Citizen Advisory Committee

September 8, 2011
June 16 Meeting – (i) Review public input on draft alternatives. (ii) Agree on draft alternatives for evaluative work from here to Sept 8 CAC Meeting.
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular Briefings to City Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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Project Timeline
Sept 8 Meeting – Initial assessment of the draft alternatives against the CAC evaluation criteria, Council principles, and environmental considerations.

**Project Timeline**
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**Outreach**

- Community Briefings
- Open Houses

**Reporting**

- Regular Briefings to Transportation Commission & Planning Commission
- Regular Briefings to City Council

**Comprehensive Plan and Development Code Amendments**

**Eastgate/I-90 Land Use & Transportation Project**
Sept 29 Meeting – Initiate discussion on preferred alternative.

|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outreach</th>
<th>Community Briefings</th>
<th>Open Houses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Regular Briefings to Transportation Commission &amp; Planning Commission</td>
<td>Regular Briefings to City Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oct 6 Meeting – Draft preferred alternative.

Project Timeline

- **CAC**
  - Nov-Dec 2010: Background & Context
  - Jan-Feb 2011: Issues & Opportunities Land Use, Transportation, Urban Design, Environment
  - Mar-Apr 2011: Identification and Analysis of Alternatives
  - May-Jun 2011: Development of Preferred Alternative
  - Jul-Aug 2011: Final Report
  - Sep-Oct 2011: Final Report
  - Nov-Dec 2011: Final Report
  - 2012: Comprehensive Plan and Development Code Amendments

- **Outreach**
  - Community Briefings
  - Open Houses

- **Reporting**
  - Regular Briefings to Transportation Commission & Planning Commission
  - Regular Briefings to City Council

---

Eastgate/I-90 Land Use & Transportation Project

Project Timeline
Nov 3 Meeting – Detailed preferred alternative.

**Project Timeline**

|-----|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------|

**Outreach**
- Community Briefings
- Open Houses

**Reporting**
- Regular Briefings to Transportation Commission & Planning Commission
- Regular Briefings to City Council
Dec 1 Meeting – Finalize preferred alternative.

**Project Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAC</th>
<th>2010-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background &amp; Context</td>
<td>Nov-Dec 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar-Apr 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May-Jun 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-Aug 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sep-Oct 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-Dec 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outreach**

- Community Briefings
- Open Houses

**Reporting**

- Regular Briefings to Transportation Commission & Planning Commission
- Regular Briefings to City Council

Comprehensive Plan and Development Code Amendments
Jan 5 Meeting – Approve final report and recommendation.

Project Timeline

- Nov-Dec 2010: CAC Background & Context
- Jan-Feb 2011: Issues & Opportunities Land Use, Transportation, Urban Design, Environment
- Mar-Apr 2011: Identification and Analysis of Alternatives
- May-Jun 2011: Development of Preferred Alternative
- Jul-Aug 2011: Final Report
- Sep-Oct 2011: Comprehensive Plan and Development Code Amendments
- Nov-Dec 2011: Open Houses

Community Briefings

Regular Briefings to Transportation Commission & Planning Commission

Regular Briefings to City Council
City Council:  
Planning Commission:  
Transportation Commission:  
Open House (Robinswood):  
On-Line Questionnaire:  

November 14  
October __  
October 13  
October __  
Oct 7 – Nov __
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Draft Alternatives
No Action Scenario

Corridor-wide transportation improvements:
1) No WSDOT I-90 corridor capacity improvements;
2) NITSG trail constructed on south side of I-90;
3) Limited sidewalk and bicycle facility improvements; and,
4) Limited transit service improvements.

TPP-154: Widen by extending third southbound land on 148th Avenue SE from westbound I-90 on-ramp to south of Eastgate Way at I-90 westbound off ramp.

TPP-155: Widen I-90 off-ramp 300’ west of 150th Avenue SE and add through lane. Widen SE 37th Street approx 500’ to east of 150th Avenue SE to allow for bypass lane on right side of the street. Channelized right turn.

TPP-162: Widen I-90 westbound off-ramp to provide two dedicated left turn lanes and shared through/right lane with channelized right turn.

RV Park converts to “Administrative Office” Add 51,400 sq. ft. office (est.)

No quantitative change to Eastgate Plaza (but future of grocery stores uncertain)

Older development replaced with similar use mix

Add 122,800 sq. ft.

