

Introduction

Transportation Element

Rapid population growth in surrounding areas such as the Sammamish Plateau and along the Highway 18 corridor have significantly increased the amount of traffic passing through Issaquah to I-90 and other destinations. This increasing regional traffic, supplemented by moderate city growth, has surpassed our ability to add new roadway capacity.

GMA requires jurisdictions to establish Level of Service (LOS) standards for their transportation systems and to prohibit development if it will cause the transportation LOS to decline below the adopted standard. Issaquah, except for brief periods in 1998 and again in 2000, has failed to meet its adopted transportation LOS and our transportation LOS has continued to decline over time.

With the development of the urban villages, the City has met its 2022 Housing Targets. However, the City's current 20-year land use plan provides enough capacity for nearly 2,800 housing units and 1.7 million sq. ft. of additional commercial space. The number of PM peak hour trips would increase from approximately 43,000 trips today to 53,000 in 2022 with the anticipated buildout of the land use plan. Since 2001, the Planning Policy Commission has been leading the effort to amend the Transportation Element to help maintain transportation concurrency as new development occurs. That effort has included:

- Analyzing existing traffic volumes, traffic operations and safety;
- Forecasting and modeling 2022 traffic volumes, based on the recommended 2022 land use vision;
- Updating the City's roadway classifications;
- Identifying and modeling system improvement alternatives;
- Recommending changes to the City's six-year Transportation Improvement Plan and 20 year road plan; and
- Recommending a 7% transit, transit supportive and nonmotorized component to the 2022 transportation vision.
- Updating the City's transportation impact fees.



Vision

Provide a well-managed transportation system that enables the safe and efficient movement of people, goods and services, and supports and complements the City's land use values and goals. In order to achieve this vision, the City must:

- GOAL A.** Coordinate land use and transportation;
- GOAL B.** Link development and transportation improvements;
- GOAL C.** Safely and efficiently connect all modes of transportation throughout the City;
- GOAL D.** Support alternative modes of transportation;

- GOAL E.** Optimize the value of transportation investments and resources;
- GOAL F.** Maintain and improve the existing transportation infrastructure;
- GOAL G.** Collaborate with Issaquah’s neighboring municipalities, King County, and other agencies to address regional impacts and issues, and;
- GOAL H.** Reduce dependency on single occupancy vehicles (SOV).

Growth Management Act: Transportation Element Requirements

The Growth Management Act requires that the adopted transportation element must implement, and be consistent with, the land use element. In addition, the transportation element must include the following components.

- GMAT-1.** Land use assumptions used in estimating travel;
- GMAT-2.** Estimated traffic impacts to State-owned transportation facilities resulting from land use assumptions;
- GMAT-3.** Facilities and services needs, including:
 - a. An inventory of State and local air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including transit alignments and general aviation airport facilities;
 - b. Level of service standards for all locally owned arterials and transit routes;
 - c. Level of service standards for highways for State-owned transportation facilities;
 - d. Specific actions and requirements for bringing into compliance locally owned transportation facilities or services that are below an established level of service standard;
 - e. Forecasts of traffic for at least ten years based on the adopted land use plan; and
 - f. Identification of State and local system needs to meet current and future demands.
- GMAT-4.** Finance, including:
 - a. An analysis of funding capability to judge needs against probable funding resources;
 - b. A multiyear financing plan based on the needs identified in the comprehensive plan; and
 - c. A discussion of how additional funding will be raised, or how land use assumptions will be reassessed to ensure that level of service standards will be met if probable funding falls short of meeting identified needs.
- GMAT-5.** Intergovernmental coordination efforts, including an assessment of the impacts of the transportation plan and land use assumptions on the transportation systems of adjacent jurisdictions; and
- GMAT-6.** Demand-management strategies.
- GMAT-7.** Local jurisdictions must adopt and enforce ordinances which prohibit development approval if the development causes the level of service on a locally owned transportation facility to decline below the standards adopted in the transportation element of the comprehensive plan, unless transportation improvements or strategies to accommodate the impacts of development are made concurrent with the development. These strategies may include increased public transportation service, ride sharing programs, demand management, and other transportation systems management strategies. Concurrent with the development means that improvements or strategies are in place at the time of development, or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements or strategies within six years.

Transportation and Land Use

GOAL A: Coordinate land use and transportation.

GOAL B: Link development and transportation improvements.

