## ISLAND CREST WAY CORRIDOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Council Action:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct the City Manager to return to the City Council with a final project scope, schedule and budget for the Island Crest Way corridor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEPARTMENT OF
Maintenance (Anne Tonella-Howe)

### COUNCIL LIAISON
n/a

### EXHIBITS
1. Historical Summary
2. Public Involvement Process Charter
3. Citizen Panel Members
4. Comparison Matrix
5. March 3, 2009 Open House Summary of Comments
6. Aerial View – Option described in 2009-2014 TIP
8. Aerial View – Citizen Panel Recommendation Alternative C3
10. Typical Cross-section

### APPROVED BY CITY MANAGER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>$ n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMOUNT BUDGETED</td>
<td>$ n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROPRIATION REQUIRED</td>
<td>$ n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SUMMARY

The purpose of this agenda bill is to provide information to the City Council as it reconsider future improvements to the Island Crest Way corridor and its intersection with Merrimount Drive. Previous decisions related to this corridor and the recommendations of the Island Crest Way Citizen Panel (Citizen Panel) will be summarized. Development Services Director Steve Lancaster will present the Citizen Panel process and recommendation. Consulting engineer Joe Giacobazzi of KPG, Inc. will describe the alternatives and be available to answer technical questions.

### Background

In 2006 the Mercer Island City Council directed staff to develop alternatives for improving the intersection of Island Crest Way and Merrimount Drive as part of a larger study of transportation improvement needs in the vicinity of the proposed PEAK project. The purpose of the study was to document existing traffic conditions, identify “level of service” (LOS) deficiencies, and develop a comprehensive and realistic set of alternatives for system improvements. The study area included the SE 40th corridor from Island Crest Way to Gallagher...
Hill Road and the intersection of Island Crest Way and Merrimount Drive. Improvements to the SE 40th Street corridor were completed in 2009.

In 2007 a trial improvement was proposed and implemented at the Island Crest Way/Merrimount Drive intersection. This improvement was designed to reduce accidents at the intersection by eliminating some traffic movements (straight through across Island Crest Way; left turns to and from SE 44th) and by improving other movements (left turn to and from Merrimount Drive) without significantly affecting traffic flow.

After a six-month trial, staff collected post-construction traffic data and returned to Council on May 5, 2008 to present what was learned from the trial improvements. What was accomplished, both positive and negative, are noted in the Historical Summary attached as Exhibit 1 (May 5, 2008 meeting). Following the presentation and discussion Council adopted the 2009-2014 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) on June 2, 2008 with the following project: 3-lane configuration from approximately SE 42nd Street to SE 53rd Street, including pedestrian crossings and evaluation of bus stops along the Island Crest Way corridor to ensure the design does not impede traffic flow.

Following adoption of the 2009-2014 TIP and based upon continuing public interest on this topic, the City Council postponed implementation of any changes to Island Crest Way and on September 15, 2008 directed staff to facilitate a public involvement process to gather additional input.

**Island Crest Way Public Involvement Process**

The approved public involvement process was defined by a “Charter” that established a Citizen Panel of 15 citizens plus two City Council members to be selected by the mayor and confirmed by the Council. The Charter set forth goals and criteria for the Citizen Panel review, including considerations of safety, travel times, fiscal responsibility and sustainability. A copy of the Charter is provided as Exhibit 2.

Forty-six Mercer Island residents submitted applications to serve on the Citizen Panel. Fifteen citizens having a variety of stated interests and representing various geographic areas were selected by Mayor Jim Pearman and confirmed by the City Council on October 20, 2008. A list of Panel members is provided in Exhibit 3. Mayor Pearman and City Councilmember Dan Grausz were selected to serve as the City Council liaisons on the Panel.

The Citizen Panel met three times between mid November 2008 and late January 2009. Over the course of the three meetings the Panel reviewed a total of ten alternatives for improving Island Crest Way between SE 42nd Street and Lansdowne Lane (summarized by Exhibit 4). Time was set aside at each meeting for the public to address the Panel.

**November 13, 2008.** After reviewing and concurring with the goals established by the Charter, the Citizen Panel reviewed the Island Crest Way options that had been considered by the City Council as well as the three-lane alternative selected by the Council on June 2, 2008. With the assistance of consulting engineer Joe Giacobazzi, the Citizen Panel identified a total of nine alternatives for further analysis and review (Alternatives A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2, D1, D2 and D3).

**December 9, 2008.** Consulting engineer Giacobazzi presented drawings and analysis of the nine alternatives previously identified by the Citizen Panel. Following considerable discussion, the Panel identified one additional alternative to be considered (C3), and eliminated four previously identified alternatives from further consideration (B1, C1, C2 and D1).

**January 29, 2009.** The Citizen Panel undertook an extensive discussion of the six remaining alternatives, at one point bringing back one previously eliminated alternative for reconsideration (B1). The Panel reached
consensus to move forward with two alternatives as its recommendation to the community and the City Council: Alternatives B2 (Exhibit 7) and C3 (Exhibit 8).

An Open House was held on March 3, 2009 to present the Citizen Panel recommendations to the community and obtain additional input. Approximately 65 people attended. A summary of the comments received are provided in Exhibit 5.

Island Crest Way Alternatives

Various options have been reviewed and analyzed over the last several years. Described below are the options as approved in the 2009-2014 TIP and the two options recommended by the Citizen Panel (B2 and C3). In addition, descriptions of the option of a traffic signal and the option to enhance what is there have been included.

