

## Section VI - 2009 King Countywide STP/CMAQ Non-Motorized Application

This application is available on the King County Web site at  
<http://www.kingcounty.gov/transportation/kc.dot/PlanningAndPolicy/RegionalTransportationPlanning/2009KCCountywideComp.aspx>

**\*\*Please read all of the text in this section before completing this application.\*\***

**Important notice:** The importance of complete and accurate information on every application cannot be overemphasized. The evaluation and scoring of all submitted projects will be based on the answers provided in this application. A project's suitability for funding may be compromised if the application is found to have omissions or inaccuracies. In addition, sponsors of projects recommended for funding as a result of the competition should be aware that their application could be used in the future to evaluate the status of a project if it fails to comply with the requirements of the Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC) Project Tracking program.

**Projects receiving funding as a result of this competition:** Funding distributed as a result of the 2009 STP/CMAQ King Countywide Programs is awarded to projects, not to the sponsoring agency itself. Sponsors of projects that receive funds from this competition will be required to submit a more detailed TIPMOD or TIPNEW application, which will be due to the PSRC on July 7, 2009. Please note that these sponsors will also be asked to certify that they will comply with the conditions of the PSRC's Project Tracking Program, as a condition of accepting funding. Failing to comply with this condition, and/or with the conditions established in the PSRC's Project Tracking Program, may eventually result in the loss and/or transfer of funds to another Countywide project.

**14-page limit:** You may use additional pages if necessary; however, please be as brief as possible and limit your application to a total of fourteen (14) pages, plus map(s) and/or other required supporting documents.

**E-mail submissions are preferred:** Attach your completed application to an e-mail and send to [peter.heffernan@kingcounty.gov](mailto:peter.heffernan@kingcounty.gov). Please name the file "(Agency): (Project title)" and in the e-mail subject line identify which Countywide program the application is being submitted (Small Jurisdiction, Large Jurisdiction, All Other, Non-motorized). If you are unable to e-mail the application, please mail a copy of the electronic file on diskette, and fax or mail a corresponding paper copy. Electronic copies of all applications are required, as they will be posted to the King County Web site. Mailed materials should be sent to: Peter Heffernan, King County Department of Transportation, M.S. KSC-TR -0814, 201 South Jackson Street, Seattle, WA 98104-3856 and/or faxed to 206-684-2111, Attn: Peter Heffernan. All applications must be submitted by **5pm May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2009**.

**Definition of a project:** For the purposes of this competition, a project must be clearly defined by geographic limits and/or functionality. If the project contains multiple components, the sponsor must clearly indicate how they are logically connected to one another. A project with multiple geographic locations must demonstrate their functional relationship (for example, signal coordination work in various locations tied together through a traffic control center). **Note: a project may request only one funding source – either STP or CMAQ, but not both.**

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION INFORMATION

<b>1</b>	<b>Project Title:</b> Thomas Street Overpass <i>(For roadway project titles: list facility name, limits and any other identifying words; e.g., SR-520 HOV (104<sup>th</sup> Ave NE to 124<sup>th</sup> Ave NE)</i>
----------	---

