

SEATTLE URBAN FORESTRY COMMISSION

Leif Fixen, Chair • Tom Early, Vice-Chair

Gordon Bradley • Donna Kostka • Richard Martin • Joanna Nelson de Flores • Jeff Reibman • Erik Rundell • Steve Zemke

The Urban Forestry Commission was established to advise the Mayor and City Council concerning the establishment of policy and regulations governing the protection, management, and conservation of trees and vegetation in the City of Seattle

DRAFT June 3, 2015

Meeting Notes

Seattle Municipal Tower, Room 2750 (27th floor)
700 5th Avenue, Seattle

Attending

Commissioners

Leif Fixen - chair
Tom Early – vice chair
Gordon Bradley
Donna Kostka
Jeff Reibman
Steve Zemke

Staff

Sherell Ehlers - SPU
Darren Morgan - SDOT
Sandra Pinto de Bader - OSE

Absent- Excused

Joanna Nelson de Flores
Richard Martin
Erik Rundell

Public

Evan Shaw

NOTE: Meeting notes are not exhaustive. For more details listen to the digital recording of the meeting at: <http://www.seattle.gov/urbanforestrycommission/meetingdocs.htm>

Call to order

Tom will be chairing the meeting and called the meeting to order.

Public comment

Evan Shaw – representing Seattle Audubon. Interested in the Arboretum Multi-use Trail recommendation.

Adoption of May 6 and May 13 meeting notes

ACTION: A motion to approve the May 6 meeting notes as written was made, seconded, and approved.

ACTION: A motion to approve the May 13 meeting notes as amended was made, seconded, and approved.

Stormwater Code update – Sherell Ehlers (SPU)

Sherell did a presentation on the Stormwater Code update.
It's required under Federal Clean Water Act.

What is in our current Stormwater code?

- Source control for ongoing practices;
- Construction site pollution prevention; and
- Green Stormwater Infrastructure (GSI) to maximum extent feasible, flow control and water quality treatment for projects.

They want to achieve equivalency with ecology Manual (2014) and 2013 – 2018 Stormwater NPDES permit.

They also want to revisit some thresholds, and use the revision process as an opportunity to:

- Address shortcomings
- Streamline requirements
- Reorganize stormwater manual based on feedback and
- Simplify and limit text in the Stormwater Manual

Draft Major Code Revisions

- Overview of changes:
- Exemptions: Ch. 22.800
 - o Revised that stand-alone utility projects not subject to on-site Stormwater management
 - o Revised 'road maintenance practices' to 'pavement maintenance practices' (to match Ecology language)
- Vested rights – transition to 2016 stormwater code (vested rights – Ch. 22.800)
 - o Added new language regarding effective date of Stormwater Code
 - o Effective date dependent upon start of constructions
 - o For projects with 'complete applications' submitted under previous stormwater code, start of construction shall be prior to June 30, 2020, otherwise 2016 code applies.
 - o Affects building and mater use permits (including short plats)
- Definitions
 - o Deleted (Ch. 22.801)
 - Agency with jurisdiction
 - Basin plan
 - Cause or contribute to a violation
 - Flow critical receiving water
 - Joint project
 - o Revised (Ch. 22.801)
 - Capacity-constrained system
 - Drainage system
 - Geotechnical engineer
 - Green stormwater infrastructure
 - Impervious surface
 - Land disturbing activity
 - Large project
 - Nutrient-critical receiving water
 - Parcel-based project
 - Pollution-generating impervious surface
 - Pollution-generating pervious surface

