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## Executive Summary

This Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) SelfEvaluation and Transition Plan establishes the City of Mercer Island's ongoing commitment to providing equal access for all, including those with disabilities. In developing this plan, the City of Mercer Island has undertaken a comprehensive evaluation of its facilities and policies related to the public rights-ofway to determine what types of access barriers exist for individuals with disabilities. This plan will be used to help guide future planning and implementation of necessary accessibility improvements.

Both the Self-Evaluation and the Transition Plan are required elements of the federally mandated ADA Title II, which requires that government agencies provide equal access to programs and services they offer. While the ADA applies to all aspects of government services, this document focuses on City of Mercer Island attributes within the public right-of-way, City facilities, and City parks. This includes attributes of sidewalks, curb ramps, pedestrian pushbuttons, bus stops, crosswalks, driveways, accessible parking stalls, staircases, and wheelchair ramps as these are the facility types inventoried by the City.

This document summarizes the Self-Evaluation, which includes an accessibility assessment of pedestrian facilities as well as practices and procedures which relate to them, such as curb ramp design standards. It also contains a Transition Plan, which identifies a schedule for the removal of barriers and identifies how the City will address requests for accommodations in a consistent manner.

The City's objective is to remove physical barriers associated within the public right-of-way and facilities including buildings and parks using operation and maintenance, overlay, and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) project funding. The City is committed to removing these barriers and in future years will implement projects to remove barriers identified in this plan. In addition, the City is continually working towards maintaining ADA compliance for all future capital improvement projects, permitted development, and any other right-of-way construction projects.

City of Mercer Island |ADA Transition Plan
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## Plan Introduction

### 1.1 Plan Requirement

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was enacted on July 26, 1990 and provides comprehensive civil rights protections to persons with disabilities in the areas of employment, state and local government services, and access to public accommodations, transportation, and telecommunications.

Cities and other government agencies are required to have an ADA self-evaluation and transition plan when they grow beyond a threshold of 50 employees. Accessibility requirements extend to all public facilities. The scope of this plan is focused on accessibility within the public rights-of-way, parks, and building facilities.

The City completed an inventory of some of its pedestrian facilities and this plan allows the City to prioritize removal of barriers and update procedures as they relate to the public right-of-way.

There are five titles, or parts, to the ADA of which Title II is most pertinent to travel within the public right-of-way and government owned buildings. Title II of the ADA requires public entities to make their existing "programs" accessible "except where to do so would result in a fundamental alteration in the nature of the program or an undue financial and administrative burden." Public right-of-way, public government buildings, and public parks all fall within the City's programs.

This effort was initiated by the City of Mercer Island to satisfy the requirements of ADA Title II Part 35, Subpart D: Program Accessibility § 35.150 (d)(3) which states:

## The plan shall, at a minimum:

i. Identify physical obstacles in the public entity's facilities that limit the accessibility of its programs or activities to individuals with disabilities;
ii. Describe in detail the methods that will be used to make the facilities accessible;
iii. Specify the schedule for taking the steps necessary to achieve compliance with this section and, if the time period of the transition plan is longer than one year, identify steps that will be taken during each year
iv. Indicate the official responsible for implementation of the plan.

To determine the physical obstacles in a public entity's facility, the proper standards and guidance must be identified for each feature type.

The 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design (ADAS), is the standards document in which all Federal ADA standards are collectively held. The 2010 ADAS and regulations from the 28 CFR Part 36 replaced the 1991 ADA (ADA Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG)).

The Revised Draft Guidelines for Accessible Public Rights-of-Way was published by the United States Access Board in 2005 to provide guidance on establishing accessible facilities within the right-of-way. The United States Access Board's Proposed Guidelines for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way, or PROWAG, was then published for comment in 2011 as a revised set of guidelines for right-of-way pedestrian facilities. Both the 2005 and 2011 guidelines have not yet been adopted as federal standards. Despite this delay, many public entities currently use the 2005 draft PROWAG as 'best practice' for features within the public rights-of-way. This practice has been endorsed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the US Access Board, and is the standard the Washington Department of Transportation adheres to.

The public right-of-way facilities evaluated under this plan were evaluated against 2011 PROWAG as this is the latest guideline developed by the Access Board.

### 1.2 Plan Structure

The structure of this plan was organized to closely follow federal ADA transition plan requirements. This includes:

Chapter 1: Introduction
Chapter 2: Self-Evaluation Documents SelfEvaluation methods and findings for policies, practices, design standards, and pedestrian facilities that result in accessibility barriers.