2	<p><b>Sponsoring Agency:</b> City of Seattle</p> <p>Also identify any co-sponsor(s):</p>
3	<p><b>Project Contact Person:</b> Jude Willcher</p> <p>Address: City of Seattle Department of Transportation, PO Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124</p> <p>Phone: 206-684-4059 Fax: 206-684-3238</p> <p>E-Mail: jude.willcher@seattle.gov</p>
4	<p><b>Project description.</b> Please distinguish between the scope of the project and the justification and/or need for the project.</p> <p><b>a. Project scope:</b> Please describe clearly and concisely the individual components of this project. What will be the specific outcome of this project? What will be built, purchased or provided with this grant request? For example, if this is part of a larger project, please be specific as to what portion on which the grant funds will be used.</p> <p>This project will continue the grade separated connection across the BNSF railroad tracks funded by this group in 2006. It will provide grade separation over Elliott Avenue West for a direct Elliott Bay Trail to West Thomas Street connection. The overpass is a link in the regional trail system that connects the Elliott Bay Trail to the Uptown Regional Center.</p> <p><b>b. Project justification, need or purpose:</b> Please explain the intent, need or purpose of this project. What is the goal or desired outcome?</p> <p>Construction of this overpass will provide bicyclists, pedestrians and other non-motorized users with a safe grade-separated crossing over both the railroad tracks and the principal arterial. This project will benefit bicycle commuters, offer a non-motorized alternative for utilitarian and personal trips, and make recreational trips far more attractive.</p> <p>The completion of this section of the overpass makes bicycle commuting a convenient, viable alternative for the Uptown Regional Center residents who will be able to connect to the Elliott Bay Trail. The Elliott Avenue W overpass will also facilitate pedestrian commute trips by providing a great connection for those who live in the Uptown Regional Center and work in the Downtown Seattle Regional Center. It also helps complete the City's Urban Trail System identified in the Seattle Comprehensive Plan with connections to the South Lake Union Regional Center and Fremont Urban Village.</p> <p>All commuters will benefit substantially from this overpass. We expect a significant mode shift to happen. Completion of the overpass will not only reduce area SOV trips, but also will minimize the need for bicyclists to use Elliott Avenue West and other downtown arterial streets, further reducing modal conflict. The total effect will be a more efficient flow of traffic through the corridor while non-motorized traffic gains a fully separate right-of-way.</p>
5	<p><b>Project Location:</b> The project area is located at West Thomas Street between Elliott Avenue West and the Elliott Bay Trail on the Seattle Waterfront.</p> <p>Answer the following questions if applicable:</p> <p><b>b.</b> Crossroad/landmark nearest to beginning of project: Elliott Bay Trail at West Thomas Street (Identify landmark if no crossroad)</p> <p><b>c.</b> Crossroad/landmark nearest to end of project: Elliott Avenue West and West Thomas Street (Identify landmark if no crossroad)</p>

6	<p><b>Map:</b> Include an 8½” x 11” legible vicinity map (if applicable) with completed application form.  <i>If unable to send map electronically, provide separately by fax or mail.</i></p>		
7	<p><b>Federal Functional Classification Code</b> (<i>Select only one</i>)</p> <p><i>Assistance in determining the functional classification of a project is available by calling Stephanie Rossi at 206-971-3054..</i></p>		
	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Rural Functional Classifications</b>            (“under 5,000 population”)            (Outside the federal-aid urbanized and federal-aid urban areas)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>00</b> Exception</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>01</b> Principal Arterial - Interstate</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>02</b> Principal Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>06</b> Minor Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>07</b> Major Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>08</b> Minor Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>09</b> Local Access</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>21</b> Proposed Principal Arterial – Interstate</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>22</b> Proposed Principal Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>26</b> Proposed Minor Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>27</b> Proposed Major Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>28</b> Proposed Minor Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>29</b> Proposed Local Access</p> </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Urban Functional Classifications</b>            (“over 5,000 population”)            (Inside the federal-aid urbanized and federal-aid urban areas)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>00</b> Exception</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>11</b> Principal Arterial – Interstate</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>12</b> Principal Arterial – Expressway</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>14</b> Principal Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>16</b> Minor Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>17</b> Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>19</b> Local Access</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>31</b> Proposed Principal Arterial – Interstate</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>32</b> Proposed Principal Arterial – Expressway</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>34</b> Proposed Principal Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>36</b> Proposed Minor Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>37</b> Proposed Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>39</b> Proposed Local Access</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Rural Functional Classifications</b>            (“under 5,000 population”)            (Outside the federal-aid urbanized and federal-aid urban areas)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>00</b> Exception</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>01</b> Principal Arterial - Interstate</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>02</b> Principal Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>06</b> Minor Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>07</b> Major Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>08</b> Minor Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>09</b> Local Access</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>21</b> Proposed Principal Arterial – Interstate</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>22</b> Proposed Principal Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>26</b> Proposed Minor Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>27</b> Proposed Major Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>28</b> Proposed Minor Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>29</b> Proposed Local Access</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Urban Functional Classifications</b>            (“over 5,000 population”)            (Inside the federal-aid urbanized and federal-aid urban areas)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>00</b> Exception</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>11</b> Principal Arterial – Interstate</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>12</b> Principal Arterial – Expressway</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>14</b> Principal Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>16</b> Minor Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>17</b> Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>19</b> Local Access</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>31</b> Proposed Principal Arterial – Interstate</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>32</b> Proposed Principal Arterial – Expressway</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>34</b> Proposed Principal Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>36</b> Proposed Minor Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>37</b> Proposed Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>39</b> Proposed Local Access</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Rural Functional Classifications</b>            (“under 5,000 population”)            (Outside the federal-aid urbanized and federal-aid urban areas)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>00</b> Exception</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>01</b> Principal Arterial - Interstate</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>02</b> Principal Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>06</b> Minor Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>07</b> Major Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>08</b> Minor Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>09</b> Local Access</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>21</b> Proposed Principal Arterial – Interstate</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>22</b> Proposed Principal Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>26</b> Proposed Minor Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>27</b> Proposed Major Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>28</b> Proposed Minor Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>29</b> Proposed Local Access</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Urban Functional Classifications</b>            (“over 5,000 population”)            (Inside the federal-aid urbanized and federal-aid urban areas)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>00</b> Exception</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>11</b> Principal Arterial – Interstate</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>12</b> Principal Arterial – Expressway</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>14</b> Principal Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>16</b> Minor Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>17</b> Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>19</b> Local Access</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>31</b> Proposed Principal Arterial – Interstate</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>32</b> Proposed Principal Arterial – Expressway</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>34</b> Proposed Principal Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>36</b> Proposed Minor Arterial</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>37</b> Proposed Collector</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>39</b> Proposed Local Access</p>		
	<p><b>NOTE:</b> <u><b>Federally Funded Projects.</b></u> A roadway must be <u>approved</u> on the federally classified roadway system before projects on it may use federal transportation funds (this includes proposed new facilities). Projects which are on a roadway with a functional classification of 09, 19, 29 or 39 are not eligible to use federal transportation funds unless they are one of the exceptions listed below. If your project is an exception, identify its functional class code as “00”.</p> <p><b>Examples of Exceptions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any bicycle and/or pedestrian project.</li> <li>• Projects <u>not</u> on a roadway and using CMAQ or other funds</li> <li>• Any transit project, including equipment purchase and park-and-ride lot projects.</li> </ul>		