Office (est.)

Add 280,000 sq. ft. Institutional (per BC Master Plan)

Transfer station redevelops

King Co site develops with light industrial use

Physically, very little change
“Opportunistic” uses increase in short-term; Industrial uses increase/return in longer term; Possible increase in R&D/high-tech uses

No Action

Eastgate/I-90
Land Use & Transportation Project
Alternative 2

Regional Employment Center

Eastgate/I-90
Land Use & Transportation Project

Alternative 2
Alternative 3

Functional Improvements

Note: Improve pedestrian connections & streetscapes in accordance with community and City priorities.
Assessment of Alternatives
• Market Feasibility
• Economic Development
• Compatibility with Adjacent Neighborhoods
• Environmental Quality/Character
• Corridor Character
• Parks, Open Space, and Recreation
• Integration of Land Use and Transportation
• Fiscal Feasibility
• Partnerships

Informed by CAC Evaluation Criteria and Council Principles
• None of the Action alternatives is fatally flawed
• Transportation network can function under any alternative; improvements still warranted at existing chokepoints
• Minor difference among alternatives in terms of environmental consequences due to developed nature of corridor
• All Action alternatives include some potentially significant expenses
• All Action alternatives both necessitate and provide opportunity for partnerships with other agencies/institutions
• Many individual enhancements identified can be applied to any alternative

Overall Key Findings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Market Study</th>
<th>No Action</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office (square feet)</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (square feet)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (square feet)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>86,000</td>
<td>-167,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional (square feet)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (units)</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (rooms)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Additional information will be forthcoming on this topic

• While No Action is feasible, it captures little identified market demand and does not provide desired services and amenities
• Alt 1 most closely approximates identified market demand
• Alt 2 provides greatest opportunity for redevelopment, but amount of office growth exceeds identified market demand
• Alt 3 has greatest retail growth, but market demand has not been quantified; falls below market demand in other areas
• Residential development in Richards Valley (Alt 1) unlikely to occur
• Large format retail (Alt 3) could be successful, but would displace other retail uses
Photo Source: http://www.gglo.com/project.aspx?projectId=171&catId=5
• Alternatives reflect range of projected job growth: Alt 2 – 6800, Alt 1 – 3300, Alt 3 – 2100, No Action – 900

• No Action does not improve competitive position

• All retain/provide broad range of economic uses

• All preserve industrial area (No Action shows some growth, Alt 1 some reduction, Alt 2 upgrades, Alt 3 no change)

• All capitalize on unique characteristics of corridor, but in different ways and to different degrees; Alt 2 specifically promotes BC/Richards Valley partnerships for economic development

• Net economic benefit of office development at Sunset Village (Alt 2) questionable
Compatibility with Adjacent Neighborhoods
• All continue to provide neighborhood-serving retail
• No Action could see displacement/loss of neighborhood-serving businesses at Sunset Village and Eastgate Plaza
• All Action alternatives reinforce/expand retail/service opportunities to different degrees, in different ways
• Residential element within corridor (Alts 1 and 3) helps support retail
• Large format retail (Alt 3) could serve neighborhood needs, but might displace existing neighborhood-serving uses
• All keep most new development away from residential edges; building design guidelines could protect adjacent neighborhoods; Alt 2 likely to require greater design control due to potential building scale
• Little difference in environmental consequences due to developed nature of corridor; negligible adverse impacts

• Redevelopment in any alternative could incrementally improve surface and ground water quality due to new stormwater regulations

• No Action results in fewest temporary (construction-related) impacts

• Increased traffic volumes (all alternatives) will increase total CO$_2$ emissions; Alt 1 will reduce Peak Hour vehicle emissions on a per capita basis

• All Action alternatives improve public health and promote sustainability; Alt 1 is strongest
• MTS Trail will contribute to corridor character under all alternatives, though limited effect in and of itself
• Under No Action, no noticeable overall change to character or urban form
• Alts 1 and 2 have most opportunity to improve character, but in much different ways, due to amount and type of redevelopment
• Housing in Alt 1 contributes to variety of scale and architectural detailing; increases evening and weekend vitality, emphasizes mixed-use character
• Transit hub focus in Alt 1 creates strong gateway feature
• Office growth in Alt 2 has opportunity to incorporate MTS Greenway character, green building standards; emphasizes large integrated office campus character

• Alt 2 office growth can change office character from current low-density low-rise form to larger taller buildings

