

## COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST

*For projects over \$500,000*

Project Name: **Route 48 Transit Plus Multimodal Corridor**Project Developer: **Elisabeth Wooton**Phone Number: **206 735 1123**

Opportunity Statement (See Project Roadmap for instructions):

This project provides a great opportunity to improve the Route 48 corridor by making its transit service faster and more reliable. It will further advance SDOT's TPMC program objectives supporting the community's desire to high quality transit service and facilities to support residential and employment growth occurring in the urban villages connected by the Route 48, e.g. University Community Urban Center, the First Hill/Capitol Hill Urban Center, Madison-Miller Urban Village, 23rd & Union-Jackson Urban Village, and Mt. Baker Hub Urban Village. Key connections are: Future U District Link Station (2021), UW Stadium Link Station, Future G-Line RapidRide (2023), Future Judkins Park Station(2022), Future R-Line RapidRide (recently paused due to COVID-19), and the Mt. Baker Link Station.

The Route 48 corridor is part of the future RapidRide transit network and the RapidRide Network described in Metro Connects. It is scheduled to become a zero-emission, quiet electric trolley by 2026. In the 2018 Move Seattle Workplan, Route 48 TPMC project funding is contingent upon grant funds; yet since the Workplan was approved, Route 48 TPMC was awarded a \$1.153 million CMAQ grant. Metro has also agreed to contribute \$500K in state funding (NL3 grant) toward construction.

Description of scope from originating project:

An alternatives analysis was completed to develop the estimated project cost and grant funding request. The Route 48 TPMC Conceptual Design Study recommended the following concepts be advanced to project development:

1. Upgrade signals to support transit signal priority (TSP) at 15 intersections along 24th Avenue E, 23rd Avenue, and 23rd Ave S.
2. Install a transit-only lane on 23rd Ave S between S Massachusetts Stand Rainier Ave S.
3. Make access and safety improvements at 24th Ave E and Boyer Ave E.

The focus of our Complete Streets Assessment is focused around the identified scope that is currently funded which focuses on the 24th Avenue E, 23rd Avenue, and 23rd Avenue S segments of the Route 48 corridor. Our assumption is that any additional scope items identified through the complete streets process that increase cost significantly would require additional funding from partnering programs.

Project Extent: **24th Avenue E, 23rd Avenue E, 23rd Avenue, and 23rd Ave S segments of the Route 48 corridor**

Project Budget and Funding Source(s) (List modal plans if applicable):

Total Project Budget: \$2.638M  
- Levy to Move Seattle: \$0.985M  
- CMAQ: \$1.153M  
- Metro NL3: \$0.5M

If grant funded, list timeline:

**CMAQ: Obligated June 2023; NL3: Available starting Q3 2023.**

## **1 Purpose of the Complete Streets Checklist**

---

Seattle's Complete Streets policy is about creating and maintaining safe streets for everyone. In 2007, the Seattle City Council passed Ordinance 122386, known as the Complete Streets ordinance, which directs Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) to design streets for people who walk, bike, ride transit and people of all ages and abilities while promoting safe operation for all users, including cars and freight. This is the lens through which SDOT views all of our projects.

SDOT uses a rigorous, data-driven process to develop complete streets. Streets Illustrated provides the roadmap of how SDOT administers the Complete Streets program. The Complete Streets checklist is the tool SDOT uses to collect data and information about the status of the street and surroundings, as well as the details of the project during a project's complete streets assessment in the early stages of the 0-30% design phase, with a goal of identifying specific improvements that can be incorporated into the project to balance the needs of all users.

## **2 Complete Streets Review Story Map - Getting Started**

---

Data pertaining to questions in this checklist can be found in the [Complete Streets Review Story Map](#). To use the map you need to know the following:

Using your mouse wheel or the zoom controls at the top left corner of the map, zoom to your project area. As you will notice, zooming in makes new data appear on the map. Alternatively, you can use the search tool (magnifying glass button) to type in an address for the location you are looking for. For the most accurate results, include both the city (Seattle) and the state (WA) after the address.

Once you have reached an acceptable scale, begin by clicking on step #3 (Arterial Classification and Street Type), and click on the following numbered tabs to see just the relevant data for each topic. Each map will preserve the scale of the previous map.

Within each map you can click on any of the features to get whatever information is associated with that layer. Because these maps include data with the same shapes, you may need to zoom in or out to see other available layers.

Summary:

- Some data layers will only display at a distinct scale, you will need to zoom in or out on the maps to find and view all the layers you need for each topic.

---

### **Questions or comments about the checklist template?**

Please email Gabriel Seo ([gabriel.seo@seattle.gov](mailto:gabriel.seo@seattle.gov)) for more information.