## PROJECT EVALUATION INFORMATION

**IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS:** Projects will be evaluated and scored based on the information provided in Parts 1 and 2 that follow. Refer to “Countywide Non-Motorized Project Evaluation Criteria” included in the 2006 King Countywide Call for Projects for information on how the projects will be evaluated.

- **Part 1:** Choose one of the two project categories that best fits your proposed project and complete Section A or B
- **Part 2:** Complete all Sections c through F

## PROJECT EVALUATION: PART 1

**Choose which of the two Centers categories your project falls under:**

- Project is located within a Center  
> *NOTE: Complete Section A, then proceed to Sections C through F in Part 2*
- Connecting Corridors  
> *NOTE: Complete Section B, then proceed to Sections C through F in Part 2*

### SECTION A: CENTERS

Complete this section if your project is a “Centers” project, then proceed to Part 2.

**Please explain how your project addresses the following:**

- How will the project help the Center to develop in a manner consistent with adopted policies or comprehensive plans? Describe how the project will support increased activity in the Center, implement any development plans for the center, and enhance the Center's sense of place. Please provide a citation and copy of the appropriate pages(s) from the plan or policies.
- Describe the impact the project will have on the Center. Will the project remedy an existing or anticipated problem (e.g., congestion, incomplete sidewalk system, inadequate transit service or facilities, etc.), or benefit a large number or wide variety of users?
- Will the project provide access to a major destination or significantly improve circulation within the Center? For projects with a parking component, describe how it will be compatible with a pedestrian-oriented environment.

### SECTION B: CONNECTING CORRIDORS

Complete this section if your project is a “Connecting Corridors” project, then proceed to Part 2.

**Please explain how your project addresses the following:**

- Describe how the investment in the corridor improves access or directly benefits a center(s) by providing a range of travel modes and by serving multiple user groups.

Extending this overpass completes a major link in the Seattle Urban Trail System identified in the Seattle Comprehensive Plan, the Transportation Strategic Plan and the Bicycle Master Plan. It will link multiple centers including the Uptown, Downtown, and the South Lake Union Urban Centers. Residents in these areas will also have better access to the Fremont Hub Urban Village and the University District Urban Center. The overpass will be multi-use serving bicyclists, pedestrians, including persons with disabilities (the overpass will be fully ADA accessible). Seattle's Comprehensive Plan calls for reducing congestion and accommodating growth by promoting non-motorized forms of transportation.

- Describe how the project improves a corridor in logical segments, thereby preventing the creating of missing links or gaps.

This link is the logical next segment of the overpass to build, extending the already funded project across Elliott Avenue. It directly connects to the Elliott Bay Trail to the west, and the fast-growing Uptown Urban Center (Lower Queen Anne) on the east. It is also the logical next step in completing a non-motorized connection from Puget Sound to South Lake Union.

- Describe how the project creates more effective and efficient travel flows along the corridor by filling missing links or removing barriers.