Option described in 2009 – 2014 TIP

This option is a corridor enhancement improving traffic flow, vehicle access and pedestrian circulation between the 4200 block and 5300 block. This option (shown in Exhibit 6) includes the following:

- 3-lane roadway between SE 42nd Street and the 5300 block with transition to 4-lane roadway north of SE 42nd Street and to the 2-lane road in the vicinity of the mailbox pullout.
- Pedestrian crossings located along the corridor at safe, sensible locations. Locations of crossings and crosswalk treatment to be selected during final design.
- Widening at bus zones and/or other locations along the corridor that may warrant widening to minimize traffic flow impedance.
- Sidewalk connections on the eastside to connect pedestrian crossings to the closest side street.
- Evaluation of street lighting along the corridor, with particular emphasis at intersections and pedestrian crossings.
- Estimated project cost (includes design and construction) - $600,000

Options recommended by the Citizen Panel

Option B2 – this option is a corridor enhancement improving traffic flow, vehicle access and pedestrian circulation between Merrimount Drive and 86th Avenue SE. This option (shown in Exhibit 7) includes the following:

- 3-lane roadway between Merrimount Drive and 86th Avenue SE with transitions to the 4-lane roadway north of Merrimount Drive and south of 86th Avenue SE.
- Pedestrian crossings located along the corridor at safe, sensible, locations. Two pedestrian signals are suggested with this option in the 4-lane roadway sections. Locations of crossings and crosswalk treatment to be selected during final design.
- Widening at bus zones and/or other locations along the corridor that may warrant widening to minimize traffic flow impedance. Locations will be identified during final design.
- Sidewalk connections on the eastside to connect pedestrian crossings to the closest side street.
- Evaluation of street lighting along the corridor, with particular emphasis at intersections and pedestrian crossings.
- Estimated project cost (includes design and construction) - $600,000

Option C3 – this option is a corridor enhancement improving traffic flow, vehicle access and pedestrian circulation between Merrimount Drive and 5300 block. This option (shown in Exhibit 8) includes the following:

- 3-lane roadway between Merrimount Drive to the 5300 block with transitions to the 4-lane roadway north of Merrimount Drive and to the 2-lane roadway in the vicinity of the mailbox pullout on the south end.
- Pedestrian crossings located along the corridor at safe, sensible, locations. One pedestrian signal is suggested with this option in the 4-lane roadway section. Locations of crossings and crosswalk treatment to be selected during final design.
- Widening at bus zones and/or other locations along the corridor that may warrant widening to minimize traffic flow impedance. Locations will be selected during final design.
- Sidewalk connections on the eastside to connect pedestrian crossings to the closest side street.
- Evaluation of street lighting along the corridor, with particular emphasis at intersections and pedestrian crossings.
- Estimated project cost (includes design and construction) - $650,000

Traffic Signal at Merrimount Drive
This option improves vehicle access and pedestrian circulation at the intersection only. This option shown in Exhibit 9) includes:
- A traffic signal at the intersection maintaining 4-lanes through the intersection. Widening at the intersection is required. The traffic signal would provide pedestrian crossing at the intersection.
- To improve pedestrian circulation along the corridor a few pedestrian crossings could be located at safe, sensible locations. Two pedestrian signals are suggested be included with this option. Locations of crossings and crosswalk treatments would be identified during final design.
- Sidewalk connections on the east side to connect pedestrian crossings to the closest side street.
- Evaluation of street lighting along the corridor, with particular emphasis at intersections and pedestrian crossings.
- Estimated project cost (includes design and construction) - $1,950,000

Improve Existing Conditions
This option improves vehicle access at the intersection only and includes:
- Improve the aesthetics of the intersection by removing pylons and other temporary devices and replace with permanent improvements. Improve street lighting and install additional signage. Widen the intersection as required.
- To improve pedestrian circulation along the corridor a few pedestrian crossings could be located at safe, sensible locations. Three pedestrian signals are suggested be included with this option. Locations of crossings and crosswalk treatments would be identified during final design.
- Sidewalk connections on the east side to connect pedestrian crossings to the closest side street.
- Evaluation of street lighting along the corridor, with particular emphasis at intersections and pedestrian crossings.
- Estimated project Cost (includes design and construction) - $740,000

Safety of the Corridor
Throughout the discussion and analysis work on Island Crest Way, much has been said about pedestrian and traffic safety in the corridor. For the purposes of the Council’s deliberations on the various options, staff makes the following safety observations:
- The temporary improvements have benefited safety at the intersection by reducing “T-bone” accidents, which are among the most dangerous type.
- For pedestrians, crossing four lanes of Island Crest Way is challenging. Locations with a protected area to cross to and that provide a shorter crossing distance makes crossing easier.
- Any of the options can be designed and built in a way that provides a safe environment for intended users.
- The 3-lane roadway option with the center turn lane provides improved left-turn access for vehicles entering/exiting Island Crest Way.

Current Status of ICW Project
As of the end of the Citizen Panel’s work, interim improvements are constructed at the intersection of Island Crest Way and Merrimount Drive. These improvements were constructed in October 2007. The City’s 2009 TIP has $500,000 earmarked for an ICW project. The final scope of this project is what the City Council will
ultimately determine at the December 7th Council meeting (See Exhibit 1 for a history of the project and a detailed timeline that brings project decisions to current status).

**RECOMMENDATION**

*Assistant City Engineer*

**MOVE TO:** Direct the City Manager to return to the City Council with a final project scope, schedule and budget for Island Crest Way consistent with Option ______ and to be included in the 2010 Transportation Improvement Program.

*(Choices: Option described in 2009-2014 TIP; Citizen Panel Recommendation B2; Citizen Panel Recommendation C3; Traffic Signal; Improve Existing Conditions)*
Island Crest Way Corridor Historical Summary

As early as 2000 during the TIP process, a traffic signal was requested for the intersection of ICW & Merrimount Drive. An engineering review including a traffic signal warrant analysis\(^1\) was conducted. The results indicated that a signal was not warranted. In 2001 and in 2005 a request was again made for a traffic signal at the intersection. Subsequent reviews again indicated that a signal was not warranted.