### 3 Project Coordination

1. Review [DOTMaps](#), the [Complete Streets Review Story Map](#) and associated links. Are there any opportunities to coordinate with relevant City projects/initiatives within the project area? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Discuss coordination opportunities and list contact information:

- Route 48 Electrification (KCM): Coordinate any potential marking modifications and/or bus route alignment, planned for substantial completion in 2025 (after our project is complete)
- East Link Connections (KCM): Coordinate on bus rerouting (Route 8) and bus stop location changes (Route 48)
- Vision Zero 23rd Avenue - Phase 3: Coordinate signal work at John St with potential bus lane concepts (Phases 1 and 2 already complete)
- Madison Street Rapid Ride: Coordinate with potential bus lane concepts
- Sound Transit Judkins Park LINK Light Rail Station: Potential to coordinate on several items being led by ST, SDOT, and Metro (bus stop relocations, Route 8 reroute, and proposed new half signal at Grand St), planned for 2023 opening (SDOT prepared the Judkins Park Action Study in 2019)
- Grand Street Commons (residential and commercial development): Potential to coordinate bus stop locations
- Route 7 TPMC, Route 44 TPMC, UW MICMA ITS, & R 520 Montlake Project (WSDOT): Awareness Only (no anticipated overlap in scope)

2. Are there any opportunities to coordinate with relevant active private development within the project area? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Discuss private development coordination opportunities and contact information:

We are not proposing any civil work that would benefit from developer coordination.

Describe final decision:

Metro has plans to relocate/consolidate stops in the vicinity of the new Judkins Park Station. The Pedestrian Master Program (David B) is working with TOD to evaluate the potential for installing a pedestrian half signal at Grand St and relocating Route 48 bus stops to this new crossing. If that signal is installed, our project would install detection and other equipment needed to implement a reverse queue jump for transit.

#### 4 Street Classification & Type

Arterial Classification: ☒ Principal ☐ Minor ☐ Collector  
☐ Non-Arterial ☐ Boulevard ☐ SFD Non-Arterial

If project area has multiple arterial classifications, describe:

Entire corridor is classified as Principal Arterial

Street Types:

- ☐ Alley
- ☐ Downtown
- ☐ Downtown Neighborhood
- ☐ Downtown Neighborhood Access
- ☐ Industrial Access
- ☐ Minor Industrial Access
- ☐ Neighborhood Corridor

- ☐ Neighborhood Yield
- ☐ Parks Boulevard
- ☒ Urban Center Connector
- ☒ Urban Village Main
- ☐ Urban Village Neighborhood
- ☐ Urban Village Neighborhood Access

Other Facilities:

- ☐ Trails
- ☐ Unopened Right of Way
- ☐ Non-SDOT Property

If project area has multiple street types, please list which segments per type:

Urban Center Connector: 24th Ave E and 23rd Ave E (north of Thomas St)  
 Urban Village Main: 23rd Ave E (south of Thomas St), 23rd Ave, and 23rd Ave S

ROW Width:

Varies (24th Ave E = ~68ft; 23rd Ave = ~60ft)

Describe relevant standards from [Streets Illustrated](#) and any [deviations](#) you'll be requesting:

Project will aim to provide 11-ft lane widths for designated transit lanes and freight routes. If unable to provide, the project will request a Streets Illustration deviation (to be determined prior to 30% design).

## 5 Safety & Channelization

1. Posted Speed:

2. 85th percentile speed (if available):

Location, date collected:

a. Is the 85th percentile over posted speed? ☐ Yes ☐ No

b. Are there high collision locations in the project area? ☐ Yes ☒ No

c. Are there Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Analysis priority locations in the project areas? ☒ Yes ☐ No

d. Does the frequent Transit Network or RapidRide network operate in the project area? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes to a, b, or c contact Vision Zero to discuss traffic calming recommendations. If yes to d. contact Transit and Mobility to discuss.

4. a. Average Weekday Traffic (AWDT):   
Location, date collected:

c. Average Weekday Traffic (AWDT):   
Location, date collected:

b. Average Weekday Traffic (AWDT):   
Location, date collected:

5. Does the project area have 4 or more lanes? ☒ Yes ☐ No
6. If AWDT is less than 25K and lane configuration includes 4 or more through lanes, contact Traffic Operations for review for potential rechannelization. If along RapidRide (existing or future), Priority Bus Network, or Frequent Transit Network include Transit and Mobility in these discussions.

Should rechannelization be considered in the project scope?