Currently, the railroad tracks and Elliott Avenue are major barriers to bicycling and walking. With previous funding awarded for the railroad portion and funding the roadway overpass in this application, the City can remove both barriers and provide a safe, convenient and continuous off-road non-motorized connection. Use of the combined overpass is anticipated to be high because of its importance in connecting urban centers, providing better access to the waterfront, and serving as a critical link in the regional Urban Trails system. Since commuters will benefit substantially from the overpass, mode shift will be the appropriate measure of the benefit this project brings.

The combined overpass will not only eliminate SOV trips, but also will minimize the need for bicyclists to use Elliott Avenue West and other downtown arterial streets, further simplifying the traffic mix. The total effect will be a more efficient flow of traffic through the corridor while non-motorized traffic gains a fully separate right-of-way.

Describe how the improvements create long-term sustainable solutions and improve the system as a whole.

This project provides a permanent, sustainable, long-term solution that benefits the Uptown Urban Center and the larger, regional urban trails network. Creating a new crossing of the railroad tracks and Elliot Avenue West also completes an important link by connecting urban centers, reducing congestion and thereby enhancing traffic flow for freight movement and other essential economic activity.

## SECTION C: PROJECT READINESS

Once Section A or B in Part 1 has been completed, complete all of Part 2, Sections C through F.

**Introduction:** Two primary tools will be used to obtain information needed to judge a project's ability to proceed: responses to the project readiness and financial plan sections below. The primary objective of the evaluation is to determine if a sponsor has assembled all of the funding needed to complete the project or phase(s), and when the sponsor will be ready to obligate the requested funding. All questions **must** be completely and accurately filled out in order for this information to be properly assessed. The information will be used to determine:

- When the sponsor can complete all prerequisites needed to obligate the project's requested funding.
- When the sponsor plans to obligate requested funding.
- The amount and source of secured funding for the project.
- The amount and source of reasonably expected but unsecured funding for the project.
- If the federal funds will complete the project or a phase of the project.

**Note:** The standard PSRC definitions will apply for determining when funding is "secured" or "reasonably expected to be secured." These definitions can be found at

<http://www.psrc.org/projects/tip/selection/2006/CallMaterials/Secured%20funding%20def%202006.pdf>

Project Readiness: **Please fill out the questions below if your project is requesting funds for a Right of Way (ROW) and/or Construction (CN) phase. Projects requesting funds for a Preliminary Engineering phase need not answer question in Section C: Project Readiness.**

**It is recognizes that the complexity of some projects can trigger a variety of prerequisites that must be satisfied before STP and CMAQ funding is typically eligible to obligate. These questions are designed to identify these requirements and assist sponsors to:**

- Identify which requirements apply to their specific project.
- Identify which requirements have already been satisfied at time of application.
- Provide an explanation and realistic completion date for all requirements not yet completed.

**Important instructions:** For question A below, select one of the three options from the drop down list for all items that apply at the time of submission of this application. These items are based on the documentation requirements for obligation of federal funds. For any item where "Item not yet completed" is selected, and for any additional requirements pertaining to the project, provide details in question B, including the estimated schedule for completion.

**A. Check all items that apply below.** Note: if no ROW is required for the project, select "not needed" for sections b through g.

Not yet completed a. Final FHWA or FTA approval of environmental documents including:

Not yet completed - BA Concurrence: NMFS, U.S. Fish & Wildlife, WSDOT.

Not yet completed - Section 106 Concurrence.

Not yet completed - FHWA/FTA Environmental Classification Summary Checklist (or EA or EIS).

Not needed b. True Cost Estimate for Right of Way.

Not needed c. Right of Way Plans (stamped).

Not needed d. Relocation Plan (if applicable).

Not needed e. Right of way certification.

Not needed f. Certification Audit by WSDOT R/W Analyst.

Not needed g. Relocation Certification, if applicable.

Not needed - Certification Audit by WSDOT of Relocation Process, if applicable.

Already completed h. Engineer's Estimate.

Not yet completed i. All environmental permits obtained such as Army Corps of Engineers Permit, HPA, etc.

**B. Additional information:** include details on any items above that are not yet completed and provide an estimated schedule; please provide any additional information as appropriate.

All items not yet completed and Shoreline Permits are expected Fall 2009.