Chapter 3: Stakeholder Engagement Documents public engagement methods and findings.

Chapter 4: Pedestrian Barrier Removal Methods and Schedule Provides an overview of existing barrier removal approaches employed by the City, describes barrier removal priorities, and develops a total planning level cost estimate for the removal of existing pedestrian barriers and an accompanying schedule.

Chapter 5 Recommendations and Next Steps Provides a set of recommendations to inform the implementation of this Transition Plan and ongoing removal of pedestrian barriers.

Several associated appendix items are included to supplement this plan.

## 2 Self-

Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires that jurisdictions evaluate services, programs, policies, and practices to determine whether they comply with the nondiscrimination requirements of the ADA.

This chapter describes the methods and findings of the Self-Evaluation. Section 2.1 provides an overview of ADA-related City policies. Next, Section 2.2 reviews county practices and design standards. Finally, Section 2.3 summarizes the Self-Evaluation's field data collection methods and findings regarding existing pedestrian facilities, such as sidewalks and curb ramps.

### 2.1 Policy Review

The City of Mercer Island primarily addresses pedestrian facilities in their City of Mercer Island Standard Details and Municipal Code. The City of Mercer Island Comprehensive Plan (2016) also includes goals and policies that address pedestrian connectivity.

The policies and standards were reviewed against the Access Board's Proposed Guidelines for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way, PROWAG 2011 and recommendations were provided to fill gaps as they relate to the ADA.

### 2.1.1 Method

These documents were reviewed for content that relate to existing ADA programs, policies, and practices.

### 2.1.2 Findings

The City of Mercer Island develops a Comprehensive Plan in order to complete long range planning for the City. The latest version of this plan was updated in 2016. The plan covers topics including land use, housing, transportation, utilities, capital facilities, and shoreline master program policies.

Goals and policies connected to transportation, specifically pedestrian facilities, within the Comprehensive Plan generally include the following:

- Encourage measures to reduce vehicular trips using Transportation Demand Management strategies
- Provide for and encourage non-motorized travel modes


### 2.2.1 Public ROW



Figure 2-1 City of Mercer Island Municipal Code Web Page

- Improve pedestrian access to transit with on and off road pedestrian improvements
- Encourage site and building design that promotes pedestrian activity, rideshare opportunity, and transit use
- Promote development of pedestrian linkages between public development, private development, and transit
- Promote a multi-modal transportation system
- Promote bicycle and pedestrian networks that safely access and link commercial areas, residential areas, schools, and parks within the City
- Meet ADA requirements and apply ADA standards to the development of the transportation system


### 2.2 Practices and Design Standards

Practices and design standards that meet accessibility standards are essential to ensure that new or upgraded pedestrian facilities are accessible and therefore reduce the number of accessibility barriers throughout the City.

This section summarizes a review of the City of Mercer Island Standard Details (MI Std.) and City of Mercer Island Municipal Code (MIC) (to identify any barriers to accessible design. The review was conducted in November 2021. For greater detail on the practices and standards review, see Appendix A for a barrier audit memo.

Practices and design standards that meet accessibility standards are essential to ensure new or upgraded pedestrian facilities are accessible and that these upgrades contribute to the removal of accessibility barriers throughout the City. This section summarizes a review of City practices and design standards for barriers and includes major findings of this work. Complete documentation of this work can be found in Appendix A. The audit was conducted in November of 2021.

### 2.2.1.1 Method

The City of Mercer Island Standard Details and MIC were reviewed for compliance with ADA guidelines found in the 2011 Proposed Guidelines for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public Right-of Way (PROWAG).

### 2.2.1.2 Findings

The City of Mercer Island maintains the MIC and adopted design standard plans for sidewalks, curb ramps, parking spaces, and driveways. Figure 2-1 shows the web pages where the municipal code can be accessed.

The City's design standards and code are limited to guidance for sidewalks, curb ramps, parking spaces, driveways, and stairways. This represents a portion of the design elements associated with ADA compliance. The review recommended several changes to the current City standards to achieve ADA compliance and improve clarity. Most recommendations to the City standards were intended to improve clarity, increase consistency across figures, and provide a greater level of detail for design elements that have not yet been addressed.

The City standards and code do not address or only partially address crosswalks, signals, transit stops, ramps, and handrails. It is recommended for many of these areas that the City may:

- Modify the City of Mercer Island Municipal Code to adopt the WSDOT Design Manual Chapter 15 or
- Modify the City of Mercer Island Municipal Code to include a section detailing the recommended design requirements that are currently missing or
- Modify the City of Mercer Island Municipal code to adopt a City of Mercer Island Design Manual with chapters pertaining to each of the design elements associated with ADA compliance.