• Added retail in Alt 3 emphasizes corridor as a retail center

• Eastgate interchange landscaping (Alts 2 and 3) creates visual gateway, but not as strong as Alt 1

• All alternatives can improve character with streetscapes, landscaping, boulevards, etc
Parks, Open Space, and Recreation
• All alternatives include Bellevue Airfield Park and MTS Trail (with different alignments)

• All alternatives improve sidewalk and bicycle facilities, though least in No Action

• No Action MTS alignment is most preferred by bicyclist community

• Alt 1 MTS alignment most effectively links activity areas (but faces other challenges)

• Alt 1 includes small parks/greenspaces, conversion of storm detention pond to park-like setting
• Alts 2 and 3 propose no new parks, but Alt 3 proposes partnership with BC for community, recreational, or services facility

• Overall, Alt 1 proposes most desirable package of parks, open space, and recreation features
Land Use and Transportation Integration

Land Use Forecasts

- **No Build**
  - Future baseline employment, land use, housing
  - Traffic Forecast
  - Non Traffic Impacts
  - GHG Analysis
- **Build Alternatives 1, 2, & 3**
  - Future employment, land use, housing
  - Traffic Forecast
  - Non Traffic Impacts
  - GHG Analysis

Evaluate Differences
Transit Assessment

Route Productivity Analysis
Coordination w/Partners
Flow Map Analysis
There is little discernible difference in the projected 2030 traffic impacts among the No Action scenario and the three land use action alternatives; this is not surprising given the already developed nature of the corridor and limited opportunities for redevelopment potential in any of the alternatives.
Travel Demand Modeling

- **Trip Generation**: Based on land use forecast (ie, 2030)
- **Trip Distribution**: Where trips go on the street network
- **Mode Choice**: SOV, HOV, Transit, Ped/Bike
- **Trip Assignment**: Trips assigned to specific streets

Land Use Forecast for Horizon Year
Transportation Network Assumptions

Traffic Data
City of Bellevue
Transportation Department
2010
Transportation Solutions for You

Eastgate/I-90
Land Use & Transportation Project

Travel Demand Modeling
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Delay (Seconds)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>Most vehicles arrive during the green phase and so do not stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10 – 20</td>
<td>More vehicles stop than with LOS A, but many still do not need to stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20 – 35</td>
<td>The number of vehicles stopping is significant, though many still pass through the intersection without stopping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35 – 55</td>
<td>The influence of congestion is noticeable, and most vehicles must stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>55 – 80</td>
<td>Most, if not all vehicles must stop; drivers consider the delay excessive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>80+</td>
<td>Vehicles may wait through multiple cycles to pass through the intersection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing traffic conditions and the anticipated increase in peak hour traffic volumes, regardless of which 2030 land use alternative is selected, indicate that future roadway, transit, and bicycle/pedestrian improvements will still be important to adequately serve transportation needs in the area.
## Estimated 2030 PM Peak Hour Volumes at Selected Intersections (vehicles per hour)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>No Action</th>
<th>Alt 1</th>
<th>Alt 2</th>
<th>Alt 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE Eastgate Way &amp; 150th Ave SE</td>
<td>5,156</td>
<td>5,724</td>
<td>5,744</td>
<td>5,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128th Ave SE (Factoria Blvd) &amp; SE 36th St</td>
<td>5,437</td>
<td>5,345</td>
<td>5,444</td>
<td>5,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150th Ave SE &amp; I-90 EB Off-ramp &amp; SE 37th St</td>
<td>4,216</td>
<td>4,376</td>
<td>4,356</td>
<td>4,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150th Ave SE &amp; SE 38th St</td>
<td>3,713</td>
<td>3,808</td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td>3,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 37th St &amp; I-90 Eastbound On-ramp</td>
<td>1,714</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>1,803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BKR Model

The greatest differences in intersection entering volumes are at SE Eastgate Way & 150th Avenue SE, where there is an 11% increase in 2030 PM peak hour volumes from Alternative 2 to that of the No Action scenario.
150 Ave SE & Eastgate Way
Existing Conditions
Enhancement Option

Third south bound through lane (TFP-154)

Extend left turn lane east into median

Retain island for pedestrian crossings and add crosswalk. Provides access to and from I-90 nonmotorized bridge.