## Section D: Financial Plan

Financial plan: **Please fill out Tables A-D below and corresponding questions E-F. The purpose of the tables and questions is to allow sponsors to fully document their project's financial plan and schedule. Tables A, B, and C build upon one another to provide the estimated cost of each phase as well as a project's total cost (Table D). The tables require sponsors to list the federal funds being requested from the Countywide Competition (Table A), as well as ALL other sources of secured (Table B) and unsecured funds (Table C) needed to complete the project.**

### Guidelines:

- All requested information must be provided to earn maximum points.
- Provide financial information for all funding types in every applicable phase, and use a separate row for each funding source.
- Totals of federal and other funds listed in Tables A, B, and C should equal the total project cost in Table D.
- Funding commitment letters must be provided for all financial partners.

**Required Match:** A minimum of 13.5% match is required for both STP and CMAQ funds. Sponsors of projects awarded funds through this competition will be required to provide information on these matching funds at a later date.

**Table A: Funding Requested from Non-Motorized Program**

Phase	Estimated Obligation Date by Phase (mm/dd/yy)	Federal Funding Source (enter either STP or CMAQ; choose only one)	Federal Funds Amount
Construction	01/31/2010	CMAQ	\$3,995,000
			\$
			\$
		Total	01/31/2010

**Table B: Existing Secured Funding**

Phase	Estimated Obligation* date by Phase (mm/dd/yy)	Source	Amount
Planning / Design / Preliminary Engineering	01/01/2006	Local	\$2,251,050
Construction	01/31/2010	Federal (PSRC 2006 STP/CMAQ)	\$1,340,000
Construction	01/31/2010	Local	\$2,417,215
<b>TOTAL:</b>			<b>\$6,008,265</b>

\*For tables B or C “obligation” may be defined as expenditure or other commitment of funds

**Table C: Needed future funding (unsecured)** Note: do not include the grant funds requested in Table A

Phase	Estimated Obligation* date by Phase (mm/dd/yy)	Source	Amount
			\$0
			\$
<b>TOTAL:</b>			<b>\$0</b>

\*For tables B or C “obligation” may be defined as expenditure or other commitment of funds

**Table D: Total Project Cost** (Please provide the total estimated cost and scheduled completed date for each phase of the project.)

Phase	Total estimated cost	Phase	Scheduled completion date (mm/dd/yy)
Planning:	\$ 33,155	Planning:	01/01/06
Preliminary Engineering/Design:	\$ 2,217,895	Preliminary Engineering/Design:	12/31/09
Right of Way:	\$ 0	Right of Way:	N/A
Construction:	\$ 7,752,215	Construction:	06/01/11
Total Project Cost:	\$10,003,265	Estimated date of completion (i.e. open for use)	06/01/11

**E. Identify the project phases (PE, ROW, CN, etc.) that will be fully completed if requested funding is obtained and status of current phases (i.e. PE at 30%):**

If this funding is obtained the extended overpass for the railroad tracks and Elliott Avenue West will be

completed.

**F. If unable to completely fill out Table D (Total Project Cost):** Use the space below to explain the nature of any project for which the total project cost is presently unknown. For example, a project may study the merits/costs of various routes or construction techniques and, consequently, the total project costs won't be determined until the study is complete.

## SECTION E: JOINT OPPORTUNITIES

**Please explain how your project addresses the following:**

- What other private and/or publicly funded project(s) will receive a benefit from this project? Describe the other project(s) and its relationship to your agency's project. Be specific. (*E.g., If funds are committed to another project, describe the commitment, including the amount. Describe any conditions associated with the commitment, including timing. If the commitment or partnership is non-financial, so indicate.*) In your answer, summarize relevant letters and/or documents describing commitments and key points. Include dates. Do not attach copies of these letters or documents.

No other private and/or publicly funded projects are associated with this project. However, establishing the overpass alignment has involved close public/private cooperation between the City, adjacent property owners, and Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway. We have sited the overpass so that it works for all parties and creates predictability for future business planning

- Will an opportunity be lost if the project does not receive funds through this project competition? Describe and explain the consequences.

Yes an opportunity to eliminate both barriers to nonmotorized traffic will be lost if the project does not receive the requested funds. Without this grant, cyclists and pedestrians will pass over the railroad tracks only to face high-volume principal arterial traffic between Uptown and the waterfront.

## SECTION F: PLANNING

Please explain how your project addresses the following:

- Describe the planning process through which this project has been developed.

**Planning Process:** This project was first identified as a "planned" trail connection in Seattle Comprehensive Plan that was adopted in 1994 and updated in 2004. Providing this connection was identified as a priority when the Uptown and Belltown Neighborhood plans that were developed in 1997 and 1998 subsequently adopted by the Seattle City Council. It is also included in the Transportation Strategic Plan that was adopted by the City in 1998 and updated in 2005. Parallel to the community planning process, the Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board along with other bicycle advocacy groups have identified this as one of their top priority projects. It was partially funded as part of the 2000 Pro Parks Levy that was approved by the voters. Subsequently, the overpass was included in the Seattle Bicycle Master Plan which was adopted by the Seattle City Council by a 9 to 0 vote on November 5, 2007.