Figure 2-2 Public Right-of-Way (ROW) Features

### 2.2.2 Facilities \& Parks

### 2.2.2.1 Method

The design of facilities and parks are governed by a variety of state, national, and international building codes.

Since the majority of these codes are developed on a national or international level, it was assumed that these codes comply with relevant ADA standards.

### 2.3 Existing Pedestrian Facilities

The Self-Evaluation inventoried barriers to access associated with existing pedestrian facilities, including curb ramps, sidewalks, pedestrian pushbuttons, as required by ADA Title II Part 35, Subpart D - Program Accessibility § 35.150 (d)(3). Each facility and associated barriers were field inventoried and cataloged within the project’s geospatial (GIS) database. Field data was collected by Transpo from June 2021 to October 2021.

### 2.3.1 Public ROW

Many existing pedestrian features within Mercer Island right-of-way contain barriers and require improvements to meet current ADA standards. It is important to note that many of these facilities were constructed before the adoption of current ADA standards, and likely met applicable state and federal standards at the time of construction. Additionally, it is important to note that ADA regulations require
facilities to be made accessible to "the maximum extent feasible," (MEF) in "circumstances when the unique characteristics of terrain prevent the incorporation of accessibility features" (U.S. Department of Justice, 28 CFR § 35.151 New construction and alterations). These circumstances are often a result of adjacent topography or otherwise constrained locations, which are common to the Mercer Island road system. This plan's Self-Evaluation examined whether facilities were compliant with current ADA design requirements; it did not examine whether non-compliant facilities were built to the maximum extent feasible or practical.

Additional detail regarding the Self-Evaluation's findings for curb ramps, sidewalks, and pedestrian pushbuttons is provided in the following sections.

### 2.3.1.1 Method

A self-evaluation of facilities within the public right-of-way was conducted by Transpo group.

The physical inventory of pedestrian facilities, as shown in Figure 2-2, included:

- 885 sidewalks, totaling approximately 34 miles
- 792 curb ramps
- 84 signal pushbuttons
- 144 bus stops
- 326 driveways
- 58 staircases
- 10 wheelchair ramps

Inventory maps of collected pedestrian features can be found in Appendix B.


Figure 2-3 Perpendicular Curb Ramp Attributes

## Curb Ramps

Field data was collected for existing curb ramps by Transpo. The field data was then evaluated for their compliance with ADA standards. Figures 2-3 and 2-4 show the major components of typical perpendicular and parallel curb ramps, respectively, two common types of curb ramps. Less common ramp types, such as ramps that provide a transition from the end of a sidewalk to the road shoulder are also located in the city.

Each curb ramp was reviewed for compliance, then scored based on the degree to which the barrier impeded accessibility. Curb ramps were scored using a scale of 0-30 and categorized as follows:

- o: Compliant
- 1-29: Minor Compliance Issue
- 30: Significant Compliance Issue


Figure 2-4 Parallel Curb Ramp Attributes

These scores are referred to as the Accessibility Index Score (AIS). Curb ramps that had running slopes that were too steep received a score of 30 and were considered non-compliant. Curb ramps that had cross slopes slightly above the compliant threshold received a score of 25 while steeper cross slopes received a 30 . Other criteria relating to turning space, flare slopes, detectable warning surfaces (DWS), obstructions, and condition were weighted lower, but could cumulatively reach the threshold for non-compliance.

Scoring and compliance criteria are discussed in more detail in Section 4.2.1 and in Appendix C.


Figure 2-5 Sidewalk Attributes

## Sidewalks

Field data was collected for sidewalks by the Transpo. This field data collection for sidewalks was completed along the length of each segment and then evaluated for their compliance with ADA standards. Common attributes for sidewalks are shown in Figure 2-5.

Each sidewalk was reviewed for compliance, then score based on the degree to which the barrier impeded accessibility.

- Sidewalk Width, i.e., the sidewalk is too narrow,
- Sidewalk Condition, i.e., amount of cracking.
- Number of barriers, i.e., vertical discontinuity, vegetation, non-slip lid, protruding obstacles, etc.

Sidewalks were scored using a scale of 0-30 and categorized as follows:

- o: Compliant
- 1-15: Minor Compliance Issue
- 16-30: Significant Compliance Issue

Scoring and compliance criteria are discussed in more detail in Section 4.2.1 and in Appendix C.