Transportation and Land Use Policies

T-1 Maintain the Comprehensive Plan's land use vision in the vicinity of transportation projects by remaining consistent with the land use designations shown in the Land Use Designation Map, Figure 1, Land Use Element, Volume 1.

T-2 Coordinate land use planning with public transportation service to provide opportunities that reduce transportation demand City-wide

T-3 Use land use assumptions, including potential build-out and growth targets, to estimate 20-year travel and transportation needs to serve the City's planned growth. Use up to date land use, facilities inventories and travel behavior data to indicate future travel needs. Provide these estimates to the State

T-4 Update the six year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) annually to reflect changes in travel demand, land use designations or levels of service standards. Include a 20 year "future years" project list with the six year TIP to establish future system plans that coordinate with the 20 year land use plan

T-5 Incorporate transit supportive and multimodal/nonmotorized friendly design features in new development through the development review process.



Transportation Demand Management

GOAL H: Reduce dependency on single occupancy vehicles.

Transportation Demand Management Policies

T-6 Develop and implement and continue to monitor transportation demand management regulations and strategies that address the following factors

- Parking
- Services to increase high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) use

- Fully utilize HOV lanes.
- Increased participation in Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) programs
- Increased public awareness of available travel alternatives

T-7 REFER ALSO TO TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE POLICY #T-5, Transit supportive and multimodal/nonmotorized friendly design features.

Mobility Management	GOAL B:	Link development and transportation improvements
	GOAL C:	Safely and efficiently connect all modes of transportation throughout the City
	GOAL D:	Support alternative modes of transportation

Mobility Management Background

Issaquah Concurrency/Level of Service. State law defines concurrency as the provision of improvements (e.g. transit facilities, streets, mobility systems, sidewalks, bike lanes etc.) at the time of development, or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements or mitigation strategies within six years¹; however, the State leaves the implementation of transportation concurrency and the adoption of LOS standards to local discretion.

The State provides little prescriptive guidance for how concurrency is to be implemented, how the level of service should be measured or what the level of service should be. As a result, the transportation level of service varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction depending on community land use and transportation goals.

As required by GMA, the City Council established Issaquah’s first transportation concurrency system in 1998 with the adoption of Ordinance No. 2184. Issaquah’s concurrency system is made up of two elements. The first element uses a transportation-forecasting model to estimate traffic volumes at 80 specific directional screenline roadway locations during the PM peak hour (4-6 p.m.). The second element uses a spreadsheet to compare the forecast PM peak hour traffic volume at each screenline to the planned capacity of the roadway at that location. Planned Capacity (PC) begins with the base capacity of the roadway and subtracts capacity if sidewalks, bicycle lanes, roadway shoulders and certain other improvements are not provided.

Each of the 80 transportation concurrency screenlines in the City has a V/PC standard. The traffic volume-to-planned capacity (V/PC) standard ranges from 1.0 for regional and principal arterials in the peak direction to 0.50 for collector streets in the non-peak direction. A standard of 1.00 means that the maximum traffic volume allowed during the PM peak hour (in order to pass concurrency) is equal to the planned capacity of the roadway. A standard of 0.85 means that the maximum traffic volume allowed to pass concurrency is 85% of the planned capacity of the roadway. A screenline passes concurrency if the traffic volume at the screenline during the PM peak hour is equal to or less than the adopted standard. The City Council provided policy direction for preparing a new transportation concurrency system in 2007 (AB 5612). The Council’s direction was based on a *Report on the Evaluation of Transportation Concurrency Policy* (January 27, 2007) and the recommendations of the Planning Policy Commission (PPC). A Comprehensive Plan-based system (formerly referred to as enhanced delay) was recommended by the PPC and selected as the preferred alternative by the City Council.

¹ Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.070(6)(e)

Planned Based Concurrency means evaluating the traffic impacts from new development based on the level of service standards adopted in the *Comprehensive Plan* and requiring motorized and/or non-motorized improvements identified in the *Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)* to be provided if the proposed development will cause the transportation LOS to decline below the adopted LOS standard. Concurrency will be measured at one or more of the sixty intersections in the City where one or more of the intersecting roads is an arterial street.