- Describe how the project is consistent with a local jurisdiction's adopted comprehensive plan, local plan, transit plan, etc. **IMPORTANT:** Provide specific citations and a copy of the appropriate pages and include dates of adoption.

**Seattle Bicycle Master Plan:** This project is included on the Seattle Bicycle Master Plan map, which was adopted by the Seattle City Council on November 5, 2007 (Resolution 31024). Two public meetings were held prior to adoption of the plan. Other specific citations include:

Bicycle Master Plan Map: Project shown as an Overpass – Bicycle Facility Recommendation

Action 1.2: Complete the Urban Trails and Bikeways System. SDOT should complete the Urban Trails and Bikeways system (p. 20; attached)....

Objective 1: Develop and maintain a safe, connected, and attractive network of bicycle facilities throughout the city. The system will include ... completion of the Urban Trails and Bikeways System (pp. 6-7; attached).

**Transportation Strategic Plan:** Originally adopted by Seattle City Council and signed by the Mayor in November, 1998, and then updated and readopted on August 15, 2005 (Resolution 30790) this plan specifically identifies completion of Seattle's Urban Trails System (which includes this project) as one of nine key strategies.

Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies, T34: Provide and maintain a direct and comprehensive bicycle network connecting urban centers, urban villages and other key locations. Provide continuous bicycle facilities and work to eliminate system gaps (p. 84; attached).

Strategy B1 Complete and Preserve the City's Urban Trails System (p. 85 attached).

**Belltown Neighborhood Plan:** Adopted - May 1999, Resolution Number: 29890

KS 1.8 Recommend a dedicated pedestrian overpass be installed over the railroad tracks to complete the connection from Myrtle Edwards Park to the Seattle Center and eventually to Lake Union.

**Seattle Comprehensive Plan (adopted in 1994 and updated in 2005):** This project is consistent with numerous provisions in this plan, which also includes the Seattle Urban Trails System (of which this project is a part) as an integral element in facilitating bicycling and walking. Ten public meetings were held prior to adoption of this plan. Some specific citations include:

L2 Promote conditions that support healthy neighborhoods throughout the city, including those conducive to helping urban village, mixed use communities thrive (p. LU-6; ).

T11 Provide adequate transportation facilities and services to promote and accommodate growth and change in urban centers, urban villages, and manufacturing/industrial centers. Seek to provide transit, walking and bicycling services and improvements to enable urban centers and urban villages to reach growth targets in a way that minimizes single occupant vehicle travel (p. T-7; ).

T45 Remove barriers to, and create incentives for, walking and bicycling for commuting, errands, other short trips, and recreation (p. T-22; ).

- Describe how the project is consistent with Destination 2030 (adopted May 2001). Refer to the PSRC website ([www.psrc.org](http://www.psrc.org)) for a list of Destination 2030 policies.

**Destination 2030:** This project completes the final link in a trail system that meets the following Destination 2030 policies: It creates a balanced, multimodal transportation system that links centers (RT-8.1); it creates a seamless connection to Downtown Seattle and the Ferry system (RT-8.2 & RT-8.4); it provides an alternative to single-occupant vehicle travel along corridors connecting urban centers (RT-8.14); and, it completes the link in a regionally coordinated network that connects centers (RT-8.33). It also meets the Destination 2030 Update policy which gives priority to non-motorized investments that fill gaps in the existing network and connect urban centers (p. 43).

RT-8.1 Develop and maintain efficient, balanced, multimodal transportation systems which provide connections between urban centers and link centers with surrounding communities by:

- o Offering a variety of options to single-occupant vehicle travel.
- o Facilitating convenient connections and transfers between travel modes.
- o Promoting transportation and land use improvements that support localized trip-making between and within communities.
- o Supporting the efficient movement of freight and goods.

RT-8.2 Promote convenient intermodal connections between all elements of the regional transit system (bus, rail, ferry, air) to achieve a seamless travel network which incorporates easy bike and pedestrian access.

RT 8.4 Maximize multimodal access to marine ferry routes through:

- a. Coordinated connections to land based transit.
- b. Safe and convenient bicycle and pedestrian linkages.
- c. Preferential access for high occupancy vehicles, and freight and goods movement on designated routes.