Figure 2-6 APS Pedestrian Pushbutton Location Attributes

## Signal Pushbuttons

Accessible pedestrian signals and pushbuttons (APS) provide integrated visual, audible, and vibrotactile information to help pedestrians cross signalized intersections. Some pushbuttons can be programmed to request an extended crossing time or to make the name of the street being crossed audible when pushed for a longer time.

Field data was collected for pedestrian pushbuttons at traffic signals by Transpo Group. Data collectors recorded location and design attributes for each pushbutton. Location attributes included reach distance to the button, availability of a clear and level area at the button, and the location relative to the intersection and corresponding crosswalk (see Figure 2-6). Design

attributes included visual and tactile elements, such as a raised arrow pointing to the crossing, as well as features that provide audible and vibrational feedback.

Each pedestrian pushbutton was reviewed for compliance using fifteen criteria, then scored based on the degree to which the barrier impeded accessibility.

Pushbutton scores ranged from 0-30 and were categorized as follows:

- o: Compliant
- 1-15: Minor Compliance Issue
- 16-30: Significant Compliance Issue

Scoring and compliance criteria are discussed in more detail in Section 4.2.1 and in Appendix C.

### 2.3.1.2 Findings

## Curb Ramps

Approximately $98 \%$ of the 792 existing curb ramps do not meet ADA standards (see Table 2-1 and Figure 2-7).

As discussed in Section 2.3.1, noncompliant ramps are those that have:

- Non-compliant ramp width, i.e., the ramping area is not present or too narrow (Figure 2-8).
- Non-compliant running slope, i.e., the ramp running slope is too steep (Figure 2-9). 288 curb ramps have running slopes greater than $8.3 \%$.
- Non-compliant cross slope, i.e., the cross slope is too steep (Figure 2-10). 503 curb ramps have cross slopes greater than $2 \%, 312$ of which have cross slopes greater than $3 \%$.
- Several minor non-compliant features, such as flare slope, detectable warning surface (DWS) placement, receiving ramp, etc.

Table 2-1 Existing Curb Ramp Compliance

| Curb Ramp | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Compliance | Miles | $\%$ of Total |
| Significant Compliance Issue | 589 | $74 \%$ |
| Minor Compliance Issue | 187 | $24 \%$ |
| Compliant Ramps |  | 16 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{7 9 2}$ |

Curb ramps are designed and constructed to tie into the existing roadway. As noted previously, steep or otherwise constrained locations may make it infeasible to meet ADA grade standards. When it is not feasible to remove all curb ramp barriers, ramps may be built to the maximum extent feasible (MEF) to satisfy ADA requirements. This planning level Self-Evaluation did not examine whether non-compliant ramps were built to the maximum extent feasible. See Section 5.1 for additional information regarding MEF documentation.







Sidewalks
Approximately 34 miles of sidewalk were inventoried with approximately 98\% not meeting ADA standards (see Table 2-2 and Figure 2-12). Grinding, patch repair, and full reconstruction are potential solutions for removing the sidewalk barriers depending on the severity of the barrier.

Table 2-2 Sidewalk Compliance

| Sidewalk <br> Compliance | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | $3 \%$ |
| Minor Compliance Issue | 32 | $95 \%$ |
| Compliant | 1 | $2 \%$ |
|  |  | Total |
|  | 34 |  |








Figure 2-17 "H-style" (left) and APS-style pedestrian pushbutton (right)

## Signal Pushbuttons

All of the 84 inventoried pedestrian pushbuttons were not fully ADA compliant. The noncompliant pedestrian pushbuttons include nonAPS style buttons to be replaced and APS-style buttons to be reprogrammed or relocated.

Approximately 86\% of pedestrian pushbuttons in the city are an older "H-style" design (see Figure 2-17 top). This style of pushbutton can be upgraded to increase accessibility but must be fully replaced with an accessible pedestrian signal (APS)-style pushbutton to achieve full ADA compliance (see Figure 2-17).

The requirement to use APS-style pushbuttons is relatively new and lack of compliance is typically due to a crossing not being upgraded over time to reflect evolving requirements. Pushbuttons are typically upgraded to APS-style in groups rather than individually. As a result, APS-style additions and upgrades usually occur on an intersection-by-intersection basis.

Figure 2-18 demonstrates the type and locations of these pushbuttons throughout the city.