The following segments were considered for bus lane treatments as a part of this project (see Alternatives Analysis - 30% Addendum Memo for more detail)

- 24th Ave between Boyer Ave & Roanoke St (NB): Original concept not supported, revised concept under review may be incorporated post-30% if supported and funding is secured
- 23rd Ave between John St & Madison St (SB): Not supported, removed
- 23rd Ave between Massachusetts St & Plum St (SB): Approved, included

Describe recommendations:

From Chris Svolopoulos (8/31/2021)

24th and Boyer:

- Ensure that LPIs are present on all legs
- Upgrade to yellow trim, 12" signal heads
- Address dominant collision patterns here (vehicles entering against reds and vehicles not yielding on turns) by considering reworking the phasing or restrictions. With 3 severe injury incidents in recent years, this would be something that TOD/SigOps should be prioritizing.

23rd and Jackson:

- There has been a spike in collisions this year vs recent years. Significant veh vs ped and veh vs bike incidents. Would warrant a more substantial review by VZ.
- Review potential for E/W split phasing or fully protected left turn phases.

23rd and Mountains to Sound Trail:

- Unsure if owned by ST, but signal heads could be replaced.
- Ask TOD if additional upstream bicycle/ped signs are warranted per

Describe final decision:

As a part of the planned signal upgrades, the Route 48 TPMC project will implement protected left-turns for NB and SB movements at 24th Ave and Boyer St and replace signal heads to current standards.

Outside of the Route 48 TPMC project and prior to construction, TOD plans to implement LPIs at 23rd Ave and Jackson St as well as other locations along the corridor that already have the capability. At intersections where the Route 48 TPMC project proposes TSP upgrades, LPIs will be considered for implementation if not already in operation at the time of construction.

Project will implement a SB bus lane between Massachusetts St and Rainier Ave S. Post-30%, northbound bus lane between Boyer Ave and Roanoke St may be included.

**6 Pavement Condition**

1. Is the Pavement Condition Index 65 or below at any point in the project area? ☒ Yes ☐ No

2. Describe any visible areas of disrepair in the roadway:

Many segments of 23rd Ave/24th Ave have been or will be repaved as a result of the Vision Zero 23rd Avenue Corridor project.

North of John St, there are areas a poor pavement, especially in the curbside lanes.

4. Describe any areaways in the project area:

None

Describe recommendations:

No funds available for pavement restoration.

*Please provide planning level cost estimates for recommendations:*

N/A

Describe final decision:

None

7

**Flex Lane / Curbspace**

1. Will project change existing flex lane use(s)? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
If No, skip to #7. If known, describe proposed changes:

2. Describe existing flex zone use(s) (e.g., loading zones) in project area:

3. Describe adjacent land use(s) that utilize the flex lane:

☐ Residential ☐ Commercial + Mixed Use ☐ Industrial

4. Describe [ROW Allocation Framework](#) prioritized functions for the flex lane for specified land use(s) [in your project area](#):

5. What is the utilization of existing parking (e.g., peak parking occupancy)?

6. How can flex lane functions be met nearby or off-street?

7. Will any existing accessible parking spaces be impacted? ☐ Yes ☒ No

8. How many accessible on-street parking spaces is your project required to install? ([per Streets Illustrated section 3.13](#))

None

Describe recommendations for flex lane:

N/A

Describe final decisions:

N/A

## 8 Signals & Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)

1. Does the project include or impact traffic signals that are on the left-turn Signal List, the High Priority (new) Signal List, or the Major Maintenance (rebuild) List?

Request for information sent to TOD on 5/13/2022

2. Is a full signal warranted in the project area? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
If yes, consult with signal design manager about opportunities to upgrade.

3. Does the project area include any signals with a Condition Index read as the worst 10% of all signals?

- 24th Ave E & Boyer Ave E  
- 23rd Ave E & E Republican St  
- 23rd Ave E & E John St (being addressed by the VZ 23rd Ave Phase 3 project)

4. Is the project on the ITS Key Arterial Network? ☒ Yes ☐ No  
If so, list segments:

The entire Route 48 corridor

Describe recommendations:

TSP Upgrades at the following intersections:

- E McGraw St (controller, fiber, cabinet)
- E Newton St (controller, fiber, cabinet)
- Boyer Ave E (controller, fiber, APS)
- E Crescent St (fiber)
- E Prospect St (fiber)
- E Aloha St (fiber)
- E Republican St (controller, fiber)
- E Olive St (controller)
- E Cherry St (controller)
- E Jefferson St (controller)
- E Alder St (controller)
- E Yesler Way (controller)
- S King St (controller)
- S Dearborn St (controller)

Please provide planning level cost estimates:

\$920K (covered by project budget)

Describe final decisions:

See above



## 9 Pedestrian Infrastructure

1. Is sidewalk repair needed in the project area? ☒ Yes ☐ No  
If yes, contact the Sidewalk Safety Repair Program (SSRP) Manager.

2. Will sidewalk repair impact trees? ☒ Yes ☐ No  
If yes, summarize recommendations from Urban Forestry:

There is potential for the sidewalk repair to require root trimming and potential tree removal. Final decisions have to be made in the field during construction in consultation with Urban Forestry.