January 2006 City Council Planning Session
Council discussed the PEAK project and its potential impacts including increased traffic. Council recognized the City’s responsibility to address existing congestion on SE 40\(^{th}\) Street if the level of service (LOS) is below the City’s standard of ‘C’. They expressed a desire for staff to examine the SE 40\(^{th}\) Street corridor to determine existing LOS. If worse than ‘C’, then identify improvements that would restore the LOS to an acceptable level. The purpose of the study was to document existing traffic conditions, identify LOS deficiencies, and develop a comprehensive and realistic set of alternatives for system improvements. It included the SE 40\(^{th}\) Street corridor from Island Crest Way to Gallagher Hill Road and the intersection of ICW & Merrimount.

February 21, 2006 (AB4063 – appropriation of funds)
City Council appropriated $25,000 for the SE 40\(^{th}\) Street Corridor Study via AB4063 including analysis of the intersection of ICW & Merrimount. The study was expected to be completed by the end of April including two neighborhood meetings.

March 14 & 29, 2006 Neighborhood Meetings
Neighborhood meetings held on March 14 & 29, 2006. The purpose of the first meeting was to gather ideas that the public had for traffic improvements. The second meeting presented possible improvements and documented reactions from the public. There were some public comments in support of a traffic signal and others in support of a 3-lane roadway for ICW & Merrimount.

April 3, 2006 (AB4074 – 6 Year TIP)
The TIP presentation included a brief update of the progress on the corridor study including public comments received at the first neighborhood meeting. There were some people in favor of a traffic signal and others against.

May 1, 2006 (AB4087 – PEAK Project Update)
City Council received a presentation of the study results from staff and consultant. Council was told that the intersection LOS for ICW & Merrimount is ‘F’. Staff recommended a traffic signal. Council directed staff to add the signalization project into the preliminary TIP in 2009-2010 and to “continue to monitor this intersection and examine alternatives to traffic signal control at this intersection.”

May 15, 2006 (AB4085 – 6 Year TIP Adoption)
City Council adopted the TIP including a traffic signal at ICW/Merrimount for construction in 2010 and budget of $500,000.

\(^1\) Warrant analyses are conducted according to the nationally adopted Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). The MUTCD is recognized as the national standard for traffic control devices on all public roads to provide uniformity in design features that provides for safe and efficient traffic operations.
Discussions regarding improvements to the intersection to address concerns such as traffic flow were ongoing. The estimated cost of the signal project was increased from $500,000 to $750,000 after comparing with recent construction projects and cost escalation based on anticipated year of construction. The increase was also attributed to further analysis of the intersection and need for realignment of the intersection, re-grading of the side street approaches, and right of way acquisition. Staff also examined alternatives to a traffic signal. These generally included:

1. Prohibit left-turn and through-movements from Merrimount/SE 44th onto ICW.
2. Reduce the north and south legs of the intersection to two lanes with turn islands at the intersection to protect lefts from Merrimount/SE 44th onto ICW.
3. Install radar based electronic speed display signs on ICW to slow traffic.
4. Install a 3-lane roadway through the corridor. Staff acknowledged that significant analysis would be required to confirm that this would work.
4a. Three lane ICW/Merrimount configuration that restricts traffic from crossing ICW, creates a northbound turn pocket, and prevents traffic from heading east on SE 44th Street from ICW.

Council directed staff to return with additional information on the traffic light, Option 1 and Option 4a.

June 4, 2007 (AB4194 – 6 Year TIP)
Presented additional information on the options described above and described a new option (Option 5) that is similar to Option 4a but it maintains two through lanes in the northbound direction instead of one. Staff informed Council that the level of effort required to further analyze the options is fairly extensive, that they hired an engineering consultant based on Council’s authorization and the work is underway. The analysis would look at “through-put” to determine how lane modifications in Options 4a and 5 would affect capacity on ICW and estimate costs. Council directed staff to continue to look at Option 1, Option 4a and Option 5, and run a traffic model for 35 mph in addition to 30 mph.

June 18, 2007 (AB4197 – 6 Year TIP Adoption)
The engineering consultant presented the results of the analysis Council directed on May 21, 2007. The analysis indicated that there isn’t an easy, low-cost solution that adequately addresses all issues without consequences and impacts. The analysis also indicated that lowering the posted speed limit did not improve the intersection Level of Service. Council adopted the TIP, directed staff to proceed with Option 4a (modified) with two additional modifications: (1) review the length of curbing north of the intersection in the northbound lane so as not to impact turning traffic to driveways and (2) maintain two southbound lanes on Island Crest Way immediately south of the intersection, and established a budget of $85,000 for this work. The TIP reserved $500,000 in the Street Fund for a future project.

August 6, 2007 (AB 4207 – Presentation of Merrimount & ICW Design Scheme)
The traffic consultant presented the proposed layout for the option approved by the Council during the June 18, 2007 meeting. Council directed staff to proceed with construction of the proposed layout. The proposed schedule included a community meeting prior to construction, post construction data collection and post construction community meeting.

Week of October 22, 2007
The option as approved by the Council was installed during the week of October 22, 2007. The improvements were installed as a temporary installation to give the community time to adjust to the changes and time for staff to monitor and evaluate how the intersection would function.
May 5, 2008 (AB4299 – Study Session Regarding ICW/Merrimount Post Construction Analysis & Options)
The traffic consultant presented what was learned with the installation and recapped the April 16th community meeting. Both positive (1 – 5) and negative (6 – 8) accomplishments from the project were noted:

1. The 85th percentile speed was lowered by 3 mph (from 43 to 40 mph)
2. There was a significant reduction of number of vehicles driving over 45 mph
3. There was no increased traffic delay on ICW and there were shortened delays on Merrimount Drive
4. There was a reduction in angle or “t-bone” accidents
5. There was no significant diversion of ICW traffic into neighborhoods
6. Less gaps in Island Crest Way Traffic for pedestrian crossings and left turns out of nearby driveways
7. The turn lanes are adding confusion to the intersection area
8. The changes don’t look good

Based on comments received most citizens prefer a traffic signal at the intersection while many like the current installation and would like to see enhancements, while some would like a 3-lane roadway.

