

---

**From:** Benson, Charles <charles.benson@soundtransit.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 05, 2018 4:23 PM  
**To:** Julie Underwood; Kirsten Taylor; Noll, Mark; Crosley, Stephen; Lamon, Luke; Hoffman, Jemae  
**Subject:** Mercer Island Transit Interchange, Progress Meeting Minutes  
**Attachments:** ST MEMO\_Mercer Island Interchange minutes\_20180926\_final draft.docx

Hello Team,

Please find the draft minutes from the September 26, 2018 meeting attached. Please review and forward and comments and/or edits to my attention. I thought we made really good progress at this meeting and I am much looking forward to a continued positive collaboration.

Thanks and have a great weekend!  
Charles

Charles H. Benson, III, AICP  
Project Manager – East Link  
Sound Transit  
O.206.398.5392  
M.917.407.4585

# MEMO



October 1, 2018

TO: Project File  
FROM: Charles H. Benson, III, AICP  
SUBJECT: Meeting Minutes from Mercer Island Transit Interchange meeting at Mercer Island City Hall on September 26, 2018 at 11:00 am

---

## MEETING ATTENDEES:

**Sound Transit (ST):** Charles Benson; Jemae Hoffman; Luke Lamon  
**City of Mercer Island (MI):** Kirsten Taylor; Julie Underwood  
**King County Metro (KCM):** Stephen Crosley; Mark Noll

## INTRODUCTIONS/AGENDA:

Jemae Hoffman (JH) gave brief introductions [this was Mark Noll's (**KCM**) first meeting with the overall project team] and outlined the agenda for today's meeting, which is obtain group consensus on study scenarios/options and schedule, public participation, and decision-making protocol.

JH provided a recap of project activities since the last project team meeting on Mercer Island in June, which focused on hiring David Evans & Associates (DEA) to conduct the operational and configuration study. JH added that DEA is currently in the preliminary information-gathering stage of the study.

Kirsten Taylor (KT) circulated the City of Mercer Island's RFQ for a mixed-use development on the former Tully's site at 7810 SE 27<sup>th</sup> Street.

## OPERATIONAL AND CONFIGURATION STUDY – DESIGN OPTIONS

Mark Noll (MN) began the discussion of the configuration and design options to be studied, noting that the restrictions outlined in the Settlement Agreement all but prevented **KCM** from providing bus service to Mercer Island; as such, Option 1 would be evaluated without the Settlement Agreement's 15-minute layover restriction, identified as the most limiting provision. KT asked how long a layover period is needed, Stephen Crosley (SC) responded that a typical layover would be around 15 minutes—comparable to existing conditions—but this figure would need to take into account potential scheduling changes and union rest rules, and requested flexibility regarding layover restrictions as **KCM** would not want to violate the terms of the Agreement. Luke Lamon (LL) added that pulse/temporal operations differ now when compared to 2014, the base conditions contemplated in the Agreement.

MN further described Options 2A (active bus operations allowed on both sides of North Mercer Way) and 2B (same as Option 2A plus bus operations allowed along 80<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE in front of the future light rail station). **KCM** provided information the number of pick-up, drop-off, and layover bays per option. SC added that while the maximum number of buses in the **KCM** preferred configuration (Option 2B) may be greater than existing conditions, **KCM** is willing to work with **MI** to meet the settlement condition of no more than 34 buses in the peak periods.

KT asked if KCM has data on transit use for Mercer Island residents, noting that regional bus service not a selling point on the island. SC responded that **KCM** can take a look at bus APC alighting data from routes that will not be served by link during the AM and PM peaks to get an idea of MI employees and residents using bus transit service. Charles Benson (CB) added that **ST** plans to eliminate **ST** Express Bus service on Mercer Island when East Link light rail service begins.