Explore appropriate angle of entry for merging traffic to balance reduced speeds, increased visibility of oncoming westbound traffic and design suitability for right turning vehicles.

Add new 12’ west bound lane on SE Eastgate Way

West bound 5’ bike lane

East bound 5’ bike lane

Consider including a planted median between east bound and west bound traffic

Wayfinding signs for cyclists

Convert to through lane only (no right turn)

Widen east bound approach (12’ lanes)

Restripe north bound approach (12’ lanes)

Directional signs to trail

Northbound 5’ bike lane to merge with sidewalk and separated path

12’ sidewalk area (includes 4’ planting strip) to merge with northbound bike lane and separated trail

Enhance existing crosswalk (only pedestrian crossing)

Wayfinding signs for cyclists

West bound 5’ through bike lane

Highlight conflict zones with colored pavement

Marked crossing for BICYCLES ONLY with waiting area added to existing island

Extend north bound right turn lane to the south on 150th Ave SE

For Illustrative Purposes Only: Applicable to Any Alternative
Construction of eastbound and westbound auxiliary lanes by WSDOT on I-90 between 150th Avenue SE and Lakemont Boulevard would have significant benefits for the I-90 mainline and would help minimize or eliminate the resulting queuing and congestion on City streets that lead to key on-ramps within the project study area.
Eastbound Auxiliary Lane
1 full lane of traffic enters Eastbound I-90 at the interchange and has an immediate merge on to the mainline.

Eastgate Interchange
1 full lane of traffic enters I-90 in the p.m. peak hours and has to merge into the through lanes in a very short distance. This merge causes congestion back up to Richards Road.

By providing an eastbound Auxiliary Lane, vehicles will have more space to enter the mainline traffic resulting a smoother merge and less congestion at this point.
In Bellevue, the current Eastgate interchange operates at or near capacity during peak travel times; often resulting in spillover traffic that causes congestion on the surrounding arterial street network.

With WSDOT improvements, more 2030 trips are expected to access I-90 from the north and south via I-405, instead of using north-south arterials such as 150th Avenue SE.

This situation helps minimize or eliminate the resulting queuing and congestion on City streets leading to on-ramps within the project study area, such as on SE 37th Street and on SE 38th Street.
Constructing a more effective interface between the State’s I-90 ramps and overpasses and the City’s interconnecting streets through the use of boulevard treatments and/or roundabouts could enhance traffic safety and provide community gateway and identity opportunities.
**Update:**
- Addition of a new roundabout at the westbound ramp terminal received WSDOT funding for design and construction (2013 completion).

**Simulated Capacity:**
- WSDOT I-90 Bellevue to North Bend Corridor Study found that roundabout enhancements improve LOS at both intersections from LOS F in the p.m. hour to LOS B or better in 2030.
- In the a.m. peak hour, the westbound ramps intersection operates at LOS F under its current configuration, while the existing single-lane roundabout to the north operates at LOS D.
- With roundabout improvements, both intersections will operate at LOS B in the a.m. peak hour.
For Illustrative Purposes Only: Applicable to Any Alternative

Enhancement Option
“Modeled existing and future operations of roundabout intersections for the Eastgate interchange show enhanced mobility and merit further consideration as a feasible approach to finding balance between motorized/non-motorized uses and the interface between community and regional transportation needs.”

– WSDOT Traffic Design, Headquarters

Simulated Capacity
Feedback from outreach ride participants and the consultant team indicate that the preferred Greenway Trail alignment is south of I-90 (identified as “No Action – Modified”) and that cyclists should also be accommodated on the frontage road on the north side of I-90.
MTSG Trail Alignments
In total, 67 people took the on-line survey. Of the four alternatives presented, 64% of respondents preferred the alignment along the south side of I-90. Cyclists preferred this alternative at a ratio of approximately two to one over the second preferred alignment (north of I-90, along Eastgate Way).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd Choice</th>
<th>3rd Choice</th>
<th>4th Choice</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Plan (2009 Bike/Ped): South of I-90, along SE 36th, continue on south side to Newport Way</td>
<td>63.6% (35)</td>
<td>18.2% (10)</td>
<td>7.3% (4)</td>
<td>10.9% (6)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1: Begin South of I-90, cross over I-90 on the 142nd bridge and continue on north to Sunset trail</td>
<td>13.2% (7)</td>
<td>15.1% (8)</td>
<td>28.3% (15)</td>
<td>43.4% (23)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2: North of I-90, along SE Eastgate Way</td>
<td>21.2% (11)</td>
<td>25.0% (13)</td>
<td>36.5% (19)</td>
<td>17.3% (9)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3: South of I-90, along SE 36th Street, cross under I-90 in tunnel to Sunset trail</td>
<td>10.0% (5)</td>
<td>42.0% (21)</td>
<td>24.0% (12)</td>
<td>24.0% (12)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enhancement Option