Six options were discussed with the community and at the study session:

Option 1 – Modify current installation and improve aesthetics
Option 2 – Install curb on centerline to restrict left-turn and thru-traffic
Option 3 – Modify intersection to more conventional 3-lane cross-section through the intersection.
Option 3a – Modify intersection as noted in Option 3 and add a traffic signal
Option 4 – Install a traffic signal using 4-lane cross-section
Option 5 – Install a traffic signal and widen ICW to add left-turn pocket in both directions

Council identified two additional options for discussion and further consideration. Option 3b: install 3-lane roadway from SE 42nd through 86th Avenue SE to address high speeds and lack of pedestrian crossings along the ICW corridor. This option is to include mid-block crosswalks. Option 3c: install 3-lane roadway similar to Option 3b but extended further south to SE 53rd.

Council indicated no support for a traffic signal at the intersection. Council requested that staff develop additional information on Option 1, Option 2, Option 3b and Option 3c and bring that back for the TIP discussion on May 19th.

May 19, 2008 (AB4267 – 6 Year TIP)
Staff presented Council with additional information regarding options still under consideration (Options 1, 2, 3b, and 3c as described in the May 5 recap). Following the presentation and discussion Council eliminated Option 2 (c-curb on centerline) from further consideration. Council directed staff to return on June 2, 2008 with scaled back Options 1 and 3c for consideration and include information for an overlay of ICW from Merrimount to SE 53rd Place with Option 3c in 2010 or 2012.

June 2, 2008 (AB4310 – 6 Year TIP Adoption)
Staff presented Council with scaled back versions of Option 1 and Option 3c per Council direction from the May 19th meeting. Following the presentation and discussion Council adopted the TIP with Option 3C: 3-lane roadway from approximately SE 42nd Street to SE 53rd Street, including pedestrian crossings and evaluation of bus stops along the ICW corridor to ensure the design does not impede traffic flow.
budget of $541,000 was appropriated for 2008 that included the work associated with installation of the interim improvements at ICW/Merrimount and the remainder for the design and construction of Option 3c in 2008.

**September 15, 2008 (AB4357 - ICW Public Involvement Process)**
Based on continuing high level of community interest in the project staff recommended that implementation of any changes be postponed until additional public outreach is completed and Council revisits its initial decision. Staff presented Council with a recommended public outreach process that included a Public Involvement Process Charter, formation of a 15-member citizen panel, a schedule of citizen panel meetings, and a follow-up community meeting. Staff would then return to Council with a presentation of the CAG draft recommendations and community meeting summary. Following the presentation and discussion Council approved the public outreach process including the Public Involvement Charter and Schedule and appropriated a budget of $65,000 for this work. Work on ICW has been postponed until the public outreach is completed.

**October 20, 2008 (Appointment of Island Crest Way Project Citizen Panel)**
Council appointed 15-citizens to be part of the project Citizen Panel to act as a sounding/advisory board to City Staff; serve as a link to the community and interested citizens; and work together to develop a community based improvement recommendation that could be taken to Council for consideration at the end of the public process approved by Council at the September 15th meeting.

**June 15, 2009 (AB4439 – 6-year TIP Adoption)**
The adoption of the 6-year TIP included $500,000 as a project reserve for Project C5 (ICW and SE 44th/Merrimount Intersection Improvements) pending further Council action.
On June 2, 2008, the City Council approved changing Island Crest Way (between SE 42nd Street and SE 53rd Place) from the current four-lane configuration to a three-lane configuration. The decision came after significant levels of engineering analysis, council discussion and public involvement – primarily focused on the intersection of Island Crest Way and Merrimount Drive.

In its discussions, the Council strove to address known vehicular safety concerns, improved turning movements to side streets, pedestrian and bicycle safety and “throughput” of vehicles traveling through the ICW corridor and the cost of improvements. The City Council considered many different solutions and, in the end, determined the three-lane configuration as the most effective alternative.

The Council has also clearly heard from some Mercer Island residents concern that the decision will not produce the desired results. The Council takes these concerns seriously.

Consequently, the City Council has determined the following:

1. Implementation of the decision will be reconsidered after a thorough public involvement process is completed. This means all final design efforts will cease during this public involvement effort; and
2. The City Council shall set out the minimum set of goals or criteria for the Island Crest Way corridor under discussion. The goals include:
   - Improve safety at key intersections (e.g. Merrimount)
   - Maintain or improve travel times on and across the corridor (volumes and posted speed limits)
   - Provide for safe pedestrian and bicycle use of the corridor.
   - Develop solutions that are fiscally responsible.
   - Remain consistent with sustainability language in the City’s Comprehensive Plan specifically regarding start and stop issues.
   - Analysis of Island Crest Way will include the evaluation of northbound and southbound peak periods.

The public involvement process shall be conducted according to the following parameters:

**Timeframe:** Commenced in the fall of 2008 and shall be completed in the spring of 2009; the proposed schedule is attached.

**Project Boundaries:** The project will focus on the Island Crest Way corridor and its cross-street intersections. It will not extend beyond SE 42nd Street to the north and Landsdowne Lane to the south.
**Participation:** A panel of approximately 15 citizens plus two Council members shall be selected by the Mayor and approved by the City Council to participate in the process. Citizens will be selected according to the interests they represent including by geographic location (south, west, north, east or on ICW) and mode of transportation used (vehicle, bike, pedestrian). Participants will be expected to attend all meetings (emergencies excepted).

**Public Meetings:** All meetings will be public. Non-participants will be welcome to observe. An opportunity for public comment will be provided at each meeting.