3. Are there missing sidewalks in the project area? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
If yes, contact the PMP Implementation Coordinator

4. Are there missing curb ramps or tactile pads in the project area? ☒ Yes ☐ No  
If yes, contact ADA Program Manager

5. Are there Accessible Pedestrian Signal requests in the project area? If yes, contact ADA Program Manager ☐ Yes ☒ No

6. Is the project within a 20mph school zone or at a school crosswalk? If yes, contact SRTS Program Manager ☒ Yes ☐ No

7. Are there tier 1 or tier 2 **signalized** intersections in the project area? If yes, contact Pedestrian Crossing Lead ☒ Yes ☐ No

8. Are there tier 1 or tier 2 **unsignalized** intersections in the project area? If yes, contact Pedestrian Crossing Lead ☒ Yes ☐ No

Describe tier 1 and tier 2 signalized & unsignalized recommendations:

Kadie Bell-Sata requested LPIs at two intersections:

- 23rd Ave/E Yesler Way
- 23rd Ave S/Jackson St

Tom Hewitt request APS and curb ramp upgrades at 24th Ave/Boyer Ave

9. Describe any adverse impacts to pedestrian travel triggered by your project (e.g., removal of a pedestrian buffer):

Potential for temporary impacts to sidewalks or crossings during implementation. If sidewalks or crosswalks are closed, a detour route will be implemented.

Describe recommendations:

Outside of the Route 48 TPMC project, TOD implemented LPIs at 23rd Ave at Jackson St, Yesler Way, and other locations where feasible. At intersections where the Route 48 TPMC project proposes TSP upgrades, LPIs will be considered for implementation.

ADA Lead recommended installation of APS and upgraded curb ramps at Boyer Ave.

Trenching work for getting fiber to the cabinet may trigger curb ramp upgrades at Republican St.

SSRP would like to include sidewalk repair on the corridor north of John St as needed and able to be funded.

Please provide planning level cost estimates:

\$370K (APS & curb ramps at Boyer covered by project budget)  
Up to \$300K (from SSRP sidewalk repair)

Describe final decisions:

Route 48 TPMC project will implement LPIs at signalized intersections with scoped TSP upgrades where feasible.

The project will also install APS and upgraded curb ramps (all corners) at Boyer Ave and other corners as triggered by trenching/paving work for fiber.

SSRP has offered to fund up to \$300K in sidewalk repairs and/or curb ramp upgrades on 23rd/24th Avenue E between John St and Roanoke St. However, exact locations of this work will be determined post-30% design and the completion of the VZ Phase 3 project which is also making sidewalk repairs. Locations near transit stops will be prioritized based on funding availability. It is assumed that no additional survey will be required to design these improvements.

10 **Bicycle Infrastructure**

1. Does the project area contain locations on the Recommended Bicycle Network? ☐ Yes ☒ No

2. Is there an existing bike facility? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
If yes, list street segments:

Burke Gilman Trail is located adjacent to the Pacific St segment. Route 44 TPMC project evaluated alternatives for bike facilities on 15th Ave NE and will be installing bus lanes, bikes permitted.

3. Do facilities in the project area meet the existing [Bike Master Plan \(BMP\)](#) designation? ☒ Yes ☐ No

*If existing facilities do not meet BMP designation, review [Streets Illustrated](#) for bicycle design guidance and consult with BMP Coordinator about opportunity to upgrade the facilities.*

4. Describe any adverse impacts to bicycle travel triggered by your project (e.g., bike lane closure during construction, pavement seam in bike lane, etc):

No anticipated impacts.

Describe recommendations:

NGW has future plans to implement infra-red bike detection at both Alder St and McGraw St. Signal upgrades, particularly at McGraw St where the foundation and cabinet are being replaced, should coordination with NGW to ensure adequate conduit capacity to support this functionality.

NGW has received community requests to provide a connection for the Central Area Greenway on Boyer Ave between 23rd and 24th Sts. Given the anticipated curb ramp work at Boyer Ave, further coordination is required. NGW has not identified funding to support this work.

Please provide planning level cost estimates:

N/A

Describe final decision:

Prior to reaching 60% design, the project team will confirm that the signal upgrades at McGraw St will support future bike detection functionality.

Prior to reaching 60% design, the following modifications will be incorporated at the intersection of 24th Ave E and Boyer Ave E to support the Central Area NGW bike connection:

- Widen the curb ramp on the SW corner to accommodate people biking
- Locate the push-button pedestal as to allow bike access to the ramp
- Install conduit in the signal cabinet to support future signal phasing modifications that may be needed

**11 Transit Infrastructure**

1. Is there a bus route/bus stop/bus layover within the project area? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, describe and consult Streets Illustrated for transit design standards. List them here.