For Illustrative Purposes Only: Applicable to Any Alternative

SE 36 Street Median Concept
**Enhancement Option**

*For Illustrative Purposes Only: Applicable to Any Alternative*

**SE 36 Street Median Concept**

ST2 East Link Project:
14’ wide bus zone on east and west side of 142nd Pl SE. Bus zone is 20’ in length with 20’ tapers north and south to expanded sidewalks of 8’

Planted medians are 10’ with a 1’ margin on either side

Planted median separates Mountains to Sound Greenway trail and roadway
Public feedback throughout the Eastgate/I-90 planning process suggests the need to develop engineering solutions to facilitate cyclist movements at intersections on both sides of I-90.
Public Input on SE 36/Factoria:

- “Dangerous intersection; surprised there are not more accidents here.”
- “Change position of access ramps onto bike path.”
- “Need protection when crossing from 36th St to and from bike path from cars turning right off of freeway downramp.”
- “My biggest concern (I have called the city and county) is the crossing of Factoria Blvd. The traffic lights between cars and crosswalks are in direct conflict and are just asking for a collision.”
Alternative 2 has the most opportunity to improve transportation connectivity (vis-a-vis trail connections in the Richards Valley area, two proposed HCT stations instead of one, and vehicular connections to the 156th Avenue SE corridor).
No Action Alternative

Non-Motorized RDI Score

Vehicular RDI Score

HCT ViaCity Score
Change in Non-Motorized RDI Score (Compared to No Action)

Change in Vehicular RDI Score (Compared to No Action)

HCT ViaCity Score

Alternative 3
Some of the improvement concepts depicted in the Action Alternatives are expected to significantly improve transit operations in the corridor (e.g., enhanced connections to Bellevue College in Alt 1 & 3) while others (e.g., direct access ramp to the I-90 Office Park complex in Alt 2) are considered too costly and potentially infeasible to implement.
Routing consistent with Bellevue College to Eastgate P&R Transit Improvement Concept in Alternatives 1 & 3. Specific themes found in the recommendation include increasing route directness to minimize in-bus travel time, serving all-day destinations with more frequent transit, and connecting the Eastgate area with more regional transit destinations.
Increased traffic volumes (all alternatives) will increase total CO\textsubscript{2} emissions; Alt 1 will reduce Peak Hour vehicle emissions on a per capita basis because of its improved Jobs/Housing balance.
Value to Price Curve

Fiscal Feasibility
The No Action alternative is most consistent with available funding because it includes a limited number of infrastructure improvements; the majority of which are programmed in either the City’s 6-year CIP or 12-year TFP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TFP#</th>
<th>Project Name, Location and Limits</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TFP-154</td>
<td>148th/150th Avenue SE/I-90 westbound on-ramp to I-90 westbound off-ramp</td>
<td>Widen by extending the third southbound lane on 148th Avenue SE from the on-ramp to westbound I-90 to south of Eastgate Way at the I-90 westbound off ramp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFP-162</td>
<td>156th Avenue SE at SE Eastgate Way (I-90 westbound off-ramp)</td>
<td>Widen the I-90 westbound off-ramp to provide two dedicated left turn lanes and a shared through/right lane with a channelized right turn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFP-195</td>
<td>150th Avenue SE/SE 37th Street/I-90 off-ramp widening</td>
<td>Widen I-90 off-ramp 300' west of 150th Avenue SE and add a through lane. Widen SE 37th Street approximately 500' to the east of 150th Avenue SE to allow for a bypass lane on the right side of the street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mountains to Sound Greenway Trail improvement is the only project not presently programmed in the City’s transportation financing mechanisms. FHWA’s recent award of Scenic Byway grant funds for the Greenway Trail bodes well for advancing this project in future rounds of grant applications.
- Combined improvements in Action Alternatives are potentially significant expenses for the City and partners.

- Identifying improvements is an important part of the planning process (i.e., “creating a new vision for the area”).