- Receiving water
 - Replace impervious surface
 - Roadway project
 - Sidewalk project
 - Single family resident project
 - Site
 - Stormwater
 - Trail project
 - watercourse
- New (Ch. 22.801)
 - Aquatic live use
 - Arterial
 - Combined sewer basin
 - Drainage basing plan
 - Erodible or leachable materials
 - Groundwater
 - Hard surface
 - Illicit connection
 - Industrial activities
 - On-site BMPs
 - Pollution-generating hard surface
 - Private drainage system
 - Project site
 - Replaced hard surface
 - Small lakes
- Prohibited and permissible discharges (Ch 22.802)
 - Discharges to public combined sewer shall meet side sewer code (Ch 21.16)
 - Revised permissible discharges – includes modifications and conditions
 - Dye testing – notice to SPU prior to test
- Minimum requirements for all discharges and all real property (Ch 22.803)
 - Added requirement to map drainage/plumbing infrastructure
 - Added requirement for site maintenance
 - Revisited minimum requirements for source control for specific discharge locations
- Minimum requirements for all projects (Ch. 22.805)
 - GSI to maximum extent feasible is now ‘on site stormwater management’
 - On-site Stormwater management thresholds are based upon project type (e.g. parcel-based, roadway)
 - Amending soils is required based upon project type
 - Added requirement to protect stormwater best management practices during construction.
- Minimum requirements for Single Family residential projects (SFR) (22.805.030)
 - Threshold for on-site stormwater management changed to 750 sf or 1,500 sf (formerly required for all SFR projects)
 - 750 sf threshold applies to projects platted January 1, 2016 or later

- 1,500 sf credit for SFR no longer applicable
- Minimum requirements for parcel-based projects (22.805.050)
 - Threshold for on-site stormwater management changed to 750 sf or 1,500 sf (formerly 2,000 sf for parcel-based projects)
 - 750 sf threshold applies to projects platted January 1, 2016 or later
 - Added flow control requirement for projects permanently discharging groundwater
 - Treatment applies to both pollution-generating hard and pervious surfaces
- Minimum requirements for Roadway projects (22.805.060)
 - Added flow control requirement for projects permanently discharging groundwater
 - Treatment applies to both pollution-generating hard and pervious surfaces
 - Added infeasibility criteria for roadway projects pertaining to:
 - Existing infrastructure and utility limitations
 - Hydraulic limitations
- Minimum requirement standards on-site stormwater management
 - Choose either:
 - On-site list (by project type), or
 - On-site performance standard
 - Size for small storm events (less than 2-year storm)
 - Meet pasture condition if the existing impervious surface is greater than or equal to 35%
 - Meet forested condition for all other projects.

UFC comment: would be good to stress the importance of including trees in trail and sidewalk projects.

Response: Ecology doesn't include trees as a way to mitigate stormwater runoff. Ecology does give credit to trees when one is doing performance standard (twice as much for conifers than deciduous).

UFC question: most of these provisions begin when development takes place?

Answer: yes.

UFC question: how about for Single Family homes?

Answer: depending on the area of the City, there are programs such as Rainwise (in combined sewer areas) and also installation of rain gardens.

UFC questions; are there any manual changes that are going above and beyond Ecology's recommendations?

Answer: Some are, for example infiltration mechanisms that make more sense for Seattle.

UFC question: how about use of Silva cells?

Answer: it would be more on the ROW not so much on the private property side. Sherell will check.

One of the competing needs is because of existing trees – you can reduce these requirements if there are conflicts with existing trees (Chapters 1543, CH 2509, 2511, 2360A).

UFC comment: The Comp Plan doesn't mention in section 3.5-11 using stormwater runoff is not mentioned as a benefit of trees.

Timeline:

Spring 2013 – outreach to frequent users

Summer 2013 – initial outreach

Fall 2013/winter 2014 – public outreach

Spring 2014 – initial drafts available for public comment

Spring-summer 2015 – legislative process and formal public review for 2016 Stormwater Code Update

Summer/fall 2015 – Director's Rule process and formal public review for 2016 Stormwater Manual update

January 2016 – Code and related Stormwater Manual (Director's Rule) and scheduled to take effect.

Trees and Sidewalks Operations Plan – Darren Morgan (SDOT)

Darren Morgan presented an update on the plan.

The Trees and Sidewalks Operations Plan's purpose was to develop options to address conflicts and use case studies to illustrate applications.

