Similar to DEIS alternative with a refined single-point interchange northeast of arboretum (interchange with two levels – through traffic below, access traffic above with one signal) with a bridge to Pacific street and Lake Washington Boulevard

December 18, 2007

- Transit Agencies presented their vision and operational considerations
- Discussed options A – G
- Conclusions:
 - Remove C options – too challenging to build (cost and impacts)
 - Remove E option (C with bus tunnel to UW) - too challenging to build (cost and impacts)
- Introduced/Discussed new options
 - I.** Retrofit with revised alignment and tunnel to the north of the arboretum with a people mover below ground from flyer stop to UW and a second Montlake Blvd bridge
 - J.** Interchange between DEIS options A and B, with a short tunnel, spur to Lake Washington Blvd with an intersection under the mainline, with no arboretum ramps

January 15, 2008

- Discussed/Evaluated/Refined Options G, D, J, A
- Conclusions:
 - Set aside option D and reconsider if the agreed upon design costs are too much.

Members to hold constituency meetings to get feed back on Options A – J (excluding C & D since they are off the table)

February 19, 2008

- Update on Oversight Committee meeting
- Discussed/Evaluated/Refined Options G, J, K
- Introduced Option L. Option K with a bridge across the cut instead of a tunnel
- Conclusion: Options A, K and L move forward for further refinement at the March meeting

March 18 & 20, 2008

- Refined options A, K and L by roadway sections (I5/Roanoke/Portage Bay, Montlake, and east of Montlake/Arboretum)
- Agreement that A, K, and L will move forward in DEIS
- Agreement to work in smaller sub groups to make final revisions to A, K and L

Oversight Committee Meetings

November 9, 2007

Key Messages:

The mediation will design a six lane (4+2) facility. Design of six lanes means six; “accommodate” does not mean a design for additional structure beyond six lanes.

The Oversight Committee needs to see these elements in any solution offered by the mediation group:

- Fiscally constrained;
- On schedule for 2012 construction (in particular, tunnel feasibility analysis must not create a delay);
- Include transit on the day a new facility opens, linked to the UW light-rail station;
- Use existing financial and other data whenever possible;
- Mitigation responds to impacts (not a competition between jurisdictions); and
- Include travel demand management strategies.

February 18, 2008

Key Messages:

- Thank you for your hard work to date and keep working
- Move forward to design and build a six-lane facility on the west side - four general purpose lanes and two joint use HOV/bus transit lanes
- Provide options to go forward in the EIS by April 1st
- Provide efficient and effective bus linkages to UW light rail station
- No more than \$3.9 billion budget

April 21, 2008

Key Messages:

- The mediation will design a six lane (4+2) facility. Design of six lanes means six; “accommodate” does not mean a design for additional structure beyond six lanes.
- The Oversight Committee needs to see these elements in any solution offered by the mediation group:
 - Fiscally constrained;
 - On schedule for 2012 construction (in particular, tunnel feasibility analysis must not create a delay);
 - Include transit on the day a new facility opens, linked to the UW light-rail station;
 - Use existing financial and other data whenever possible;

- Mitigation responds to impacts (not a competition between jurisdictions);
and
- Include travel demand management strategies.