**Table T-1
Traffic Density Level of Service Measurements
(Highway Capacity Manual Method)**

Level of Service Standard	Density Range (passenger vehicles/ lane/ mile)
A (Primarily free flow operation, speeds at speed limit prevail, unimpeded maneuvering)	0 - 10.0
B (Reasonable free flow operation, speeds near free flow, slight impedance in maneuvering)	10.1 - 16.0
C (Speeds below free flow, restricted impedance in maneuvering)	16.1 - 24.0
D (Increased restricted impedance in maneuvering)	24.1 - 32.0
E (Steady traffic stream, maximum facility capacity, maneuvering extremely limited)	32.1 - 45.0
F (Stop and go)	> 45.0

Planned Based Concurrency supports achievement of the community vision because the adopted level of service and TIP projects are consistent with the land use and transportation goals adopted in the *Comprehensive Plan*.

GMA also requires that local jurisdictions provide an estimate of local transportation impacts to State-owned transportation facilities and their level of service standards. Table T-2 provides a summary of traffic impacts to Interstate 90 and SR-900, the two State-owned facilities within Issaquah. Table T-2 provides existing and future average annual daily traffic (AADT) and calculates level of service standards for road segments on both facilities.

For more information on the Level of Service for State Owned Facilities, see the *Transportation Element Background, Volume 2*.

Table T-2
Estimated Local Traffic Impacts to State Owned Transportation Facilities

Interstate 90				
Road Segment (mileage markers)	Existing AADT*	Future (2020) AADT	Existing Level of Service (LOS)	Future (2020) Level of Service (LOS)
12.94 - 13.89	98,774	129,423	D	F
13.89 - 15.24	57,112	80,244	D	D
15.24 - 16.19	41,017	67,451	B	C
16.19 - 17.94	43,743	45,622	B	B
SR-900				
Road Segment (mileage markers)	Existing AADT	Future (2020) AADT	Existing LOS (Am/PM Peaks)	Future (2020) LOS (AM/PM Peaks)
15.39 - 15.66	13,688	39,549	AM: D PM: C	AM: E PM: E
15.66 - 15.69	N/A	38,532	AM: A PM: B	AM: D PM: D
15.69 - 15.98	N/A	41,701	AM: B PM: E	AM: C PM: E
15.98 - 16.20	25,371	61,881	AM: D PM: F	AM: E PM: E

Transportation Improvement Program. Anticipated transportation projects and their estimated costs are identified in the Six Year Transportation Program (TIP) in Table T-3. Sixteen capacity projects, totaling over \$89 million are identified in the six year transportation financing plan. The remaining projects are classified as non-capacity projects as they do not directly add capacity to the City’s transportation system and therefore don’t directly contribute to the City’s level of service standards. The non-capacity projects are expected to cost approximately \$11 million over the six year timeframe. Much of the revenue to fund both the capacity and non-capacity projects will come from grants or bonds, with contributions, impact fees and money from the City’s street improvement fund making up the remainder.

Although Table T-3 identifies nearly thirty transportation projects for a total of over \$100 million, not all of the projects are funded and therefore may not be constructed. Because the City has limited fiscal resources which must cover a wide range of services including transportation, it may not be possible for the City to accomplish all the projects identified in the TIP. Each year, the City reviews and prioritizes transportation projects and budgets money for those projects that are deemed most necessary.

Those projects that are reasonably funded are placed on the “A-list” and are budgeted in the adopted budget. Remaining projects will be reviewed against the City’s need and its fiscal resources.

The six year transportation finance plan does not lock the City into the projects listed. Instead, it provides the City with an estimate of future transportation needs and costs to help the City budget its resources more efficiently. The City has the flexibility to develop other transportation projects should opportunities arise or new funding sources become available.

* Average Annual Daily Traffic

Mobility Management Policies

- T-8** If system improvements are not provided consistent with development and a system failure is triggered, action such as adjustment of LOS standards, modifications to land use assumptions and designations, or limits on new development must be taken to address the LOS deficiency. Development proposals that do not meet the adopted concurrency level of service may provide mitigation by providing road improvements to meet the concurrency requirement, phasing or modifying the project and/or implementing demand-management strategies or other measures to reduce the number of peak hour trips generated by the project to meet the concurrency requirements. Projects failing concurrency that do not provide adequate mitigation will be denied concurrency in accordance with state law.
- T-9** The following Adequacy Time Frame may be used to further define concurrency for various road classifications in the City:

Functional Class	Adequacy Time Frame
Principal Arterials	6 years
Minor Arterials	4 years
Commercial Collector	2 years
Residential Collector	2 years
Local Non-Residential	Immediate
Local Residential	Immediate

- T-10** Maintain a capital improvement program that improves existing substandard roadways to current standards, provides a balanced system of automobile, nonmotorized and HOV facilities and recognizes road improvements that are needed to improve traffic flow and High Accident Locations and meet transportation needs and concurrency requirements.
- T-11** Support multi-modal transportation solutions including general purpose lanes, High Capacity Transit, HOV lanes, transit and nonmotorized improvements that implement the 20-year transportation projects shown in the Roadway Projects Map (Figure 20, Volume 1), Transit and Transit Programs Map (Figure 22, Volume 1) and the Nonmotorized Corridor Map (Figure 7, Volume 1). Use the best available technologies when implementing these projects.
- T-12** Provide a seamless roadway and nonmotorized transportation system through implementation of the Roadway, Transit, Nonmotorized 20-year plans and the Sidewalk priority criteria. Use transit service within the city boundaries to connect major commercial centers, neighborhoods and regional transportation facilities.

Roadway Network	GOAL C: Safely and efficiently connect all modes of transportation throughout the City.
	GOAL F: Maintain and improve the existing transportation infrastructure.

Roadway Network Background

Functional Roadway Classifications represent the desired functions of the roads.

Principal Arterial. These roadways provide for traffic movements into, out of and through the City. Principal Arterials constitute a small percentage of the overall network, yet they carry the highest traffic volumes and longest trips. These arterials contain the regional and inter-city bus routes and transit centers. Service to abutting land use is subordinate to travel service provided by Principal Arterials.

Minor Arterial. Minor Arterials accommodate trips of moderate length and lower travel mobility than Principal Arterials. They serve intra-city and some through traffic trips as well as serve local and intra-city bus routes. Unlike Principal Arterials, Minor Arterials provide access to abutting land uses such as retail and office centers.

Collector Arterial. Collector Arterials carry moderate traffic volumes and shorter trips than Principal and Minor Arterials and have little through traffic. They may serve local bus routes. Collector Arterials provide movement within neighborhoods with direct neighborhood trips to Principal and Minor Arterials as well as land access to neighborhoods, commercial and industrial areas.

Local Streets. Local Streets comprise all roadways and streets not otherwise classified. The primary function of Local Streets is the provision of access to abutting properties. The balance of roadways within the City are Local Streets.

Roadway Network Policies

- T-13** Adequately fund, design and build the roadway network in accordance with the 20-year roadway plan shown in Figure 20 (Volume 1) in order to achieve the desired roadway classifications.
- T-14** Complete missing links, sidewalks, and other enhancements in the existing street system to provide more effective use of existing roads through implementation of the Roadway, Transit, Bicycle and Shared Use Maps and Sidewalk Inventory Map and Sidewalk priority criteria.
- T-15** Design arterials to be consistent with their roadway and transitway classifications shown in the Roadway and Transitway Classification Maps. New roadways must be included in the 20-year transportation plan prior to design so that the design is consistent with its roadway and transitway classifications.
- T-16** Facilitate the smooth flow of traffic on major arterials through signal coordination and other available technologies.

Transit Network

GOAL D: Support alternative modes of transportation.

Transit Network Background

Regional Transitways. Regional Transitways are characterized by a separate facility for public transportation modes such as rail, subway, or busway.

Major Transitways. Major Transitways are characterized by having high transit volumes and by utilizing priority lanes or signals for transit vehicles.

Minor Transitways. Minor Transitways exhibit medium bus volumes and function as a minor corridor or single route for buses.

Local Transitways. Local Transitways correspond to routes using small buses, paratransit or jitneys.

Transit Network Policies

- T-17** Achieve the 2022 Transportation System goal to include 7% transit and nonmotorized trips by working with State and regional jurisdictions and transit providers to implement the



transit supportive projects in the 20-year transit plan (Figure 22, Volume 1) and to achieve the desired transitway classifications.

- T-18** Ensure that regional transit system development occurs in accordance with the adopted Sound Transit Phase 2 system map and plan and King County Metro six-year plan by working with the regional transit providers.
- T-19** Ensure regional transit facilities provide safe and convenient access for transit vehicles, automobiles, bicycles and pedestrians. Development surrounding transit centers should contribute to easy mobility to and from regional transit facilities.
- T-20** REFER ALSO TO TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE POLICY #T-5, Transit Supportive and Nonmotorized/Multimodal Friendly Design.