The project goals are accessibility and health, environment, equity and efficiency.

Public comment was received and incorporated. They included comments from the Urban Forestry Commission, Feet First, Community members, and additional internal SDOT reviewers.

The final plan was adopted as SDOT Director's Rule on February 2015. As the project comes to a close they are doing implementation in Madrona.

UFC question: What's going on with 23rd Ave – from Rainier to University District. Trees have signs.

Answer: there are some trees being protected and some are being removed.

Darren will send out the link to the tree posting CAM and the website to the 23rd Ave project.

UFC question: how are conifers evaluated in this situation? How is conflict management dealt with? If you are evaluating a space for tree planting where there might be soil constraints, how do you evaluate what kind of tree should be planted? Sometimes conifers create fewer conflicts than some hard woods.

Answer: we do the same evaluation and bring our urban forestry knowledge. There are also actions recommended that were beyond the scope of the project. One of them is updating the street tree list and incorporating looking at soil volume and canopy space. SDOT tries to make it a priority to plant conifers if the location is appropriate.

UFC question: this effort came out of a Madrona project. Has this been instituted in the area?

Answer: yes, we are working on implementing it this summer.

Next steps:

2015 – Madrona project construction, 23rd Ave Phase I. Sidewalk spot repairs will be ongoing.

Revised Arboretum Mixed-use Trail letter of recommendation – discussion and possible vote

The Commission discussed the revised letter.

ACTION: A motion to approve the letter of recommendation as amended was made, seconded, and approved.

Bylaws update and protocols review – discussion and possible vote

Sandra presented the changes to the Bylaws which reflect the addition of a tenth position

UFC comments to ECA and LID updates – initial discussion

Move to next week

Comp Plan EIS – Steve introduced a document to guide next week’s discussion.

New business and announcements

Natural Area Policy – how to proceed with UFC involvement. MOVE TO NEXT WEEK

Explore the option of asking for additional funding for at least a part time position to provide additional support. Agenda item for discussion and then produce a letter.

Adjourn

Public Input

From: Mark Holland [mailto:solarhound@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2015 10:05 PM

To: Acosta, Rachel

Cc: LEG_CouncilMembers; Mira Latoszek; Pence, Roger; friends@seattleolmsted.org; Pinto De Bader, Sandra; Sugimura, Diane; Matsuno, Bernie

Subject: CHEASTY - Do not approve current design.

Seattle Board of Park Commissioners,

I ask that you do not approve the design for the Cheasty Mountain Bike/Pedestrian Trail Pilot Project tomorrow night for the following reasons.

THE CURRENT DESIGN DOES NOT MATCH **Council Bill Number: 118151, August 11, 2014.**

The current design does not match the City Council approved concept for a multi use trail. If the Board of Park Commissioners approves the current design, they will be telling the City Council that they made a mistake in their vote on Cheasty.

If the Project Advisory Team (PAT) process did not produce a design that matches the City Council directive then the PAT failed and the design should not be approved.

Instead of multi-use, the current design splits the trail into two separate tracks with minimal "multi-use" function. One track for bikes and a separate track for pedestrians.

On the tour of Cheasty today, we heard board members, Parks Department and City Council staff discuss all the reasons why the Parks Department decided to use a separated trails system, rather than a multi-use trail like the design at St. Edwards State Park.

The Parks Department cited St. Edwards as a model of what they want to achieve at Cheasty, yet the design chosen by the Parks Department for Cheasty is the opposite of the multi-use trails at St. Edwards. If the Parks Department wanted to build a separated trails system, why did they give the example of St. Edwards, a multi-use trail system?

If you would like to hear what the City Council said, here is the meeting video from 8/11/2014. The discussion of Cheasty Greenspace starts at about 34:40. It is approximately 20 minutes long. .

<http://www.seattlechannel.org/mayor-and-council/city-council/full-council?videoid=x20397>

THE CURRENT DESIGN IS NOT A MULTI-USE TRAIL.