Streets Illustrated calls for 11-foot transit lanes and sidewalks that are 2' wider than standard. Transit stops must be located 30 feet outside of the intersection if right turns are permitted in the travel lane.

2. Is there a RapidRide (existing or future), Priority Bus Network, or Frequent Bus Network route within the project area? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, describe which bus routes and type of overlap. Consult Transit Master Plan for investment recommendations. List recommendations here and consult with the Transit and Mobility group.

Entire Route 48 corridor a part of the Frequent Transit Network (very frequent designation) and was identified as a future RapidRide route. As a T&M project, the objectives of the project are to improve transit travel time, reliability, and access. The planned scope is described in the recommendations section.

3. Is there overhead catenary wire for trolley buses within the project area? ☒ Yes ☐ No  
[23rd Ave/24th Ave/Montlake Blvd \(btwn Pacific St to John St\)](#)  
[23rd Ave \(SB btwn Jefferson St and Cherry St\)](#)  
 Is a change to channelization proposed with this project? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes to either of the above, describe and consult with the Transit and Mobility group who will connect you with the appropriate Metro contact, if necessary.

4. Are there transit stops in the project area more than 500 ft from a controlled crossing in the project area? ☒ Yes ☐ No  
 Is there an opportunity to consolidate bus stops? List recommendations here and consult with the Transit and Mobility group who will connect you with the appropriate Metro contact, if necessary. [E Roy St: VZ 23rd Ave Ph 3 project is consolidating stops and this stop will be removed](#)
5. Describe any adverse impacts to transit operations triggered by your project (e.g., any anticipated operational impacts to bus travel times, rechannelization, bus stop impacts etc.)

Planned improvements will benefit transit although there will be temporary impacts during implementation.

*Describe recommendations:*

The 30% design includes the following transit improvements:  
 - Upgrades at 15 signalized intersections to support NextGen TSP (see pg.8)  
 - Install a SB bus lane between S Massachusetts St and S Grand St and a transit only approach at Rainier Ave S for buses turning left (see pg.5)

Post 30% design:

- If the NB bus lane between Boyer Ave E and E Roanoke St is supported and included in the project, signal heads for SB travel lanes will have to be shifted at McGraw St, Newton St, and Lynn St. This may require rewiring intersections which could add additional signal scope.

*Please provide planning level cost estimates:*

N/A (covered by project budget)

*Describe final decision:*

See above.

## 12 Freight Infrastructure

1. Is the project on the Recommended Freight Network? ☒ Yes ☐ No

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Major Truck Street            | <input type="checkbox"/> Limited Access Street       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor Truck Street | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Over-Legal Route |
| <input type="checkbox"/> First / Last Mile Connector   | <input type="checkbox"/> Heavy Haul                  |

2. Does project area meet [curb radius](#) and [clearance standards](#)? ☒ Yes ☐ No

3. Are there identified freight projects in project area? [\(Freight Master Plan \(FMP\)\)](#) ☐ Yes ☒ No

4. Is this project in the [downtown traffic control zone](#)? ☐ Yes ☒ No

### [Details on Question 1:](#)

Minor Truck Streets: 24th Ave E and 23rd Ave to Union St

Over-legal Route: 24th Ave and 23rd Ave

### *Describe recommendations:*

Maintain 11' lanes on designated freight routes. Need to consider impacts to freight mobility as a result of proposed bus lanes.

Post-30% design, a decision will be made about including a NB bus lane on 24th Ave E between Boyer Ave and Roanoke St. This bus lane would overlap with a minor freight route.

### *Please provide planning level cost estimates:*

N/A

### *Describe final decision:*

30% design does not include modifications to lane widths on designated freight routes.

If NB bus lane on 24th Ave E between Boyer Ave and Roanoke St were to be included post-30%, consideration would need to be given to any impacts to the minor freight route including potential additional delay and lane width modifications.

13 Urban Forestry

1. Describe any existing [urban forestry](#) assets within the project limits that need to be protected during construction:

None identified

2. Are there Heritage Trees in the project area? ☒ Yes ☐ No  
[24th Ave btwn E Fir St and E Spruce St](#)
3. Does your project propose planting trees or expanding the ground plane landscape? ☐ Yes ☒ No
4. Will there be ground cover that requires maintenance or pruning? ☐ Yes ☒ No
5. Will sidewalk infrastructure be impacted (e.g. narrowing of sidewalks, sawcutting etc.)? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, contact the Sidewalk Safety Repair Program (SSRP) Manager and summarize recommendations from SSRP:

Sidewalk repair may require tree root trimming and/or tree removal. Final decisions on tree impacts and potential mitigation for specific locations will be made in coordination with SSRP and Urban Forestry later in design or during construction.

Describe recommendations:

N/A

Please provide planning level cost estimates:

N/A

Describe final decision:

Protect existing trees during construction.