RT-8.14 Emphasize transportation investments that provide alternatives to single-occupant vehicle travel to and within urban centers and along corridors connecting centers.

RT-8.33 Develop a regionally coordinated network of facilities for pedestrians and bicycles which provides effective local mobility, accessibility to transit and ferry services and connections to and between centers.

Destination 2030 Update, April 2007: Investing in Non-motorized Transportation: Priority investments are those that complete the non-motorized system by filling gaps in the existing network, creating connections to, and within, urban centers and developing intermodal connections (p. 43).

## SECTION G: AIR QUALITY

**NOTE: While project sponsors are not requested to provide detailed quantitative analyses at this time, those projects that are selected for CMAQ funds will be asked to assist staff in quantifying the benefits of their projects prior to TIP submittal.**

**Describe how your project will reduce emissions. Include discussion of the population served by the project – who will benefit, where and over what time period. Be as specific as possible and include examples. Answers will vary depending on the type of project, for example:**

- Describe how your project will reduce VMT, either by eliminating or shortening vehicle trips;
- **Describe how your project will result in a mode shift from SOVs to transit, carpool or nonmotorized;**
- Describe how your project will result in an increase in transit ridership, either through new transit service or greater accessibility to transit;
- Describe **how your project will improve the flow of traffic** and reduce the amount of idling vehicles - how will this project relieve an existing problem;
- Describe how your project will reduce emissions through alternative fuels or vehicles.

This project will reduce VMT by 143,583 miles per year. This corresponds to 124,353 lbs of avoided carbon dioxide emissions, 71 lbs of avoided hydrocarbon emissions, 600 lbs of avoided carbon monoxide emissions, and 51 lbs of avoided nitrogen oxide emissions. We also estimate that there will be 27,700 new walking trips per year on this facility. See attached methodologies for air quality and pedestrian walking trip calculations.

The overpass, by removing the railroad tracks and Elliott Avenue West as major barriers to bicycling and walking, will not only eliminate SOV trips, but also will minimize the need for bicyclists to use Elliott Avenue West and other arterial streets, further simplifying the traffic mix. The total effect will be a more efficient flow of traffic through the corridor while non-motorized traffic gains a fully separate, right-of-way. `

## Attachment 1:

### Mode Shift and Air Quality Calculations Attachment I

Our methodology for estimating the carbon dioxide benefit can be categorized into the following steps:

- Step 1: Estimating the number of new, regular bicycle commute and utilitarian trips per day;
- Step 2: Estimating what the number of new daily bicycle trips corresponds to in terms of avoided SOV trips;
- Step 3: Estimating how many VMT (vehicle miles traveled) are avoided;
- Step 4: Estimating avoided CO<sub>2</sub> and pollutant emissions;

**Step 1A: New, daily bicycle commute trips.** We estimate that the Thomas Street Overpass will attract 73 new bicycle commute trips daily. We arrived at this number using the following assumptions and calculations:

- 1.A.1. We assume that a new facility will attract new users within one mile (subtracting bodies of water and parks within this radius) equals a “travel-shed” area of approximately 1.57 square miles.
- 1.A.2. Based on an estimate of the population in 2007 (source: Washington State Office of Financial Management), the estimated average population density of Seattle is 6,979 people per square mile.
- 1.A.3. We also know that out of the general population, 53.6% commute, regardless of travel mode (source: 2000 Census data). This results in a “universe” of 3,741 commuters per square mile. The population of commuters within an average 1.57 square mile area is 5,875.
- 1.A.4. From the 2000 Census data, we know that 1.9% of Seattle residents commute by bicycle; we estimate that 6.65% commute by bicycle at least occasionally (which is inclusive of the 1.6%). This estimate is based on prorating the 1990 Census figure of 5.6% by 18.75%, which is the percentage increase in the percent of residents that commute by bicycle in 2000 compared to the percent of residents that bicycle commute on a regular basis in the 1990 Census. The difference between the percentage that bicycle to work and the percentage that commute by bicycle at least occasionally equals 4.75% - these are people who are most likely to shift habits and bike commute regularly.
- 1.A.5. Based on a national Harris poll published in Bicycling Magazine, 26% of respondents stated that if bicycle facilities were improved, they would bicycle more for commuting purposes.
- 1.A.6. We therefore estimate that 26% of the 4.75% of the people that are most likely to bike commute regularly, would if this new segment of trail were constructed. This yields 73 new, daily bicycle commute trips along this facility.  $(6,979 * .536 * 1.57 * .0475 * .26 = 73)$