What I did not hear discussed on the tour are the reasons why the City Council approved a multi-use, perimeter trail only design for Cheasty.

Those reasons are:

A. The Urban Forestry Commission Letter from April 2, 2014, recommending a perimeter trail only with no incursion into the forested interior to avoid disturbing or displacing wildlife.

[http://www.seattle.gov/parks/projects/cheasty/files/letter_from UFC 4-2-14.pdf](http://www.seattle.gov/parks/projects/cheasty/files/letter_from_UFC_4-2-14.pdf)

B. Overwhelming public opposition to the bike park component of the Cheasty trails plan. In an unprecedented action, the City Council held back the \$100,000 Neighborhood Matching Fund from a package of twelve applications. That is how we wound up with the PAT. It also shows how serious the City Council is about their decision. I would not recommend the Board take a vote of opposition to the City Council decision lightly. Remember, the letter sent by the Board to the Mayor and City Council in support of cross trails and the full build out of the bike park produced a negative reaction from the City Council, and only served to further disrupt the public process.

C. Nature trails or Mountain Bike race track? To design the trails in such a way that slows bicycles down and does not turn the entire forest over for a race track for a single user group (mountain bikers) to the exclusion or detriment of other users. That might mean that bicycles would have to slow down for pedestrians and share the trail once in a while.

D. To limit the effect of impermeable trail surface in order to protect the wetlands and avoid erosion. The Parks Department claims that a separated trail system will have less impact on the forest than a multi use trails system. They claim that a four foot wide path is inadequate for bikes and pedestrians, and that it would have to be ten feet wide to accommodate bikes and pedestrians. If mountain bikers slow down that will be no problem. Parks claims they need a four foot wide trail for pedestrians, and an additional two to four foot wide trails for bikes. That is an area of six to eight feet wide times 2 miles (5280 feet) long equaling 84,480 square feet. In other words, the Parks Department is talking about removing nearly two acres of permeable surface from this tiny 29 acre parcel of forest. A single multi use or pedestrian only trail would still remove an acre (43,560 sq. ft.) of permeable surface.

THE CURRENT DESIGN IS NOT A PERIMETER TRAIL.

The current design does not comply with the City Council directive for Cheasty to have a multi-use perimeter trail only. Instead, the bike trail goes deep into the forest around the bulk storage yard, and goes directly through the forest interior for most of the narrow Northern section. The trails also go directly through wetlands in some locations. This goes directly against the recommendations of the Urban Forestry Commission and the City Council. During the PAT, someone pointed out to the bike park architect after her presentation that the trails are interior, not perimeter. She agreed and said, "But no one said anything."

FALSE COMPARISONS

On the tour, we also heard comparisons of Cheasty to the Burke-Gilman trail and Green Lake. These are false comparisons. Burke-Gilman is a major bicycle transportation corridor linking miles of Seattle Neighborhoods, Parks and Boulevards. A better comparison for Burke-Gilman would be the Chief Sealth trail. Green Lake is a Major urban park with a regional user base. Jefferson Park would be a better comparison for Green Lake.

Cheasty is not a bicycle transportation corridor, or a regional park. Cheasty Green Space a tiny strip of forested wildlife habitat surrounded by a dense urban environment. Wildlife Habitat is the official designation of the Cheasty Green Space.

An accurate comparison for Cheasty would be another forested park like Seward. At Seward Park, bikes are only allowed on the multi use perimeter trail, but never on the interior forest trails.

Thanks to the bicycle use policy, bikes never will be allowed in Seward Park interior forest trails.

If bicycles will never be allowed in Seward Park, bicycles should not be allowed in Cheasty either.

What makes Cheasty less deserving of the protection of the bicycle use policy than Seward Park? Why should Beacon Hill and Rainier Valley not get the same level of protection as people in Seward Park?

Bicycle use policy: Notice the language is explicit. "Sensitive Natural Areas.....have been damaged by excessive bicycle use."