**Staff/Consultants:** The Public Process will be facilitated and “serviced” by City Staff and retained engineering consultants. The Assistant City Engineer will serve as overall Project Manager and coordinator. The City’s Communications Coordinator will provide meeting facilitation and logistics including meeting notices, minutes and information dissemination and arrangements for meeting facilities, tours and field trips. KPG Engineering will provide all technical analyses and production/presentation of text and graphical materials.

**Costs:** the public involvement process will require consultant work and other incidental meeting expenses estimated at $ 52,000.
Citizen Panel Members

Citizen Panel
Marc Berejka
Deborah Ehlers
Bryan Goode
Betty Harper
Jake Jacobson
Thomas Jones
Todd Kelsay
Scott Milburn
Elliot Newman
Peter Orser
Shawn Parry
Mary Stoll
Sam Sullivan
Bonnie Wojciehowski
Eva Zemplenyi

Council Liaison
Dan Grausz
Jim Pearman

Staff
Joy Johnston, public information
Steve Lancaster, facilitator
Anne Tonella-Howe, project manager

Consultant – KPG
Jan Ciganik, traffic engineer
Joe Giacobazzi, project manager
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SE 44TH STREET ROADWAY CONFIGURATION</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST (INCLUDES CONSTRUCTION, ADMINISTRATION, DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING EXPENSES)</th>
<th>COST DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ESTIMATED AVERAGE TRAVEL TIMES BETWEEN SE 53RD STREET AND SE 40TH STREET (UNITS IN SECONDS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AM PEAK (NORTHBOUND)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>4-LANE ALL THE WAY</td>
<td>ROAD IS CLOSED TO OUTGOING AND INCOMING TRAFFIC</td>
<td>$1,430,000</td>
<td>CHANNELIZATION, 3 PED SIGNALS, LANDSCAPING, CUL-DE-SAC CONSTRUCTION, ROW TAKE</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>4-LANE ALL THE WAY EXCEPT 5-LANE AT MERRIMOUNT INTERSECTION (ADD NB THROUGH LANE)</td>
<td>ROAD IS OPEN TO OUTGOING RIGHT TURN ONLY AND CLOSED TO INCOMING TRAFFIC</td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
<td>CHANNELIZATION, 3 PED SIGNALS, LANDSCAPING, ROADWAY WIDENING, ROW TAKE</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>IMPROVE WHAT IS OUT THERE NOW</td>
<td>ROAD IS OPEN TO OUTGOING RIGHT TURN ONLY AND CLOSED TO INCOMING TRAFFIC</td>
<td>$740,000</td>
<td>CHANNELIZATION, 3 PED SIGNALS, ROADWAY WIDENING</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>RESTRIPE ROADWAY SECTION BETWEEN MERRIMOUNT DRIVE AND 86TH AVENUE SE (3 LANE CONFIGURATION)</td>
<td>ROAD IS OPEN TO OUTGOING RIGHT TURN ONLY AND CLOSED TO INCOMING TRAFFIC</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>CHANNELIZATION, 2 PED SIGNALS, ROADWAY WIDENING</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>RESTRIPE ROADWAY SECTION BETWEEN SE 42ND ST TO 5300 BLOCK (3 LANE CONFIGURATION)</td>
<td>ROAD IS OPEN TO OUTGOING RIGHT TURN ONLY AND CLOSED TO INCOMING TRAFFIC</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>CHANNELIZATION, LANDSCAPING, ROADWAY WIDENING (BUS PULL OUTS)</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>RESTRIPE ROADWAY SECTION BETWEEN MERRIMOUNT AND 5300 BLOCK, 4-LANE SOUTH OF MERRIMOUNT INTERSECTION AND 4-LANE NORTH OF MERRIMOUNT INTERSECTION (3-LANE TRANSITION BEGINS NORTH OF THE MERRIMOUNT INTERSECTION)</td>
<td>ROAD IS OPEN TO OUTGOING RIGHT TURN ONLY AND CLOSED TO INCOMING TRAFFIC</td>
<td>$620,000</td>
<td>CHANNELIZATION, 1 PED SIGNAL, LANDSCAPING, ROADWAY WIDENING (BUS PULL OUTS)</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>RESTRIPE ROADWAY SECTION BETWEEN MERRIMOUNT AND 5300 BLOCK, 4-LANE SOUTH OF MERRIMOUNT AND 4-LANE NORTH OF MERRIMOUNT (4-LANE TRANSITION BEGINS AT THE MERRIMOUNT INTERSECTION)</td>
<td>ROAD IS OPEN TO OUTGOING RIGHT TURN ONLY AND CLOSED TO INCOMING TRAFFIC</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>CHANNELIZATION, 1 PED SIGNAL, ROADWAY WIDENING (BUS PULL OUTS)</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>INSTALL SIGNAL AT MERRIMOUNT INTERSECTION - 3-LANE ALL THE WAY</td>
<td>ROAD IS OPEN TO ALL OUTGOING AND INCOMING TRAFFIC</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>CHANNELIZATION, 1 SIGNAL AT MERRIMOUNT, LANDSCAPING, ROADWAY WIDENING (BUS PULL OUTS)</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>INSTALL SIGNAL AT MERRIMOUNT INTERSECTION - 4-LANE ALL THE WAY</td>
<td>ROAD IS OPEN TO ALL OUTGOING AND INCOMING TRAFFIC</td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
<td>CHANNELIZATION, 1 SIGNAL AT MERRIMOUNT, 2 PED SIGNALS, LANDSCAPING, GRADING, ROW TAKE</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>INSTALL SIGNAL AT MERRIMOUNT INTERSECTION - 4-LANE ALL THE WAY EXCEPT 5-LANE AT MERRIMOUNT INTERSECTION (NB &amp; SB LEFT TURN LANES ADDED)</td>
<td>ROAD IS OPEN TO ALL OUTGOING AND INCOMING TRAFFIC</td>
<td>$2,860,000</td>
<td>CHANNELIZATION, 1 SIGNAL AT MERRIMOUNT, 2 PED SIGNALS, LANDSCAPING, ROADWAY WIDENING, ROW TAKE</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March 3, 2009 Island Crest Way Corridor Open House Comments

Ruth Jacobson
C3
Maybe this will work!

