

1. If Shoreline is the lead on this project, why would we put wider sidewalks and paths on the south side instead of the north side?

All sections are looking east. Typically the wider non-motorized improvements are shown on the north (Shoreline) side of the corridor. Non-motorized concepts are shown to represent the range of possibilities for bicycles and pedestrians. Any of these concepts can be “mixed and matched” with any of the roadway sections to arrive at a preferred concept.

2. Can staff remind us on Monday of the goals and principles council previously discussed for this project? That would help me remember what we have already decided, and while we may adjust them, it would save time to not reinvent them.

Project goals and principles previously discussed with Council are as follows:

1. **Develop a preferred design concept that will improve the safety, mobility and accessibility for all users along and across the corridor.**
 2. **Arrive at a preferred design concept that will emphasize the movement of people through all modes by enhancing the attractiveness of transit, walking and cycling along the corridor.**
 3. **Develop a preferred design concept that optimizes efficient movement of people and goods.**
 4. **Arrive at a preferred design concept that can support both local and regional economic development objectives by stimulating interest in reinvestment or redevelopment of property along the corridor and near the 145th Street light rail station.**
 5. **Arrive at a preferred design concept that supports City of Shoreline and City of Seattle plans and policies.**
 6. **When identifying the preferred design concept, consider the impacts to adjacent property and business owners resulting from right-of-way acquisition and the construction of improvements including access to property and impacts to existing buildings and improvements.**
 7. **Arrive at a preferred design concept that allows utilities to access, operate, maintain and upgrade facilities in a way that meets the system and/or service requirements for the street and the areas this corridor serves.**
 8. **Arrive at a preferred design concept that provides environmental benefit and mitigation for impacts to critical areas.**
 9. **Improve aesthetics in a manner that improves the comfort of the user and considers enhancements to views.**
 10. **Involve adjacent residents, property and business owners, the public and affected jurisdictions in the decision making process to allow for consideration of all needs along the corridor.**
 11. **Arrive at a preferred design concept that allows different characteristics and features along the corridor and has the flexibility to incorporate site specific constraints, such as environmentally critical areas.**
3. Study concept 3 appears aimed at improving mobility for cars instead of busses. Without bus lanes, could that alternative make improvements for busses such as pull outs and queue jumps so that busses move faster than cars through the corridor?

Concept 3B is an alternative concept that would designate the outer two travel lanes as BAT lanes, thus giving a priority to transit. In addition, queue jumps and Transit Signal Priority (TSP) could be designed into this concept (or any of the concepts). Bus pull outs are being evaluated in study concept 2; typically Metro does not favor pull-outs since it can make it more difficult for the bus to re-enter the traffic stream.

4. Would any of these study concepts allow for future light rail in the corridor, either elevated with columns in the median or center-running at grade? Perhaps 4A, with center running busses, which could be a predecessor to future rapid transit in the corridor if we provide room for center platforms?

At this time, we do not know if the widest concept, 4A could support future light rail. We have not looked at any concept with the idea of designing the corridor to accommodate future light rail. We can certainly do this; it is currently not within the project scope.

5. Has staff looked at scenarios where additional ROW might be all on one side for part of corridor and all on the other side for other parts? Intuitively, it would seem that this approach could accommodate any cross section with 50% or fewer properties impacted.

To date, we have assumed that improvements would be centered about existing roadway centerline to simplify comparisons between alternatives. As we begin to develop a preferred study concept we will start to look at opportunities to shift the roadway alignment to one side or the other to minimize overall property impacts. It is likely that there will be significant property impacts at each intersection even if the alignment can be shifted.