<http://www.seattle.gov/parks/projects/cheasty/files/BicycleUsePolicy.pdf>

SCIENCE IS SUPERFICIAL, MORE STUDY NEEDED.

The science on the Cheasty Green Space barely scratched the surface on both geotech and wildlife. The ESA report identified twelve individual wetlands in Cheasty, up from the three identified in the 2003 Cheasty Green Space Vegetation Management Plan. The wetlands identified in the ESA report have yet to be delineated.

In fact, the science is so superficial that the Urban Forestry Commission (UFC) recently sent a letter to the City Council and Mayor detailing their concerns about the lack of adequate geotechnical study. Here is the May 6, 2015 UFC letter on Cheasty.

<http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/UrbanForestryCommission/FinalIssuedDocuments/Recommendations/ADOPTEDCheastyWetlandHydrologyIssues050615.pdf>

The wildlife biologist only visited Cheasty on two days in winter. Birds are most abundant in the forest throughout nesting season from April through October each year. A two day winter study is not sufficient to assess the wildlife conditions on the ground, or in the trees.

The Parks Department says they will monitor the Bike Park pilot for "success". How will they be able to measure that success, regarding wildlife protection, when all they have is a two day study during winter?

Here is the ESA

report: http://www.seattle.gov/parks/projects/cheasty/files/Jan29_Cheasty%20Greenspace%20Wetland%20and%20Geotechnical%20Reconnaissance.pdf

CITY COUNCIL BILL 118151

The bill and three amendments are attached.

Here is the "council connections" article written by Tom Rasmussen shortly after the Park Board letter to the Mayor and City Council calling for cross trails and a full build out of the plan. The board chose to send the letter while the Project Advisory Team was still meeting and had yet to vote on the issue.

Synopsis: The environmental regulations that protect forests and natural areas in Seattle were passed by the City Council for good reasons that are still valid today. Let's not forget why we created these policies in the first place.

<http://council.seattle.gov/2015/02/04/%EF%BB%BFupdate-on-the-cheasty-mountain-bikepedestrian-trail-pilot-project/>

As a member of the public, I would describe the Park Boards decision to send the bike park support letter as akin to a member of the public standing up during a Park Board meeting and yelling NO! during the board discussion outside the public comment period. The public respects the Parks Board process. Why does the Park Board not show the same respect for the public process?

The Park Board showed a lack of respect for the public process with their Cheasty letter. I hope that poor decision was an aberration, and not a new direction for the Park Board.

Seattle Board of Park Commissioners, do not go it alone. To support the current design is to go against the recommendations of the Urban Forestry Commission, the City Council, and a significant portion of the public. Opposition to this project is city wide now.

ALTERNATIVE PLAN: FOLLOW PORTLAND'S EXAMPLE

Instead of rushing ahead with a bike park, Seattle should follow Portland's lead and put a moratorium on mountain biking in natural areas until a city wide comprehensive study can be completed to identify the right places for mountain bike facilities. Portland has far more natural area (70%) than Seattle (14%). Yet look at the precautionary approach Portland takes with natural areas, even though they have so much, while Seattle blunders blindly forward focused only on Cheasty, with only superficial study, all while preparing to develop the last 14% of Natural areas left in Seattle for active recreation.

http://www.oregonlive.com/environment/index.ssf/2015/03/portland_officials_ban_mountain.html

Thank you,

Mark Holland
2218 14th ave. S.
Seattle, WA. 98144

From: JvA [mailto:julievanarcken@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2015 10:29 PM

To: Acosta, Rachel; LEG_CouncilMembers; Pinto de Bader, Sandra; Sugimura, Diane; Matsuno, Bernie

Subject: Cheasty: do not approve current design

Dear Board of Commissioners:

I wanted to echo many of Mark Holland's comments about why you should not approve the current Cheasty design:

--The current design does not match the City Council-approved concept for a multi-use perimeter trail.