Liz Blaszczak
Other
Leave it alone. Go back to 4 lanes like it was.

Glen Kasman
1st choice: D2 2nd Choice: B2
Support safety improvements but believe traffic flow and throughput will be impeded by conversion to 3 lanes. To argue that throughput will only be slowed immaterially seems entirely inconsistent with my experience everyday during peak times. I would urge us to preserve 4 lane flow to the greatest extent feasible as a fundamental quality of life issue for those living toward the south end.

Leslee Ferrel
Other: D2 & D3
Please no bike lane! Bikers ride the perimeter for the 18 mile loop, very few ride Island Crest. We need a light! Too many hear noises with the past and current configuration.

No contact information

Please install a traffic light at the Merrimount intersection. Save the $500,000 that you would spend on a “road diet” and put it toward the traffic light if you do not have the money now. Putting in bike lanes does not serve the best interests of the public! It is not a solution to any problem and will only lead to increased frustration, TRAFFIC, road rage, and possibly accidents for Island drivers. Changing a road from two lanes in a direction to a single lane in that direction will double the traffic in the single lane, making it much more difficult for drivers to turn onto ICW from side streets, as I do every morning on my way to school. I will not bike to school because I often carry a backpack, cello, or tennis bag to school. Vast (99.9%) majority of my classmates will also not begin biking to school because of the new bike lanes. If you truly want what the public wants, hold a public, NON BIASED, survey of Island residents. Thanks for your time.

Richard and Marilyn Brody
Other: D2 or any configuration with a signal
This is purely a safety issue. This intersection has long been a problem and most plans to not address the central goal. Please consider the make up of the committee! Rather than an all Island population it should be __ with those residents most affected, living south of 40th. It appears that the cost was more important than safety. Poll your neighbors, we want safety, we want a signal!
James Rauch  
Other  
Leave 4 lanes as is. Don’t reduce to two lanes and left turn lane in center. This is regressive. In the area involved how many streets abut where people take left turns, 3 or 4? If anything is going to be done about bicycle paths, how about east west mercer ways which the overwhelming number of bicyclists use and the space for this is totally hit or miss?

Jan Zemplienzi  
Other: D2  
The intersection needs to have a regular traffic signal, like the majority of intersections of this type. Keep 4 lanes intact. All other alterations will cost money and will not solve any problems.

Walt Ritchie  
Other: D2  
I favor leaving ICW as it is configured today. Of the alternatives presented, I favor D2. I question the cost estimate of $1,500,000 attributed to alternative D2. In talking with the city’s consultant this evening he was unable to support this estimate.

Roy Palmer  
Other: A1  
A1B2 and C3 are unacceptable. Option A1 is the absolute best solution with the exception that the shared bike lane markings be deleted. A traffic light at Merrimount is out of the question. Anyone with a basic understanding of Queuing theory knows that a traffic light is not desired nor required. The City has taken traffic data at this intersection which undoubtedly would support no light. Get rid of the maze at Merrimount and the traffic zoo it has created. If the choice is only between B2 and C3 I would choose C3!

David Bozson  
Other  
1) Remove all nonsense at ICW/MM intersection, except for mandatory right turn off of 44th to ICW. Try it for a year.  
2) If accidents continue, make MM a right turn only onto ICW, and try for a year.  
3) If accidents continue, put in stop light.

John and Janet Morse  
Other  
Improve the Merrimount Intersection by making the changes more permanent (get rid of white posts and put in curbing, etc.) to leave the rest of ICW unchanged. Seems like a lot of money to potentially not improve ICW significantly, with the potential to create new problems, ie: more bottlenecks, fewer gaps in traffic for high school/library/peak traffic to outer roadway across traffic. I would favor a two step
process – Improve the Merrimount intersection as a first step, continue evaluating the road diet as a second step. Allocate some money toward getting a “second opinion” from another traffic engineering consultant before proceeding. For another $75k, you could get a couple of more opinions that would greatly clarify this issue.

Peter Nordstrom
Other: D3
D3 is the only safe and prudent solution to auto safety, traffic flow, and pedestrian safety. We have lived at this address for 28 years and cross this intersection 4+ times daily. We see regularly 2+ potential accidents each week. Drivers are confused and without a light they gamble on making it safe to their lane off of Merrimount to north or ICW in the face of south traffic. Many children would like to walk or bike to the high school but cannot due to safety.

Lynne Elfendahl
Other: Do nothing! Leave it alone
I have lived on Mercer Island traveling up and down ICW for over 40 years. There is no reason to reduce 4 lanes to 2 with turnouts, buttons or bicycle lanes. To do any of these would be to make ICW/Merrimount simply dangerous.

Mollie Parkinson
Other
If Merrimount had a right turn only access to ICW and 44th Street had a right only access to ICW we could remove all the existing barriers at no cost. Those motorists wishing to go north could use se 40th and those at SE 40th wishing to go south could continue along 86th Ave which runs into ICW.

Robert and Mary Bragg
Other: D2
D2 makes the most sense. Light at Merrimount and 44th and 4 lanes all the way. Least disruptive and less confusing. In the meantime extend curb which keeps northbound traffic separated from Merrimount traffic turning north onto ICW.

Bitty Rauch
Other: A traffic light!