The parties agreed that it is important to provide operational and visual context when discussing service levels and design options. KT suggested a narrative that describes proposed operations as they relate to specific restrictions in the Settlement Agreement, such as “[X]% of buses are anticipated to have a layover of 15 minutes or less” as estimated by **KCM**. SC added that **KCM** can also provide estimates pertaining to the number of buses laying over at one time on Mercer Island and compare this number to existing conditions. LL stated that is important to address the misinformation that served as the basis for a number of restrictions in the Settlement Agreement. **KCM** agreed to provide a letter containing a narrative on the study options that would provide some solutions to the settlement restrictions, in the next couple of weeks.

The parties agreed to move forward with study options 1, 2A and 2B.

In reference to the design of the 77<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE roundabout (traffic circle), Julie Underwood (JU) stated that she was open to design modifications to limit property acquisition. KT added that the proposed roundabout should be designed to reduce vehicular conflict points with pedestrians and bicyclists, but was opposed to a poorly-designed roundabout just to prevent property acquisition. CB noted that WSDOT may need to weigh in on the roundabout design depending on whether or not the proposal affects their right-of-way.

### **TIMELINE/SCHEDULE**

CB began the discussion of project timeline and schedule, noting that overall schedule was informed by the start of East Link revenue service in 2023 and time needed for property acquisition. CB circulated the updated project work plan, and detailed current activities by DEA, who are currently in the information-gathering stage of the operational and configuration study, with an anticipated completion date of November 2018. The group agreed that January 2019 was a more preferable date to schedule an open house and Mercer Island City Council study session to get Council decision on their preferred option (earlier discussions had this date in December 2018).

CB stated that property acquisition would be an approximately two-year process and would necessitate contacting affected property owners in the very near future. Noting that potentially-affected homeowners are aware of this project, JU requested that **ST** use its experience for the property acquisition process and recommended that **MI** would engage with the residents as this process moves forward.

### **COORDINATION WITH NEARBY PROJECTS**

CB identified the I-90 Trail improvement project along North Mercer Way adjacent to the Mercer Island Park & Ride garage, which would provide a separate travelway for bicyclists, new pavement markers, and relocate street furniture (bus shelters and kiosks) to reduce pedestrian/bicycle conflict areas at this

location. CB added that these improvements—part of FEIS mitigation—are expected to begin on October 15 and be completed in about two weeks.

KT spoke briefly about the City of Mercer Island’s RFQ for a mixed-use development on the former Tully’s site and asked if **ST** was interested on serving on the interview panel to select a consultant for this project. LL stated he would look into **ST** involvement in this process.

#### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

JH began the discussion on public participation, noting that the group previously considered the formation of a representative stakeholder group as a form of public outreach to gather input on the project. KT stated that a recent Aubrey Davis focus group went surprisingly well, but agreed with LL’s assertion that stakeholder groups of this sort on Mercer Island generally have not produced positive results in the past. JU stated that she did not necessarily see the need for a stakeholder group, and that the determination of a preferred option is a Council decision. We agreed that we would proactively reach out to people who may be interested in attending the open house to make sure we get broad feedback including from residents, transit riders, and businesses. The parties agreed that a representative stakeholder group would not be necessary for this process.

JH asked about the potential members of the Executive Steering Committee, which would include members from **ST**, **MI**, and **KCM**. The parties agreed that this Committee should be comprised of two (2) members from each agency, and should be comprised of leadership from each party who could decide on a preferred option. Potential members were identified as follows:

**ST:** Eric Beckman, Jemae Hoffman, Luke Lamon

**MI:** Kirsten Taylor, Julie Underwood

**KCM:** Bill Bryant, Steve Crosley, Chris O’Claire

#### **NEXT STEPS**

1. **KCM** to provide letter detailing service options per restrictions outlined in the Settlement Agreement.
2. **ST**, **MI**, and **KCM** to select members for the Executive Steering Committee.
3. **ST** to provide draft of the Operational and Configuration Study to the project team for review (anticipated late October 2018).