--The Urban Forestry Commission recommended a perimeter trail only with no incursion into the forested interior to avoid disturbing or displacing

wildlife: http://www.seattle.gov/parks/projects/cheasty/files/letter_from_UFC_4-2-14.pdf

--According to the Urban Forestry Commission, the geotechnical study completed to date is inadequate: <http://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/UrbanForestryCommission/FinalIssuedDocuments/Recommendations/ADOPTEDCheastyWetlandHydrologyIssues050615.pdf>

--As City Councilmember Tom Rasmussen pointed out, the environmental regulations that protect forests and natural areas in Seattle were passed by the City Council for good reasons that are still valid

today: <http://council.seattle.gov/2015/02/04/%EF%BB%BFupdate-on-the-cheasty-mountain-bikepedestrian-trail-pilot-project/>

Thank you,
Julie van Arcken
5559 20th Ave. S.
Mid Beacon Hill

From: Robert Kettle [mailto:kettlere@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2015 4:17 PM
To: Pinto De Bader, Sandra
Cc: Future Anne Queen
Subject: Seattle Children's Home Development Update: Toll abandons Full Review commitment

Sandra,

Please pass the following update to the Urban Forestry Commission. Thank you.

Urban Forestry Commission,

Please see the Future Queen Anne notice below regarding a change in Toll Bros. approach to the review process of the Seattle Children's Home development on Queen Anne despite numerous assurances to Future Queen Anne and other organizations that they were committed to the review process. This change is quite concerning especially since the community has not seen the new updated Toll Bros. arborist report from the draft that read quite differently from the initial Toll Bros. arborist report.

Thank you for your interest and concern about this development project in Queen Anne and how it plays in our city's tree canopy goals by hopefully being an example of smart growth that protects trees!

Best regards, Bob

Robert Kettle

Begin forwarded message:

From: Future Queen Anne <futurequeenanne@outlook.com>
Date: May 22, 2015 6:32:57 PM PDT
To: Future Queen Anne <futurequeenanne@outlook.com>
Cc: "Sugimura, Diane" <diane.sugimura@seattle.gov>, "bruce.rips@seattle.gov" <bruce.rips@seattle.gov>
Subject: Toll abandons Full Review commitment

UPDATE

Dear Community Members,

We have just been informed of a change in the status of Toll Brothers application to redevelop the historic Seattle Children's Home site and wanted to ensure the community had this information.

Toll has bailed out of the City's Full Design Review process. At several public meetings Toll assured the community and the City that they were committed to Full Design Review rather than Streamline Review of their application. We had no indication that had changed until yesterday. We have been tracking the project on the DPD website and the only activity since February was a notice that the project was put on hold due to nonpayment of fees. With a recent payment the hold was lifted. DPD sent a Public Notice yesterday indicating Toll has now reapplied under Streamlined Review. In this silent period, it appears, decisions were being made behind the scenes to expedite the application process.

This development could become the largest townhouse development in any LR1 neighborhood in Seattle. It merits comprehensive review. Not only are the associated impacts significant with a project of this scale, the decisions made could set a precedent for the few unique, large, green properties in other Seattle neighborhoods.

Toll's new project application has not yet been posted. We will provide more information about the implications of this switch, and how best to give input, as soon as we have access to the documents.

Thank you for your continued engagement and commitment toward a better outcome for our community and our City. We'll let you know when we know more.

Future Queen Anne

From: Peg Staeheli [mailto:pegs@svrdesign.com]

Sent: Monday, June 01, 2015 8:56 AM

To: Pinto De Bader, Sandra

Subject: FW: [seattleped] Re: Roosevelt Paving & Safety Project Update- relates to Trees

Sandra- as this change also relates to street trees I thought it would be good to let the UFC know

Peg Staeheli, FASLA, LEED AP | founding principal / landscape architect

SvR Design Company 1205 Second Avenue, Suite 200 Seattle, WA 98101

t. 206.223.0326 ext.1002 f. 206.223.0125

www.svrdesign.com tw. @svrdesign fb. www.facebook.com/svrdesign

This message is intended solely for the recipient and should not be opened, read or utilized by any other party. This message shall not be construed as official project information or as a direction except as expressly provided in the contract documents.