Beverly VauHartesvelt
Other: D2 or D3
Any attempt to restrict traffic flow for south end residents is extremely short sighted. Bicyclists own east and west Mercer Way, which I tolerate knowing I can turn up 70th to ICW, and move at a reasonable pace up the Island. Over the past several years more homes have been built at the S end and several more businesses have been added, thereby increasing traffic. What are you thinking? Reducing lanes? As a past PTSA president at the high school I sat in on prior traffic engineering reports that were conducted during the discussions around the PEAK project, and the neighborhood around the high
school made it very clear that they were concerned about the amount of traffic on 86th. The current configuration, and proposals being considered, restrict access from our main arterial (ICW) to our public library, and force the majority of high school traffic onto 86th. None of this really fixes the safety issue at ICW and 44th, and the prior engineering study recommended a traffic light as the safest solution at this intersection. Why have we abandoned this recommendation? If cost is the issue, let’s save for a few years and do the right thing for south end residents. Perhaps we should let the south end residents vote on this issue. I know what the outcome would be.

Julia Olsen
Other: D2
Better for pedestrians, simpler for everyone!

Deborah Ehlers
Other: D2
___ is wasting our money! We need to make ICW/Merrimount safer.

MaryKay Woolston
Other: A-1 (but I know it’s expensive) or D2 or Nothing!
Narrowing ICW for bike trails is causing a more dangerous situation than it solves. Direct bikes up 86th. They are safer there either way. Narrowing ICW will put them closer to more traffic anyway.

Susan Denham
Other: D2 or D3 (4 lanes with a light)
Please do not penalize people who know how to drive and drive the speed limit. The 3 lane configuration forces all of us to follow the slow drivers, large trucks, garbage trucks, and makes it VERY frustrating. We should not be limited to one lane that has a school on it and all the traffic that the high school also generates. The fact that lots of people drive one lane now does not mean we do this happily or without frustration. As soon as able, I am using the other lane to go the stated speed limit. You are treating us like children forced to give up and march in single file. If traffic flow must be regulated then put in a light!
The center turn lane will not offer bad drivers a comfortable alternative and will create potential problems when 2 intersections have people turning north and south at the same time. PLEASE INSTALL A LIGHT!

David Gusdorf
Other: D2 or D3
We need a light at the intersection of Merrimount and ICW – with the four lanes both ways. I’m a cyclist and I would never ride my bike on Island Crest Way. It’s too dangerous – someone will be killed on a bike if there’s a bike lane on that road!

Kathy Gusdorf
Other: D3
4 lanes both ways with a light at Merrimount! Please email as to upcoming City council when this will be presented.

Hardin and Helen Turney
Other: “smart” stoplight – traffic light
Enough studies and surveys have been paid for the needed stop light. Safety is the most important, not ___ Redesigning the lanes of traffic from 4 to 2 + turning lane will cause more accidents – endangering the foot traffic with includes school children.

Beverly Horowitz
Other: D2
Over the 15 ½ years that I’ve lived near West Mercer and Merrimount I have seen several accidents and near accidents at the intersection of Merrimount and ICW. I am STRONGLY in favor of a traffic light at the intersection for the safety of Mercer Island residents.

Rick Stovnoff
Other: Traffic Light
A light at Merrimount will allow for smoother traffic flow through the intersection. Safety can be further increased by not allowing free right turns on red lights from both Merrimount and SE 44th. Island Crest Way is the main south route on the island. Traffic would move smoother if there were two lanes in each direction past Island Park School clear to the south end. But I am not asking for that. Just don’t compound the traffic problems by reducing to two lanes from 40th to the south making entrance to Island Crest more difficult because of reduced traffic flow from several side streets.

Joyce Palmer
Other
Anything other than creating a 2 lane roadway with you current “turn/bike lane”

Jeremy Sparrow
Other: D2
Either leave it as is, which is better than it was or to option D2. D2 does not reduce traffic flow from 4 lanes and putting in a light will make it safer. Keep 4 lanes of traffic! The other options decrease access for everyone who lives at the south end. They waste tax payers money.

Julie H Sun
Other : D2
If you want to make Merrimount safer a traffic light is the only way! It is terrible idea to narrow an part of Island Crest Way to three lane.

Ed Horwitz
Other: D2 (4 lanes and a “smart” traffic light)
Current situation very dangerous – Walk and drive everyday on Merrimount. Do it become a fatality.

Ruth Maloney
Other: D3 is a better option and safer for all
This has been a ___ handed process as it has not been driven by citizens but by City Council – if either of these options are adopted without a community vote – none of City council members will receive my vote again. Very poor process.

Cindy Sodenberg
Other: D3
A light is what people have requested for years. Changing the lane structure all along ICW is dangerous and confusing. Bike lanes are unnecessary. Currently there is danger going north. When people jockey for position into right lane prior to Merrimount, often kids getting to school and often cut people off.

Joe Williams
Other: A2
A2 provides dedicated turn lanes at Merrimount intersection while avoiding slowdowns and last-minute lane changes. I suggest adding crosswalks further south as in plans B2 (but without center islands). Use the flashing lights in pavement.

Lenore Defliese
Other: I am in favor of 2 lanes in each direction and installing a stoplight at Merrimount
I find it interesting that the objective of this plan has veered away from the assigned stated intent of fixing the dangerous intersection at Merrimount. That isn’t even listed on you objectives chart. It strikes me the the real intent of this plan is to enable a few cyclists to ride their bike on ICW. Given the climate and long hours of darkness in Seattle, there will never be enough cyclists and pedestrians to justify taking away a lane of traffic.

I would gladly sacrifice to the proposed stoplight at 86th Ave and 40th in order to pay for this light. Having driven up ICW from the lakes to the high school every day for several years, I am very familiar with the long traffic backups that happen on the 2 lane section of Island Crest. If it is narrowed to 2 lanes, cars will be stacked up for blocks twice a day x 3 schools as the busses stop to pick up and drop off. This will create havoc at rush hour in the morning, in particular – and even if there are long delays, it would not stop people from driving instead of taking the bus.