Figure 2-19 Facilities \& Parks Features

### 2.3.3 Facilities \& Parks

### 2.3.3.1 Method

Barrier assessment for facilities and parks covered elements of pedestrian pathways within buildings and at building entrances, as well as vertical elements in public parks. Facilities and parks barriers include non-compliant signage, restroom fixture height, countertop or table height, gate width, pedestrian access routes, and play area ramps, among other
barriers. 637 barriers were found in these areas. For each barrier found, information collected included a description of the barrier, recommended solution and estimated cost as well as other information such as recommended priority ranking and photos of the barrier. Survey Solutions ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$, a custom software database, was used to generate the ADA Survey Results. The consultant's data collection efforts for facilities and parks occurred between June to October 2021.

Table 2-3 Facilities \& Parks Barrier Distribution

| Sidewalk Compliance | Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| 77th Avenue SE Landing | 2 |
| Aubrey Davis Park | 43 |
| Bicentennial Park | 23 |
| Boat Launch | 3 |
| Calkins Landing | 5 |
| Clarke Beach | 14 |
| Community and Events Center | 106 |
| Deane's Children's Park | 19 |
| Ellis Pond | 3 |
| First Hill Park | 5 |
| Forest Landing | 2 |
| Franklin Landing | 2 |
| Fruitland Landing | 4 |
| Garfield Landing | 2 |
| Groveland Beach | 17 |
| Homestead Park | 29 |
| Island Crest Park | 44 |
| Lincoln Landing | 3 |
| Luther Burbank Park | 81 |
| Luther Burbank Park Administration Building | 24 |
| Main Fire Station \#91 | 4 |
| Maintenance Hall | 12 |
| Mercer Island City Hall | 65 |
| Mercerdale Park | 13 |
| Miller Landing | 1 |
| Pioneer Park | 7 |
| Proctor Landing | 2 |
| Roanoke Landing | 1 |
| Roanoke Park | 10 |
| Rotary Park | 5 |
| Secret Park | 6 |
| Slater Park | 4 |
| South Fire Station \#92 | 8 |
| South Mercer Playfields | 34 |
| Wildwood Park | 5 |
| Youth \& Family Services Thrift Shop/Recycling Center | 34 |

### 2.3.3.2 Findings

Table 2-3 shows the number of barriers found in each facility and park.

The field surveys for the properties were conducted using proven ADA survey instruments and calibrated measurement tools. Collected data was reviewed and analyzed, and recommended preliminary solutions were developed. A complete report of all barriers recorded in facilities and parks can be found in Appendix D.

## ๑ Stakeholder Engagement

Public and stakeholder input is an essential element in the transition plan development and self-evaluation processes. ADA implementation regulations require public entities to provide an opportunity to interested persons, including individuals with disabilities or organizations representing individuals with disabilities, to participate in the selfevaluation process and development of the transition plan by submitting comments ( 28 CFR 35.105 (b) and 28 CFR $35.150(\mathrm{~d})(1)$ ). There were three primary goals for the public outreach activities prior to adopting the plan:

- Inform the public about the City's plan and processes regarding removal of barriers to accessibility within the right-of-way. Provide information to assist interested parties to understand the issues faced by the City, alternatives considered and planned actions.
- Obtain public comment to identify any errors or gaps in the proposed accessibility transition plan for the public rights-ofway, specifically on prioritization and grievance processes.
- Meet Title II requirements for public comment opportunity.


### 3.1 Engagement Methods

To generate public involvement and capture public feedback on the ADA Transition Plan, the City used four methods: a virtual open house, engagement survey, online mapping tool, and an in-depth focus group. Promotion and advertising for these outreach methods utilized the City's website and social media channels, as well as hardy copy surveys and flyers delivered by City staff. The City of Mercer Island developed a project website: https://www.mercerislandada.com for easy online access to project information and ways to provide feedback. A full account of the public engagement findings can be found in Appendix E.

### 3.1.1 Online Open House and Survey

An online open house that dove into the ADA transition plan project, goals and areas of focus of the project, was made available on the City's website. Within the open house an online survey and reporting tool was provided for the public to give feedback on gaps and barriers at specific locations.

The surveyed contained questions focusing on the following areas.

- Whether they have a disability or support someone with one;
- Which type of accessibility barriers they currently experience;
- How they rate the accessibility conditions of existing right-of-way facilities; and,
- What facility types they believe should be prioritized when removing accessibility barriers.

The survey was made available for public participation from July 4, 2021 to September 14, 2021. A detailed summary of engagement and outreach efforts including promotion and advertising, online survey, online mapping tool, listening sessions, and a senior citizen advisory committee meeting are included in the Engagement \& Public Involvement Summary in Appendix E.

The survey respondents identified their first and second priorities for improving pedestrian facilities within the city. The weighted rank priorities showed that the following three categories were highest priority:

- Transit
- Retail
- City parks

Detailed information regarding the priorities and locations identified through the survey and online mapping tool are included in Appendix E.