Coordinate any sidewalk repair work with SSRP and Urban Forestry to determine any potential tree impacts and/or mitigation for specific locations.

## 14 Urban Design and Planning

1. Is there a [Street Design Concept Plan](#) for the project area? ☐ Yes ☒ No

2. List any plan(s) that overlap with project area (and relevant plan boundaries):

Some of the more recent relevant plans include:

- Rainier Beach Neighborhood Plan Update (2012)
- U District Station Area Mobility Plan (2018)
- U District Neighborhood Design Guidelines (2018)
- Central Area Neighborhood Design Guidelines (2018)
- Judkins Park Station Access Study (2019)

3. Have other urban design or transportation plans been completed, or are draft plans in progress, within project area (including plans from other City departments)? ☒ Yes ☐ No

4. Is there an opportunity to add pedestrian lighting in the project area? ☐ Yes ☒ No

5. Is your project within the [Age-Friendly Prioritization Area](#)? ☒ Yes ☐ No  
**23rd Ave btwn E Marion St and S King St**

If yes, please contact Urban Design Program Coordinator, Policy and Planning to discuss opportunities for incorporating Age-Friendly Street Design elements.

The Age-Friendly Street Design elements may include:

- Seating
- Public Toilets
- Hill Climb Assists
- Weather Protection
- Wayfinding
- Transit Amenities

6. Is your project likely to include any departure from Streets Illustrated design standards and/or Best Management Practice e.g. two-way PBLs, interim design treatments - flexible delineators and paint striping for bike lanes, curb bulbs, alternative sidewalk designs, etc.? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please contact Urban Design Program Coordinator, Policy and Planning.

If NB bus lane is implemented on 24th Ave E, there may be one block (McGraw St to Lynn St) where the proposed lane widths (10.5') are narrower than recommended in Streets Illustrated for a transit lane and minor truck street (11' standard). For southbound lanes, this would be an improvement (existing lanes are 9' and 10'). For northbound lanes, this would be a reduction in width (existing lanes are 9' and 13'). As required, the project will request a Streets Illustrated deviation.

Describe recommendations:

Per a meeting with Gabriel Seo on 9/9/2021:  
If making signal upgrades in Age-Friendly Prioritization Area, ensure crossing speeds are appropriate and consider LPIs.

At intersections where the Route 48 TPMC project proposes TSP upgrades, LPIs will be considered for implementation if not already in operation at the time of construction.

Please provide planning level cost estimates:

No additional cost anticipated

Describe final decision:

At intersections where the Route 48 TPMC project proposes TSP upgrades, LPIs will be considered for implementation if not already in operation at the time of construction.

**15 On-Site Stormwater Management**

1. Does your project create or replace 2,000 SF of hard surface, or disturbing 7,000 SF of land?  
If yes to either, do an early draft of drainage memo to better understand requirements  
  
If no, skip to item 3.  
  
☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Have the minimum requirements of the [2016 Stormwater Code](#) been evaluated?  
  
☐ Yes ☐ No
  - i. Is this project in an area identified as suitable for infiltrating GSI approaches (per SPU GIS data), including permeable pavement options?  
  
☐ Yes ☐ No
  - ii. Does project area require infiltration investigation? If investigation has been done, include findings in description of BMPs below  
  
☐ Yes ☐ No
  - iii. Are there opportunities in the project limits to accommodate On-Site Stormwater Management BMPs?  
  
☐ Yes ☐ No
  - iv. Is there an opportunity to remove impervious surface as part of this project in accordance with the [2013 Executive Order](#) which urges all City departments to incorporate natural drainage features into capital projects?  
  
☐ Yes ☐ No

*Describe recommendations:*

The 30% design includes very limited civil work (some curb ramps, cabinet foundations, and some minor pavement restoration after trenching). Based on the current scope, we do not anticipate impacting the existing drainage system or identifying opportunities for on-site stormwater management.

Additional sidewalk repair or curb ramp upgrades may be identified post-30% design (funded by SSRP) which may need additional review for potential drainage impacts and/or on-site stormwater management opportunities.

*Please provide planning level cost estimates:*

N/A

*Please describe opportunities:*

*Please provide rough cost estimates:*

3. Is this project on a street identified as potentially eligible for SPU partnership opportunities (per SPU GIS data)?  
  
☒ Yes ☐ No

*Describe final decision:*

See above.

## Art

Consult with SDOT Arts & Enhancements Project Manager to complete this section.