SvR Design Company's Confidentiality Notice and Permitted Use:

This email message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient and may contain confidential, proprietary and/or privileged information, as well as content subject to copyright and other intellectual property laws. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not disclose, use, copy or distribute this email message or its attachments. If you believe you have received this email message in error, please contact the sender by reply email and immediately delete this email and destroy any copies.

Prior to use of this email message or its attachments, the intended recipient agrees to SvR's terms of Use for intellectual property located at <http://www.svrdesign.com/termsofuse>. Any such use indicates recipient's acceptance of the above statements and conditions of permitted use without exception.

From: seattleped@yahoogroups.com [<mailto:seattleped@yahoogroups.com>]

Sent: Saturday, May 30, 2015 10:16 PM

To: <jacobstruiksma@gmail.com>

Cc: <seattleped@yahoogroups.com>; dickie dyksterhuis; Marci Carpenter; Jeffrey Linn; Jennifer Olegario; John Stewart; Godden, Jean; <joanne.patten@seattlechildrens.org>; <jon.morgan.1999@owu.edu>; Beau Morton; <caitlin@feetfirst.info>; Cathy Tuttle; Chas Redmond; <CASCADE-TRANSPORTATION-FORUM@LISTS.SIERRACLUB.ORG>; Conrad Reynoldson; <lisa@feetfirst.info>; <livablestreets@seattlechildrens.org>; Madame Keya; Anne Vernez Moudon; James, Michael - DOT; Shaw, Michael; Mike O'Brien; James McIntosh; People for Michael Maddux; Mike Lindblom; <neseattle-greenways@googlegroups.com>; Nick Licata; Robin Randels; Tanna Shoyo; Wu, Howard; Brochet, Art; Dougherty, Brian

Subject: [seattleped] Re: Roosevelt Paving & Safety Project Update

This is unbelievable. Truly. When this project was presented to the ped board recently, we were assured the funding had been secured. How can that have been so far from the truth? We need for someone to come and explain this at the June 17 meeting.

At this point my personal preference would be to see this project added to the Move Seattle levy and delayed until such time as safety improvements for all users can be accomplished.

On May 30, 2015, at 4:52 PM, "Jacob Struiksma" <jacobstruiksma@gmail.com> wrote:

This is crazy that curb bolts not going to happen at all the intersections on Roosevelt way. Why do people that walk have to be second to everything? Why do people that walk get the short end of things all the time?

From: Elliott, Paul [<mailto:Paul.Elliott@seattle.gov>]

Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2015 10:34 AM

To: Elliott, Paul

Subject: Roosevelt Paving & Safety Project Update

Dear Neighbor,

SDOT will periodically distribute project updates about the Roosevelt Paving & Safety Improvement Project.

We write today to let you know that the expected start of construction has been moved back from late September until the end of the year. Perhaps more significant, fiscal constraints have forced SDOT to remove construction of most of the curb bulbs and expanded tree pits, which we'd previously indicated would be included in the project. (The one positive benefit of dropping these elements from the project is that construction will likely be significantly shorter than the ten months previously expected.)

Curb bulbs extend the sidewalk out, typically into a parking lane at intersections, in part to ensure that curb ramps (wheelchair ramps) meet the federally mandated standards of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). They have the additional benefit of making pedestrians more visible to motorists, and vehicles more visible to those pedestrians. They also have the effect of shortening the crossing distance for these pedestrians. As such, curb bulbs increase safety for pedestrians, and seem to enjoy broad community support.