### 3.1.2 Focus Group

An in-depth virtual focus group and interviews were conducted on September 30, 2021. The focus group used the Zoom virtual platform that included closed captioning to facilitate discussion from Mercer Island residents and survey responders. All of the respondents interviewed live on Mercer Island and have a disability or support a person with a disability. The focus group identified priorities for barrier removal that include City parks, sidewalks, and accessible parking availability. Detailed information regarding the priorities and locations identified through the focus ground are included in Appendix E.

## - Pedestrian Barrier <br> Removal Methods and Schedule

Chapter 4 provides a summary of barrier removal methods and priorities to guide implementation of this plan. This chapter presents a total planning level cost estimate for the removal of existing pedestrian barriers. Finally, a schedule is presented that outlines the steps necessary to achieve compliance with current ADA standards.

### 4.1 Barrier Removal Methods - Public ROW

The City currently has a variety of barrier removal methods that are funded from sources that include Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects, Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) projects, and permitted private development. Certain programs provide continual means of barrier removal while others vary based on outside influences such as permitted development and grants. The manner in which an existing pedestrian barrier is removed is typically a function of its complexity and cost. Less complex pedestrian barriers, such as a missing detectable warning surface (DWS), can be removed through maintenance and operations programs. More complex barriers, such as barriers associated with ramp or sidewalk design, typically require additional engineering as part of a more costly capital construction project.

For these methods to be effective, City practices and design standards must comply with federal ADA guidance. If standards are not updated and enforced, new or reconstructed pedestrian facilities may not be constructed to accessible standards, requiring costly revision, and increasing the duration it will take the City to remove accessibility barriers.

The following sections provide additional detail regarding CIP projects, TIP projects, and permitted development.

### 4.1.1 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Projects

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a rolling 6 -year plan updated annually with a focus on maintaining the existing transportation network and improving it safely by using the City's Street Fund, Transportation Benefit District vehicle fees, Sound Transit East Link mitigation funds, and other funding sources. Transportation projects include residential street projects, arterial street improvements, and pedestrian and bicycle facility projects. The City of Mercer Island updates its TIP annually and forecasts projects for a six-year period. ADA compliant improvements (new or replacement) are often included as a component of these projects. With this transition plan, accessibility barriers are now easier to identify and include in TIP projects. The City's Six Year 2022-2027 TIP includes six projects with ADA barrier removal elements: 8oth Avenue Sidewalk (SE 28th - SE 32nd), 78th Avenue Sidewalk (SE 32nd - SE 34th), SE 40th Sidewalk Improvements (Gallagher Hill - 93rd Ave SE), and SE 32nd St (77th to 78th Ave SE) Sidewalk Replacement, Sunset Hwy/77th Ave SE Improvements, and Mid-Block Crosswalk 76th Ave SE between SE 24th and SE 27th.

### 4.1.2 ADA Compliance Plan Implementation

As described above, the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a rolling 6-year plan updated annually including projects to maintain and improve the City's transportation network. The City has identified a specific ADA Compliance Plan Implementation project to remove barriers identified by this transition planning effort.

### 4.1.3 Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities (PBF) Plan Implementation

The City's Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Plan was last updated in 2010 and guides investments and actions related to maintaining and improving the City's pedestrian and bicycle networks. These networks include trails, crosswalks, bike lanes, and sidewalk facilities. Within the 2022-2027 TIP, the City has identified funding for PBF Plan Implementation. This annual program identifies, prioritizes, designs, and constructs small pedestrian or bicycle improvements on facilities citywide. It was assumed that a portion of this implementation is dedicated to ADA barrier removal.

### 4.1.4 Maintenance

Operational and maintenance activities typically resolve less costly and less complex barriers to
accessibility. A subset of the work completed by the Public Works Roadway, Trail \& ROW Maintenance Team helps to remove ADA related barriers through curbs, streets, and sidewalk repairs. Though maintenance investments for pedestrian facilities often do not bring sidewalks, ramps, and other pedestrian infrastructure fully up to ADA standards, these investments of staff time and resources typically result in critically important access improvements. These activities include sidewalk panel grinding, panel replacement, and request-based curb ramp installations. Maintenance investments are crucial to increasing the longevity of the existing pedestrian network.

### 4.1.5 Street Resurfacing Programs

The Arterial Street Resurfacing Programs and Residential Street Resurfacing Programs is used to maintain the current roadway system by providing street resurfacing, pavement rehabilitation, and curb and sidewalk repair. When a street overlay is being conducted in areas adjacent to ADA features, the curb ramps will be retrofitted or replaced to meet current standards if found to be non-compliant.