Nonmotorized Network

GOAL D: Support alternative modes of transportation.

Nonmotorized Network Background

Sidewalks, bicycle lanes, shared use paths and transit services are all essential in creating a safe and efficient transportation system. The federal government agrees. Federal legislation States, “Bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways shall be considered, where appropriate, in conjunction with all new construction and reconstruction of transportation projects, except where bicycle and pedestrian use are not permitted.” (23 USC §217) “Due consideration,” defined by the federal government, means:

- A presumption that bicyclists and pedestrians will be accommodated in the design of new and improved transportation facilities
- The decision NOT to accommodate them should be the exception not the rule, and
- There must be exceptional circumstances for denying access through design or prohibition. (USDOT’s February 2000 Guidance Memorandum)

Additionally, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities States, “All highways, except those where cyclists are legally prohibited, should be designed and constructed under the assumption that they will be used by cyclists.” (AASHTO, 1999)

The nonmotorized corridors, pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, in this element address urban corridors, not recreational trails. Recreational trails are addressed in the Parks, Recreation, Trails and Open Space Element.

The primary intent of nonmotorized, urban corridors is to provide safe connections for commuter and recreational cyclists and pedestrians to get from point A to point B such as schools to parks, residential areas to pedestrian emphasis districts and local corridors to regional nonmotorized routes. There are often tremendous constraints in incorporating all of these elements into a transportation system; the challenge is to find the balance.

Shared Use Corridors are intended to serve walkers, joggers, and cyclists and other nonmotorized forms of transportation and connect activity centers such as parks, schools, commercial centers, libraries and high density housing and the regional recreational trail system. Shared Use Corridors shall:

- Be physically separated from the roadway by a 42” high, 2’ wide concrete barrier. Where this is not desirable, a clear zone analysis will be done to consider the appropriate width the path should be from the traveled way;
- Have a minimum width of 10’ for two-way shared use pedestrian and bicycle traffic with 2-foot shoulders along each side or a 12’ path shall be considered where high shared use traffic is expected;
- Have signage used to indicate it is a shared use path with way-finding signs directing path users with arrows, names, and distances to destinations;
- Have a 2-foot buffer between the path and the property line (is usually required only if 2-foot shoulders are not possible); and
- Be constructed with an Americans with Disabilities Act accessible surface.

On-Street Bicycle Lanes shall:

- Be 4-feet wide when located on local, collector and minor arterial roads that do not have a curb.
- Be 5-feet wide when located on local, collector and minor arterial roads that have a curb.
- Be 8-feet wide when located on principal arterials to ensure enough width to provide an additional buffer for the user as well as an emergency stopping point for drivers with automobile trouble.
- Have travel lanes for motor vehicles with a minimum width of 10-feet when an on-street bicycle lane is present.
- Be free of parking. Parking is not allowed in the bicycle lanes.

Nonmotorized Network Policies

- T-21** Use the Nonmotorized Corridor Map (Figure 7, Volume 1) to balance competing demands on City right-of-way, determine use of annual nonmotorized funding, and guide completion of the City’s nonmotorized network.
- T-22** Use the Nonmotorized Corridor Map (Figure 7) to guide the planning, design, construction and maintenance of all bicycle and pedestrian corridor projects to be included in the annual Transportation Improvement Program and other annual maintenance programs. Corridors that complete or expand the nonmotorized system rather than make enhancements to existing, safe, functioning corridors should take priority during project selection.
- T-23** All roadway projects shall be consistent with the Nonmotorized Corridor Map unless physical obstacles present significant difficulties or budget constraints are present. If either of the exceptions apply, attempts to design alternative routes must be considered in the project design.
- T-24** Establish annual funding used to construct and maintain nonmotorized projects identified on the Bicycle and Shared Use Corridor Map that are not otherwise included in roadway projects.
- T-25** Use the Sidewalk Priority Criteria to establish a performance system to determine the location of sidewalks to be constructed or restored during the funding of the annual sidewalk program. The sidewalk priority criteria include:
 - High Accident Area (5 points)
 - Access for Senior Citizen Groups or Disabled (4 points)
 - Completes Missing Links, Connects to Multi-Purpose Trail or Parks (4 points)
 - Roadway Classification/Hierarchy (3 points)
 - Adjacent to or Access to Transit/School Stops (2 points)
 - Non-Conformance Width of Existing Sidewalk (2 points)

The annual sidewalk program shall also be consistent with the Issaquah School District’s Safe Routes to School sidewalk plan.
- T-26** Require plats to include nonmotorized facilities that connect the ends of cul-de-sacs to existing and/or proposed nonmotorized routes to achieve improved circulation when those plats are adjacent to routes identified in the Nonmotorized Corridor Map (Figure 7).