### **Step 1.B: New, daily bicycle utilitarian trips**

- 1.B.1. Estimating utilitarian trips begins with the first three steps used to estimate commute trips, with the only difference being that we assume everyone takes utilitarian trips. The “universe” of people, therefore, equals 6,979 people per square mile times 1.57 square miles, or 10,961 people.
- 1.B.2. Based on a random phone survey conducted by the Seattle Department of Transportation, 9.3% of the population reported using their bicycle for non-commute utilitarian trips. We assume that utilitarian trips occur at the same rate for 365 days in a year.
- 1.B.3. Using the statistic mentioned in Step 1.A.5., we estimated that 26% of the 9.3% that bike for utilitarian purposes would do so regularly if this trail system were constructed.  $6,979 * 1.57 * 9.3% * 26%$  equals 265 new utilitarian bike trips per day.

## Step 2: Avoided SOV trips

- 2.A. Not every bicycle commute trip replaces a single occupancy vehicle trip. Consequently, we assume that every two bicycle commute trips replaces one SOV trip. This yields 36 daily SOV trips eliminated.
- 2.B. We assume that every three utilitarian bicycle trips replaces one SOV trip. This yields 88 daily SOV trips eliminated
- 2.C. Total avoided SOV trips = 125.

## Step 3: Avoided VMT

- 3.A. Based on 1990 Census data, the average round trip bike commute length in Seattle is 5.7 miles. Multiplying this by the number of SOV trips avoided results in avoided VMT.  $5.7 * 36 = 206$ .
- 3.B. We assume the average round trip utilitarian bike trip is 2.85, half the distance of the average round trip bike commute length.  $2.85 * 88 = 252$ .
- 3.C. We assume there are 250 commute days per year, and 365 utilitarian trip days per year. Multiplying daily avoided commute and utilitarian VMT by these factors, respectively, yields an annual total VMT avoided figure of 143,583.

## Step 4: Avoided CO2 and pollutant emissions.

- 4.a. The average nationwide fuel economy for passenger vehicles in 2006 was 22.4 miles per gallon. Dividing VMT avoided by this figure yields the gallons of gasoline not combusted.
- 4.b. Applying the carbon content conversion factor for gasoline (19.4 lb. per gallon) yields pounds of CO2 emissions avoided per day.
- 4.c. Emissions of hydrocarbons (HC), carbon monoxide (CO), and nitrogen oxides (NOx) were calculated the same way. Grams of emissions per mile are listed below. Source: EPA's Mobile 5.0 model.

19.4	CO2 emissions: lbs per gallon of gasoline
5	Hydrocarbon emissions: grams per gallon of gasoline
42.48	Carbon monoxide emissions: grams per gallon of gasoline
3.58	Nitrogen oxide emissions: grams per gallon of gasoline

## Thomas Street Overpass –Methodology for Estimating New Walking Trips

### Assumptions:

0.5	Distance, in miles, within which the impact of the overpass will be felt
81.0%	% of population that walks on errands (SDOT survey)
4%	% of population that would walk more often if sidewalk enhancements were made
3	Estimate of projected increase in per person walking trips per week
586,200	Estimated 2007 City of Seattle population (Washington State Office of Financial Management)
6,979	Average population density, per square mile

1. To estimate the number of new walking trips associated with the overpass, the first step is to calculate the area and the population for which the improvements will serve. We assume that the project improvement will influence residents within a 1/2 mile radius on the east side of Elliott Ave. The “travelshed” area equals  $.5 * (\pi * .5^2)$ , or .39 square miles.
2. With an average population density of 6,979 people per square mile, these improvements will serve about 2,740 citizens.
3. Based on SDOT survey data, we know that 81% of the population walks on errands and use this as a proxy for estimating the percentage of the population that would walk for recreation. We also assume that 4% of the population would walk more if sidewalk enhancements were made, and that the frequency of walking trips would increase by 3 round trips every week, or 312 one-way trips per year. Multiplying 2,740 people \* 81% \* 4% \* 156 trips per year results in 27,700 new walking trips per year.



Overpass will cross the BNSF Railroad tracks.

# Thomas Street Overpass

This project will provide a grade-separated nonmotorized connection over the BNSF railroad tracks and Elliott Avenue. Together they pose a significant obstacle to nonmotorized travel between the Elliott Bay waterfront, Seattle's Uptown neighborhood and South Lake Union. Request: \$4 million.