### 4.1.6 Permitted Development

Even with the current funding for accessibility improvements, it will take many years to remove accessibility barriers or provide sidewalk connections between gaps. Redevelopment of properties such as construction of new housing or commercial buildings or major remodels can provide a valuable boost to barrier removal efforts. At times, private development results in street frontage improvements as a function of construction permit requirements. All such improvements are designed and built to meet City and ADA standards. This approach to barrier removal is incremental and depends on the outside influence of developers, and therefore was not included in the City's funding estimate.

### 4.2 Barrier Removal Methods: Facilities \& Parks

The City currently uses a few methods to remove accessibility barriers for facilities and parks. Some of these methods are annual programs that provide continual means of barrier removal while others vary based on outside influences such as permitted development and available grant funding. The methods being used currently range from stand-alone projects, removal of barriers as part of other City projects and
removal of barriers during ongoing maintenance and operations. In order for these methods to be effective, City practice and design standards must comply with federal ADA guidance. If standards are not updated and enforced, new or reconstructed parks and facilities may not be constructed to accessibility standards, requiring costly revision, and increasing the duration it will take the City to remove accessibility barriers.

### 4.2.1 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Parks Projects

The Capital Improvement Program (CIP) defines projects and identifies funding for different elements of the government including the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). The City has identified seven CIP projects that focus on parks improvements and include ADA barrier removal efforts. These projects include City Hall Building Repairs, FS91 and FS92 Building Repairs, Aubrey Davis Park Luther Lid Connector Trail, Aubrey Davis Park Safety Improvements, Luther Burbank Dock Repair and Reconfiguration, Mercerdale Playground Replacement, and Roanoke Playground Replacement.

### 4.3 Barrier Removal Plan and Schedule

The ADA requires agencies to specify a schedule for taking the steps necessary to make existing facilities ADA compliant. This plan section summarizes the three-step process used to develop a barrier removal implementation plan and schedule, consistent with ADA transition plan requirements:

1. Prioritization of pedestrian barriers. Physical barriers identified through the Self-Evaluation were prioritized based on the degree to which they physically impacted accessibility and their proximity to key pedestrian destinations. Community input received through stakeholder engagement informed the prioritization process.
2. Estimation of planning level costs to remove pedestrian barriers. Unit costs were applied to the barrier inventory to generate a total planning level cost estimate to remove Self-Evaluation identified barriers. This planning level cost estimate is the total estimated 'need' for barrier removal.
3. Development of a schedule for barrier removal. An estimate of available financial resources was generated and compared to the total estimated need to develop a schedule for barrier removal.

### 4.3.1 Prioritization of Pedestrian Barriers: Public ROW

To inform the City's future project selection and understand the impact of barrier removal programs, a prioritization system was developed and used to score each pedestrian facility. This system was informed by the Self-Evaluation data, the community engagement process, and technical expertise. It reflects both a facility's physical characteristics and its importance to pedestrian travel. Under the prioritization system, each barrier was scored independently on two factors:

- Physical impact to accessibility
- Proximity to key pedestrian destinations, such as transit stops and schools.

The two resulting scores were added together to incorporate both factors into a single score for prioritization. Based on each facility's score, it was categorized as very high, high, medium, or low priority for barrier removal. Under this system, facilities that present greater barriers to accessibility and are located near multiple key pedestrian destinations are considered a high priority, while facilities with less significant physical barriers located farther from key pedestrian destinations are considered a low priority. Prioritization scoring factors are described below.

## Physical impact to accessibility: Accessibility Index Score (AIS)

The Accessibility Index Score describes the degree to which each facility presents a physical barrier to accessibility. Criteria and weights were developed for sidewalks, curb ramps, and pedestrian pushbuttons. These criteria and weights are shown in Appendix C.

Potential scores for each facility range from o (compliant) to 30. Each facility's Accessibility Index Score is the sum of the individual criteria scores. Curb ramps with non-compliant ramp widths, running slopes, or cross-slopes greater than three percent were assigned the highest possible score of 30.









## Proximity to key pedestrian destinations:

## Location Index Score (LIS)

The Location Index Score describes the importance of the pedestrian facility to accessing key pedestrian destinations. Each existing pedestrian facility was scored based on its proximity to schools, parks, transit facilities, signals or roundabouts, public buildings, and downtown or commercial business centers. Facilities near government buildings, hospitals and medical facilities, and City parks received a higher score to reflect feedback received through the public engagement survey.