- T-27** Require new or redeveloping properties to design and build bicycle/ pedestrian corridors that maximize the use of nonmotorized transportation alternatives.
- T-28** Continue to investigate potential nonmotorized corridors that link existing neighborhoods with destinations such as schools and parks, where needed. Needed improvements include:
 - a. An additional I-90 crossing
 - b. Links from residential areas to schools
 - c. Additional linkages within the North Issaquah subarea
- T-29** Ensure changes to roads do not eliminate existing nonmotorized transportation facilities unless equivalent mitigation is provided.
- T-30** Ensure public safety by maintaining bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- T-31** Use the guidelines outlined in the Capital Facilities Element, Policy 1.8 to fund pedestrian and bicycle related projects.
- T-32** Enforce bicycle and pedestrian safety laws equally among bicyclists, pedestrians and motorists to ensure safety and build mutual respect among all system users.
- T-33** Provide transportation safety education programs to elementary schools in conjunction with the Issaquah School District.

Finance	GOAL E: Optimize the value of transportation investments and resources.
----------------	--

Finance Policies

- T-34** Maintain a 20-year financing plan to provide predictability and assurance that transportation system improvements are accomplished when needed and in accordance with the six-year Transportation Improvement Program.
- T-35** Use impact fees to complete projects that mitigate or accommodate growth required by the Growth Management Act.
- T-36** Prioritize transportation funding in accordance with Comprehensive Plan policies CF-1.5 through CF-1.8 in the Capital Facilities Element.

Regional Coordination	GOAL G: Collaborate with Issaquah’s neighboring municipalities, King County, and other agencies to address regional impacts and issues.
------------------------------	--

Regional Coordination Policies

- T-37** Engage in discussions with the State Department of Transportation, Puget Sound Regional Council, Sound Transit, King County and the cities of Sammamish and Bellevue to attempt to influence regional decision making processes that promote the transportation system in the Issaquah community.
- T-38** Enter into interlocal agreements with regional agencies and adjacent jurisdictions that mandate the shared financial responsibility of mitigating impacts of new developments and their associated transportation facilities as well as those that benefit the regional transportation system.

**Table T-3
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) 2011-2016
City of Issaquah 6-Year Transportation Projects (previously adopted)**