*Seattle was one of the first cities in the United States to adopt a percent-for-art ordinance in 1973. The program specifies that 1% of eligible city capital improvement project funds be set aside for the commission, purchase and installation of artworks in a variety of settings.*

1. Is there an opportunity for a 1% Percent for Art funded public art project(s) in the project area? ☒ Yes ☐ No
2. Consult the [SDOT Art Plan](#). Is there an opportunity to implement [SDOT Art Plan](#) toolbox elements (e.g. signal box art, sidewalk inlays, creative street furniture or bollards or planters, creative bicycle racks, etc.) in the project area? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Contact: Kristen Ramirez  
Email: [kristen.ramirez@seattle.gov](mailto:kristen.ramirez@seattle.gov)  
Phone: (206) 615-1095

Prepare the following information:

1. Name of Program (official CIP name)
2. Approximate project scope & budget
3. Timing/schedule
4. Whether there is space for art in the project area

Describe Public Art or SDOT Art Plan opportunities:

7/22/21 Meeting with Amy Nguyen and Jason Huff (OAC):  
Confirmed that the 1% for Arts allocation for Route 48 TPMC (\$3,000) and other programmatic arts funds available for transit projects; Transit Corridor Improvement (\$19,278) and STBD (\$50,000).

Most likely pathway for incorporating art in the project is through the development of a transit corridor art program. A signage initiative was discussed as a potential arts project for transit corridors. SDOT UD has formed a steering committee to discuss programmatic arts projects to help guide these decisions.

Describe final decisions:

Post-30% design, work with Joshua Gawne to determine if incorporating art along the corridor is feasible or if the Route 48 TPMC 1% for Arts allocation should be reallocated to support a larger public art effort.



Based on the initial project information provided, the above noted Complete Streets elements are recommended to be incorporated into the project scope. The program owners and subject matter experts (collectively the Complete Streets Checklist Reviewers), who provided input through the Complete Streets Checklist process, will collectively make final decisions regarding project scope, based on these preliminary Complete Streets recommendations. If at any time, resolution between the team members cannot be reached regarding a scope item or additional department wide policy guidance is needed, the project should present the issue to the Complete Streets Steering Committee (CSSC).

In addition to these broad preliminary scope recommendations, ongoing urban design review is required for 30%, 60%, and 90% design drawings to review consistency with these preliminary recommendations, as well as ongoing design details and urban design opportunities. To the greatest extent possible, all major scope recommendations will be made during the Project Definition phase.

Should any scope changes be proposed post the Project Definition phase, the Project Manager is to inform the Complete Streets Checklist Reviewers (or CSSC if applicable) and obtain consensus for the revised scope. The Complete Streets Checklist and Project Definition Memo will need to be updated accordingly.

**Project Developer** elisabeth Wooton

*name (please print)*

06/30/2022

*date*



elisabeth Wooton (Jun 30, 2022 09:44 PDT)

*signature*

**Project Manager** Iona McKenzie

*name (please print)*

07/05/2022

*date*



Iona McKenzie (Jul 5, 2022 13:18 PDT)

*signature*

## COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST : REVIEW COMMENT FORM

**Instructions:** This document is intended to be used at the end of the Complete Streets Review process. Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) should have been invited to a kick off meeting to understand project goals and received an opportunity to provide comments / scope direction on the Complete Streets Checklist (CSC). This form should accompany the final review of the CSC. It allows the SMEs to make final comments / clarifications and provide concurrence on the project scope decisions. If concurrence cannot be reached, project team members should follow the escalation protocol. PD leads should circulate to all SMEs listed on the CSC Reviewer Contacts form.

[CSC Reviewer Contacts](#)

**Project:** Route 48 TPMC  
**Project Developer:** Elisabeth Wooton  
**Speed Type:** TRC1161-S0001  
**Date:** 6/30/2022

Please use this shared form to enter your comments by Wednesday, June 8, 2022. If we do not hear from you by this date, we will assume concurrence. Thank you!

