

Comments from City of Issaquah

PLAN and APPENDICES

1. Thorough and overall glad to see environmental protection and overall sustainability tone with the issues included (i.e. reducing pollution, managing stormwater, promoting health, climate impacts, air and water quality, environmental justice and equity, etc.)
2. Very important to continue to emphasize and focus on the need to develop regional connections for regional trips—it is not acceptable to expect that local streets carry the burden of regional traffic demands.
3. Continue to look at opportunities to apply advancements in technology to our regional transportation system to improve mobility in ways beyond traditional infrastructure improvements.
4. Provide clearer language about implementation for both rural and suburban, it seems at implementation some of the suburban seems lost. (Gaps/Prioritized Strategies)
5. Issaquah would like a stronger call for making trainings and materials available in other languages (Title VI) to better “Promote customer-friendly travel training and information...” (Prioritized Strategies)
6. It should be noted in the Plan that King County has the largest fleet of electric buses in the country under the Current Status section. Such a note would help indicate good work in the region that should continue.
7. The Plan acknowledges equity issues when implementing user fees, such as a Road Usage Charge (RUC), by indicating that the design should be careful to consider the financial implication on different populations, particularly those with low incomes, or who live in remote areas with few transportation options. However, it doesn’t have the solution(s) for people who do not have public transportation as an option. (Financial Strategy Implications). The only funding mechanism seems to be to tax the existing tax base for the future capacity needs. There should be mention of a regional transportation impact fee, levied on all new construction to pay for the capacity improvements required to connect cities.
8. Additionally, for Build High Quality (pg. 57), Separated Facilities: needs to be a little clearer - did ridership really increase from 21% to 171% within one year of building the protected lanes. In numbers or other clarity.
9. Local roads often support regional traffic that connect to the regional system. This regional traffic is more often than not, a burden on those local corridors. Individual jurisdictions cannot make improvements over these entire corridors; therefore, corridor planning that involves every jurisdiction that may use that corridor needs to be included in the Plan. This corridor planning should correspond with local and regional plans and include input from the Regional Transportation System Initiative.
10. Front St N is called out as a principal arterial. It should be noted, however, that Issaquah has no plans to widen the roadway or otherwise expand capacity on this corridor.
11. Appendix F: While it is included in the main Plan (pg. 15), we have heard from some Issaquah businesses solicited that advocacy groups (outside of transportation field) as well as employers need to be called out as “implementers” more strongly. This is a good thing as the businesses see the important role they play in implementing trip reduction strategies. Also, “better marketing to the general public” about trip reduction is needed. Glad to see social determinants content, but would like more inclusive language in reference to “affordable housing” to include “housing support services” such as access to shelters, day centers,

emergency financial assistance, and fuel assistance.

12. Appendix L: Active Transportation Plan, In the executive summary, under The Need section paragraph two, the last sentence needs to state. “Non-motorized serious injuries and fatalities increased from 21% to 27% “of the total” between 2010 and 2016 in the central Puget Sound region.” This will provide context as it does when the study is cited later in the document.

PROJECTS

1. Plan, Figure 8: King County Key Investments: Issaquah Mountains to Sound Greenway trail on Newport Way from Lakemont to SR 900 is missing from this map and should be included.

2. Appendix G and Map:

- SR 900 to SE 54th St should be included on the list of Regional Capacity Projects
- The 11th/12th I-90 crossing appears to be included in project 2529, Link LRT extension from South Kirkland to Issaquah. It should be included separately. Additionally, in the description, it is described as “a pedestrian bridge across I-90 at Central Issaquah.” This is intended to be multi-modal. It is included in our TIP and WSDOT’s project list as a multi-modal bridge.
- As we understand it, the Cedar-Sammamish Trail should be located on the east side of SR900, along Tibbetts Creek – not the west, as shown.
- Link LRT should terminate on I-90 at Front (or east of Front), but not extend down Front Street.

Contact ID	Name
770722	City of Issaquah
770723	Christen Leeson