Exhibit A to Resolution
Page 1 of 34

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM 2011-2016														
Project Class. No.	Project	Dept	Prior Years (10 years)	2010 Budget	2010 Estimate	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Future Years (10 years)	Total (prior thru future)	
T - 1	Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program	PWE	Annual	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 19,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 21,000	\$ -	\$ 129,000	
T - 2	I-90 Undercrossing Improvements	PWE		\$ 2,854,975	\$ 2,960,000	\$ 2,660,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,750,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,764,975	
T - 3	Street Overlay Program	PWE	Annual	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 736,000	\$ 759,000	\$ 762,000	\$ 806,000	\$ 830,000	\$ 855,000	\$ 800,650	\$ 5,640,650	
T - 4	Complete Streets	PWE	Annual	\$ 574,000	\$ 574,000	\$ 570,000	\$ 595,000	\$ 620,000	\$ 645,000	\$ 670,000	\$ 697,000	\$ -	\$ 4,371,000	
T - 5	Dogwood Bridge Replacement	PWE		\$ 44,163	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 350,000	\$ 2,545,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,939,163	
T - 6	NW Dogwood Street Improvements	PWE		\$ 22,717	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 208,000	\$ 1,572,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,802,717	
T - 7	NW Juniper St Improvements	PWE		\$ 213,299	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 225,000	\$ 985,000	\$ 1,354,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,777,299	
T - 8	Rainier Boulevard N. Improvements	PWE		\$ 623,975	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,158,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,781,975	
T - 9	NW Newport Way Improvement West of SR-900 to City Limits	PWE		\$ 13,477	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 535,000	\$ 1,004,000	\$ 6,349,000	\$ 12,697,000	\$ -	\$ 20,598,477	
T - 10	Newport Way Improvements (Maple Street to W. Sunset Way)	PWE		\$ -	\$ 212,583	\$ 212,583	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 8,621,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,333,583	
T - 11	E. Sunset Way Improvements	PWE		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 268,000	\$ 645,000	\$ 3,807,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,720,000	
T - 12	Front Street & Sunset Way Intersection Improvements	PWE		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 132,000	\$ 526,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 658,000	
T - 13	E. Lake Sammamish Parkway Improvements (SE 96th Street to I-90)	PWE		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 258,000	\$ -	\$ 10,581,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,839,000	
T - 14	Issaquah-Pine Lake Road	PWE		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 285,000	\$ 6,531,000	\$ -	\$ 6,816,000	
T - 15	12th Ave NW/SR 900/NW Sammamish Road Improvements	PWE		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 132,000	\$ 186,000	\$ 2,613,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,931,000	
T - 16	Maple Street Extension (SR900 to Newport Way)	PWE		\$ 4,555	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 290,000	\$ 12,916,000	\$ 13,210,555	
T - 17	NW Gilman Blvd (SR 900 to 500' east of 7th Ave NW)	PWE		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 170,000	\$ 2,248,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,418,000	
T - 18	SR900NW Sammamish Road Widening (WB 11th Ave NW to I-90)	PWE		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 214,000	\$ 334,000	\$ 7,636,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,184,000	
T - 19	SR 900 Pedestrian/Non-Motorized Improvement	PWE		\$ 385,443	\$ 5,986,000	\$ 5,003,000	\$ 983,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,371,443	
T - 20	Front Street and Gilman Blvd Improvements	PWE		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 258,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 2,758,000	
T - 21	NW Sammamish Road from Lakemont Blvd. to State Park	PWE		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 6,000,000	
T - 22	Maple St & Newport Way Intersection Improvements	PWE		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,426,000	\$ 2,426,000	
T - 23	Providence Point - Intersection Realignment and Signalization	PWE		\$ 342,129	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,842,129	
T - 24	Sammamish Trail Grade Separation at SE 56th St	PWE		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 361,000	\$ 4,669,000	\$ -	\$ 5,030,000	
T - 25	SE Andrews St Improvements	PWE		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 90,000	\$ 2,009,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,099,000	
T - 26	Three Trails Crossing Intersection Improvements	PWE		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 819,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 919,000	
T - 27	Traffic Signal Installation at E. Sunset Way and 2nd Ave	PWE		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 495,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 495,000	
T - 28	SE Black Nugget Road - Retaining Wall Repair	PWL		\$ -	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 440,000	
T - 29	Trolley Bridge Replacement	PWE		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 879,000	\$ 879,000	
T - 30	North Issaquah Local Improvement District (LID)	PWE		\$ -	\$ 63,736	\$ 422,945	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 486,681	
T - 31	SR 900 Widening (Between NW Maple St. and NW Gilman Blvd.)	PWE		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,044,000	\$ -	\$ 8,044,000	
T - 32	Sunset Interchange - Sunset Way Ramp	PWE		\$ -	\$ 3,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,500,000	
T - 33	Front Street/I-90 Interchange Improvements	PWE		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ 300,000	
TOTAL BUDGET				\$ 4,504,734	\$ 9,777,583	\$ 12,058,319	\$ 6,450,945	\$ 9,142,000	\$ 27,280,000	\$ 9,566,000	\$ 21,303,000	\$ 34,104,000	\$ 29,101,650	\$ 153,510,648
TOTAL FROM NON-CITY SOURCES				\$ 349,000	\$ 5,645,000	\$ 8,326,868	\$ 1,061,473	\$ 280,000	\$ 8,489,000	\$ 2,653,000	\$ 10,673,000	\$ 23,238,600	\$ 7,748,000	\$ 62,817,944
TOTAL FROM CITY SOURCES				\$ 4,156,731	\$ 4,132,583	\$ 3,731,451	\$ 5,389,473	\$ 8,862,000	\$ 18,791,000	\$ 6,913,000	\$ 10,630,000	\$ 10,865,400	\$ 21,353,650	\$ 90,692,705