Page	CSC Section	SME Name	SME Comments	PD Response	Concurrence (Yes, No, No Response)
1	Complete Streets Policy	Gabriel Seo			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
2	Complete Streets Review Story Map	Gabriel Seo			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
3	Project Coordination	Johanna Landherr			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
3	Project Coordination	Jonathan Williams			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
5	Safety & Channelization	Chris Svolopoulos			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
5	Safety & Channelization	Venu Nemani			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
5	Safety & Channelization	Andrew Natzel			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
6	Pavement Condition	Ben Hansen			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
6	Pavement Condition	Christopher Jackson			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
7	Flex Lane / Curbpace	Mary Catherine Snyder			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
7	Flex Lane / Curbpace	Brian Hamlin			Yes
8	ITS & Signals	Venu Nemani			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
8	ITS & Signals	Tom Le			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
9	Pedestrian Infrastructure	David Burgess			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
9	Pedestrian Infrastructure	Mario Macias			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
9	Pedestrian Infrastructure	Nathalie Salazar	If new signalized crossing is implemented at Grand St & 23rd Ave S. APS must be installed. This is a high priority intersection for constituents that travel to Light House for the Blind (23rd Ave S route is an important route for the deaf blind community).	The proposed signalized crossing at Grand St is not being implemented by this project but the project team working on the pedestrian half signal has confirmed that APS is included in the design, as with all new signals.	
9	Pedestrian Infrastructure	Nathalie Salazar	Add the Light House for the Blind as contacts for outreach. The deaf blind constituents frequently use this route and they need to be aware of the upgrades. ADA Lead recommended installation of APS and upgraded curb ramps at Boyer Ave.	Lighthouse for the Blind is on our contact list for the project but we will also add them to our Stakeholder Log. We presented to both the PAAC and SPAB prior to 30% design but will make sure to offer a briefing to Lighthouse as well.	
9	Pedestrian Infrastructure	Nathalie Salazar	We also recognize the potential for curb ramp upgrades required along this corridor segment by potential SDOT construction triggers and will review the preliminary design/30% plans when they are available. One designs are circulated and reviewed, we can discuss the curb ramp requirements and any other pertinent information from the ADA Program (i.e. proximate customer service requests) before concurring on a list of required curb ramp improvements.	Noted. Input on any customer requests or priority locations for curb ramp installations or upgrades are helpful to receive prior to 30% design for including in the baseline estimate and identifying funding.	
9	Pedestrian Infrastructure	Kadie Bell Sata			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
9	Pedestrian Infrastructure	Jinny Green	There may be additional SSRP scope identified on 24th Ave E between Boyer Ave E and Interlaken. Can this be provided later when we determine the sections of sidewalk repair?	Yes. As indicated in the checklist, additional sidewalk repair locations (up to \$300K) may be identified prior to 60% design. Sidewalk repair and curb ramp work near transit stops will be prioritized.	
10	Pedestrian Infrastructure	Stuart Vitagliano			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
9	Pedestrian Infrastructure	Ashley Rhead			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
10	Bicycle Infrastructure	Hallie O'Brien	Does the Lake WA Loop project intersect with this project at Boyer? Potential new bike lane crossing route 48 in u-district at 11/12 with paving project (30% design) bike lanes are unfunded but could cross 45th @ 11th Ave and 12th and continue on those streets up to 47th.	Will confirm with NGW on the Lake WA Loop connection. We have no proposed scope in the U District so no need/opportunity for coordination on the 11th/12th Ave bike lanes.	Yes
11	Bicycle Infrastructure	Monica Dewald			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
12	Bicycle Infrastructure	Summer Jawson	At Dearborn, bike push buttons for NGW crossing are in place and signal modifications must maintain existing functionality.	TOD has confirmed that the existing bicycle detection will not be impacted by design.	Yes (emailed on 6/16/2022)

Page	CSC Section	SME Name	SME Comments	PD Response	Concurrence (Yes, No, No Response)
12	Bicycle Infrastructure	Summer Jawson	At Alder, NGW has future plans to implement infra-red bike detection and signal modifications must support that capability.	TOD has confirmed that the modified signal will be able to support future bike detection functionality.	Yes (emailed on 6/16/2022)
12	Bicycle Infrastructure	Summer Jawson	At McGraw, NGW has future plans to implement infra-red bike detection and signal modifications must support that capability.	Project plans to rebuild the foundation and cabinet at this location and will coordinate with NGW to ensure adequate conduit capacity to support future bike detection functionality. We will make a comment in the 30% design circulation to this effect.	Yes (emailed on 6/16/2022)
12	Bicycle Infrastructure	Summer Jawson	Request from stakeholders to improve connection to Central Area Neighborhood Greenway on Boyer Ave between 23rd Ave and 24th Ave. Since curb ramp work is proposed at Boyer Ave for the Route 48 TPMC project, coordination is needed. NGW does not currently have funding to support this connection.	Coordination meeting held with project team, NGW, and TOD on June 28. As a result of the meeting, the Route 48 TPMC design will be modified as follows to support this bike connection: - Expand the curb ramp on the SW corner to accommodate people biking, - Locate the push-button pedestal as to allow bike access to the ramp, and - Install conduit in the signal cabinet to support future signal phasing modifications These design modifications will not be reflected in the 30% plan but comments will be made during circulation and they will be incorporated prior to 60% design.	Yes (emailed on 6/29/2022)
11	Transit Infrastructure	Christine Alar			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
12	Freight Infrastructure	Chris Eaves			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
12	Freight Infrastructure	AJ Cari			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
13	Urban Forestry	Cindy Kozak			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
13	Urban Forestry	Ben Roberts			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
14	Urban Design & Planning	Gabriel Seo			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
15	Green Stormwater Infrastructure	Bob Spencer (SPU)			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022
16	Art	Joshua Gawne			No Response: Assumed concurrence 6/9/2022