Also, in reading the road diet material on the City website, I noted that a main goal seemed to be creating a pedestrian park like setting to encourage walking – the problem is that there is nothing mid-Island to walk to – except the library or perhaps church on Sunday. So in effect the two proposals are asking tax payers to pay extra to promote recreation over commutation.

Joy Matsura
Other: Keep it 4 lanes the way it WAS. If people turning left are causing a problem, then make it no left turn.
The current jury-rigged configuration is ugly, even with the supposed protected left it feels funny and unnatural (and there should be arrows on the road to guide cars because it’s an unnatural path). Losing the southbound lane below Merrimount is compounding the stupidity of the current plan. Do you really think there’s going to be sufficient bike traffic to warrant giving up a lane for bikes to go a few blocks on ICW? You say there isn’t a lot of car traffic in the right lane, but I bet there are more cars driving on it now than there will be bikes on it in the future.

Alec and Barbara Purcell
We feel the City in responding to the irresponsible acts of a very few persons is imposing inconvenience on all the citizens that live south and east of the revision. And indeed it may be argued that the city has added safety issues as well.

We have lived on the Island for over 30 years and prior to this revision had never seen a rear end collision at Island Crest and 86th. However, within the first 5 weeks after the revision there were two such accidents that we witnessed. The compression of traffic was a contributing factor.

This revision adds stress to drivers in both directions, having to “get in line early” to pass through the revision area. It makes no sense to deprive most of us of an asset we have paid for because of the irresponsibility of a very few. Thank you for considering our views.

Tom O’Callahan
Other: D2 – Second choice is C3
Eliminate the planting strip in the middle of 47th intersection. Provide safer pedestrian access (refuge islands). Build safer bicycle access from the middle of the island south to the business district and park/ride.

Craig and Linda Fetters

Dear citizen panel:
We live south of the intersection of ICW and Merrimount Drive. We travel on Island Crest Way at various times throughout the day. In 26 years we have lived on Mercer Island, we have seen the volume of traffic grow. During the rush hours and the time traffic is heavy to and from our schools, all four lanes are needed at least as far south as they currently exist.

We have observed more than a few near-misses with the current configuration at Merrimount Drive. Vehicles entering Island Crest Way from Merrimount to the north (entering both from the west and the east) have a challenge either due to visibility to the south in the case of those entering from the east or the awkward turn and merge for those entering from the west.

In addition we continue to observe vehicles exceeding the speed limit on a daily basis.
We urge your panel to strongly recommend the placement of a traffic signal at this intersection and to keep the current four lane configuration that exists to mid-island. This will provide a safer intersection and also slow down traffic and provide a signaled crosswalk.

It is time to stop spending money studying the issue or continuing with the current configuration. The volume of traffic and the safety of our citizens can best be served by a traffic signal at this intersection. We understand this signal can be installed at a cost much less than the $500,000 mentioned for a reconfiguration. Not only is this the best course for public safety and smooth traffic flow but in these times the money saved from what is a common sense approach can be used for many other projects and priorities facing us. Thank you for your consideration.

Robert Tykulsker
Other: Please don’t remove a southbound lane. Leave it as is.
Removing the lane will cause more auto congestion from left turning south bound cars. A so-called bicycle path is a fallacy, since there will need to be numerous cuts to allow vehicle turns. Each cut is the site of a potential vehicle/bicycle or vehicle/pedestrian accident.

Joe Wallis
Other: None of the above.
Supplement to Comment Sheet:
The information on this page is supplemental to the comment sheet that I received at the March 3rd meeting.
There is insufficient information provided to make a choice of the alternatives shown. Some concerns that are not explained include the following:
1. Will there be a separately striped bicycle lane where the three-lane configuration is designated? If bicycles are in a common lane with motorized vehicles, there will likely be conflicts when motorized vehicles are slowed excessively.
2. It is my opinion that location of the crosswalks as described to me by the KPG representative will not be used on a regular basis. The existing crossing near SE 46 is rarely used and when it is, automobile drivers do not respond for the safety of those that rarely use the crosswalk. Enforcement at SE 42nd where many high school students cross seems to be rare and inconsistent. If the proposed crosswalks located away from the intersections are treated similarly to the existing walk at 42nd Street, then additional pedestrians will be exposed to additional unsafe conditions.
3. I live on SE 48th Street and at the intersection of SE 48th Street and Island Crest Way (ICW) site distances are limited north and south. It is common to see automobile drivers take risks after waiting (often with vehicles waiting behind) a lengthy time. It seems to me that concentrating all of the north and south bound traffic into one lane, getting access from side streets will be more difficult than current conditions, which are marginal for
reasonable safety. I wonder if reducing the speed limit on ICW and enforcing the reduced speed limit would be an effective alternative.

There seem to be valid suggestions offered by citizens as shown by the number who responded to the March 3rd open meeting. I genuinely hope there will be a response to suggestions offered by interested citizens. It is my sense that the city has a reputation of holding public meetings for “show” after decisions have been made with citizen interest into applied changes are ignored. It is my opinion that the KPG representative was more interested in validating a completed design that listening to citizen interest.

Frances Ohringer
Other: C3
Shouldn’t expansion start at 40th? This should be less confusing. A change would be expected at 40th. A traffic light at Merrimount would be best.
3-LANES (SE 42ND ST TO 5300 BLOCK)

OPTION DESCRIBED IN 2009-2014 TIP
3-LANES (MERRIMOUNT DR TO 86TH AVE SE)

ALTERNATIVE B2 SELECTED BY CITIZEN PANEL
Typical Cross Sections
ISLAND CREST WAY

Four Lane Option

- 6'-8' sidewalk
- 10' travel lane
- 10' travel lane
- 10' travel lane
- 10' travel lane
- 6'-8' sidewalk

Three Lane Option

- 6'-8' sidewalk
- 3.5' shoulder
- 11' travel lane
- 11' two way left turn lane
- 11' travel lane
- 3.5' shoulder
- 6'-8' sidewalk