- Despite financial uncertainty, there are encouraging developments that will advance components of the project list.
- **Comprehensive Plan** outlines the City’s long-term (over 20 years) land use vision.

- **Long range facility plans** include a wide range of improvement projects designed to meet the mobility goals of the subarea.

- **Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP)** City’s transportation implementation plan, constrained by identified City and other revenues that are projected for the next 12 years.

- **Capital Investment Program (CIP)** provides a minimum six-year period (the City adopts a seven-year CIP every two years) for implementation of TFP projects that are likely to be needed in the short term.
- I-90 improvements dependent on WA State financing at a time when revenue is limited.

- Despite financial difficulties, if new revenues are realized (e.g., I-90 tolling) it is very likely that the EB auxiliary lanes would be implemented as they are one of WSDOT’s priority projects in I-90.

- **Update:** Encouraging news regarding WSDOT improvements at the Lakemont Interchange. The addition of a new roundabout at the WB ramp terminal received funding for design/construction (2013 completion).
Sound Transit (ST) funding available ($71 M) for ST-3 planning work that may lead to a vote on a future system expansion in the I-90 corridor, including High Capacity Transit (HCT) from Bellevue to Issaquah.

Although it does not fully fund the enhanced station concept in Alt 1 & 3, ST is installing loading zones on 142nd Place SE to provide a paratransit/bus transfer point to replace functionality lost at South Bellevue Park & Ride during construction. Funding for this near-term improvement will help advance the vision for this bridge structure.
Alt 1 & 3 assume reconstructing roads, improving intersection at Snoqualmie River Rd and Coal Creek Rd, and adding new transit stops (cost est = $4.4M); results in more direct bus service to/through Bellevue College and reduces running times for buses (est savings for King County Transit = $500K/year).


“Alt 2 includes a direct access ramp to enhance transit access to the employment area in the vicinity of 156th Avenue. The cost of such a facility is in the vicinity of $80M, if it is feasible to construct.” – Nelson\Nygaard
If implemented, an additional 4,800 hours and 5 buses required for transit vision consistent with Alt 1 and 3.

Some improvements might be realized from ST resources being made available with redeployment of 550 hours upon East Link implementation.

Consistent with new Strategic Plan, Metro is expected to start reducing/eliminating unproductive services in order for it to reinvest resources in more productive areas.

Today’s land use decisions will have a significant influence on King County’s transit resource allocation decisions relative to the project area in the future.
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Partnerships
The No Action and three action alternatives all envision the elimination of the “Eastgate Gap” in the Greenway Trail by 2030.

A City/Greenway Trust partnership, funded through the 2010 National Scenic Byways Grant program, is underway to advance the Greenway Trail alignment recommendation into a more detailed feasibility analysis.
Both Alt 2 and Alt 3 include a gateway treatment for the Eastgate interchange area (estimated cost = $3.2M).

At present there is no direct allocation from WSDOT to increase the tree canopy coverage in the Eastgate interchange area.

**Partnership Concept:**

For every person who test drives a car, Carter Motors makes a donation to plant a tree in the Mountains to Sound Greenway. For each car purchase, it funds the planting of three additional trees. Carter has funded over 27,000 tree plantings in the Greenway.
**WSDOT Interstate Improvements** – The three action alternatives all present greater partnership potential in working with WSDOT than does the No Action alternative.

**Bellevue College to Eastgate P&R Transit Improvements** – Both Alt 1 and Alt 3 incorporate 142nd Place SE transit corridor enhancements, and therefore offer the best partnership opportunities with King County Transit and Sound Transit. Given the benefits of this project to transit operations, a cost sharing partnership (involving both transit agencies) could be explored to advance this project.

**Sound Transit (ST-3)** – The three action alternatives each assume that the Eastgate Park-and-Ride is expected to have high capacity transit stopping at the facility. Bellevue expects (as it has in the past) to play an active role in Sound Transit’s planning process to ensure that appropriate service and capital investments are made in Bellevue.
Bellevue College Land Use Partnerships – The three action alternatives explore partnerships with Bellevue College, but in different ways. Alt 1 promotes strong physical, land use, and market relationships with private development to the south. Alt 2 envisions workforce development and job creation through partnerships with BC and nearby businesses. Alt 3 suggests partnerships with BC and City of other agencies/organizations to create community-oriented uses on the campus. All are worth exploring.
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