Sadly, the curb bulbs and enlarged tree pits were determined to be the most logical project elements that could be eliminated and bring the budget back into balance. The curb bulbs were initially included in part to provide adequate room for standard curb ramps. However, we were able to accommodate the ramps and meet design standards without the curb bulbs in most locations. A summary of the changes is as follows:

- 65th – Existing curb bulb on the southeast corner will remain. The planned bus island on the west side of Roosevelt (on the south side of 65th) will be moved a little south from the current bus stop location.
- 64th – The existing curb bulbs on all four corners of this intersection will remain unchanged.
- 63rd – Curb ramps planned for all four corners have been eliminated.
- 62nd – Curb ramps planned for all four corners have been eliminated.
- 61st – Plans to extend out the northeast corner (in front of Salvatore Ristorante Italiano) and the southeast corner (by the Budget Rental lot) have been shelved and will remain in the current configuration. (Extending, or pushing out the sidewalk reduces the curb radius, which helps to reduce the speed of turning vehicles, while also reducing the crossing distance, though not as much as with a curb bulb.)
- Ravenna Boulevard – The planned curb ramps for the northwest and southwest corners have been eliminated, as well as on the northeast corner, where the original plan had called for pushing out the sidewalk.
- 59th, 58th, & 57th – These three T-intersections have streets intersecting with Roosevelt from the west, but have no corresponding east/west street on the east side of Roosevelt. The original plan had been to bulb out the sidewalk on the east side of Roosevelt, with corresponding curb bulbs on the west side of Roosevelt at all three intersections. The updated plan would retain the east side bulb out at 58th, but would eliminate those planned for 59th & 57th. The west side curb bulbs will be retained at both 58th and 57th, but will be eliminated at 59th.
- 56th – The previous plans would have pushed out three of four corners, but did not provide for curb bulbs at each. Instead, all four corners will remain as they are today.

- 55th – Plans to build curb bulbs on the northwest and southwest corners have been eliminated. All four corners of the intersection will remain unchanged.
- 53rd – This is another T-intersection, with 53rd intersecting with Roosevelt from the west. The planned sidewalk bulb out on the east side of the street is being retained, but the companion curb bulbs on the northwest and southwest corners of the intersection have been eliminated. Instead the sidewalks on the northwest and southwest corners will be pushed out to better match the new east side ramps.
- 52nd – This T-intersection has 52nd intersecting with Roosevelt from the east. The planned curb bulbs for the northeast and southeast corners of the intersection will be constructed.
- 50th – The original construction plan would retain the existing condition on all four corners of this intersection. This remains unchanged. The existing curb bulbs on the northeast and southeast corners of the intersection will be retained.
- 47th – The curb bulbs planned for all four corners have been eliminated.
- 45th – A new bus island will be constructed on the southwest corner of the intersection. The other three corners will not be altered by the project.
- 43rd – The existing curb bulb on the northeast corner will remain unchanged, while the planned curb bulb for the southeast corner has been eliminated. The plan to bulb out the sidewalk on the east side of Roosevelt in front of the Watertown Hotel is being retained in the project plan. The northwest and southwest corners will remain unchanged by construction.
- 42nd – The planned bulb out on 42nd on the northeast corner (by Hardwick's Hardware) is being retained in the project plan. The plan to bulb out the sidewalk further to the south (in front of Portage Bay Café), opposite the southern leg of 42nd (west side of Roosevelt) will be retained, but will be shorter than originally planned. Plans to bulb out the northwest and southwest corner into 42nd have been eliminated.
- 41st – No curb bulbs had been planned for this intersection, and that remains unchanged.

All other elements of the project previously released to the public will remain unchanged. The protected bike lane along the west side of Roosevelt from NE 65th to the University Bridge will remain, as will plans to replace sidewalks buckled by tree roots.

As mentioned at the beginning of this email, construction is now scheduled to begin at the end of the year. SDOT will hold a pre construction open house for the public, and will see that adjacent property owners and/or tenants will be informed of the schedule for construction in front of their property along with the expected impacts.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to email or call and we'll do our best to provide answers.

Thank you for your cooperation and understanding.

<image006.jpg>Paul Elliott
 Community Relations
 City of Seattle Department of Transportation
 O: 206.684.5321 | F: 206.615.1237 | paul.elliott@seattle.gov