Location Index Scores reflect the number of types of key pedestrian destinations within a defined radius. The full score for each type of destination is assigned if at least one facility of that type is nearby; scores do not increase if a facility is within the radius of multiple destinations of the same type. For example, a facility within one-eighth mile of two parks will receive a score of 5 , while a facility within one-eighth mile of a park and a school will receive a score of 10.

Total Location Index Scores ranged from o to 45. Location scoring criteria and weights are shown in Appendix C.






## Combined Index Score

The Combined Index Score sums the Accessibility Index Score and Location Index Score to prioritize facilities with accessibility barriers in areas where pedestrians would be expected.

Scores were grouped into four categories:

- Very High: significant physical barriers in high-demand areas: 46-75 points
- High: 31-45 points
- Medium: 16-30 points
- Low: minor barriers in low-demand areas: 1-15 points

Scores reflect relative priority within each facility type; they do not indicate relative priority between facility types (ex., the importance of addressing a curb ramp barrier versus a sidewalk barrier).

Combined index scores provide planning level context to barrier removal and overall accessibility needs within the city. As this Transition Plan is implemented, barrier removal will be guided by multiple factors, including funding availability, location of capital projects that include pedestrian elements, construction efficiency, project-level analysis, etc. Barriers of all priority levels will be removed over time.




### 4.3.2 Prioritization of Pedestrian Barriers - Facilities \& Parks

A similar assessment was performed for barriers inventoried in facilities and parks. Each facility's attribute and most parks elements, collected in the field was prioritized by the criteria provided by the Department of Justice (CFR Title 28). The priority scores were combined with building or park use information to generate a final score. Pedestrian pathways and curb ramps within parks were scored using the same method as facilities in the public right-of-way. The highest scores were given to barriers with the highest priority that are located in high use facilities.

## Physical impact to accessibility: <br> Accessibility Index Score (AIS)

The Accessibility Index Score describes the degree to which each facility presents a physical barrier to accessibility. Criteria and weights were developed for sidewalks, curb ramps, and pedestrian pushbuttons. These criteria and weights are shown in Appendix C.

As each barrier was inventoried in the City's facilities and parks, each barrier was assigned a prioritization level based on Title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations. CFR Title 28 defines four levels of priority based the level of access provision. Appendix C shows priority criteria as well as a description of each level. These priority levels were assigned points which were used as the Accessibility Index Score for facilities and parks.

## Facility Use Index Score (FIS)

A Facility Use Index Score was developed for each building and park based on the level and type of use of each facility. Criteria used to develop this score for each facility and park is shown in Table 5-11. A summary of the scoring for each facility and park is included in Appendix G. Detailed prioritization criteria for parks facilities are included in Appendix C.

### 4.3.3 Planning Level Cost Estimates to Remove Pedestrian Barriers

To meet the ADA transition plan requirement of demonstrating how barriers are to be removed over time, annual available financial resources were estimated and compared to the total estimated barrier removal costs.

## Process

Unit costs were developed for the improvements needed to address the pedestrian barriers inventoried through the Self-Evaluation. Unit cost estimates for each barrier type were developed using recent WSDOT and other construction bid tabulations, input from subject matter experts, and planning level cost assumptions. Unit cost estimates assumed contractbased construction, instead of use of in-house crews.

Unit cost estimates were applied to the inventoried barriers, with adjustments made to account for construction efficiencies and to avoid applying redundant improvements to the same facility. All cost estimates are in 2021 dollars. Cost estimate assumptions are detailed in Appendix F.

Barrier removal construction cost estimates account for contingency, design, right-of-way, mobilization, temporary erosion control, traffic control, and construction management. Sales tax, structural impacts to buildings, permit fees, inflation, and potential changes to accessibility standards are not assumed in the cost estimate.

This planning level cost analysis did not assess whether non-compliant pedestrian facilities had been built to the maximum extent feasible. Therefore, this cost estimate may overstate the amount of feasible improvements.

Planning level cost estimate to remove all identified barriers were developed for public right-of-way, parks, and facilities. The removal costs for all non-compliant assets within the public right-of-way add to $\$ 30,760,000, \$ 7,220,000$ for the evaluated parks elements, and $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 9 8 1 , 4 3 9}$ for the evaluated building elements (in 2021 dollars). Cost estimates by facility and improvement type are shown in Table 4-1, Table 4-2, and Table 4-3.

Table 4-1 Planning Level Cost Estimate within Public Right of Way

| Ada Deficiency | Improvement Types | Quantity | Costs | Total Price |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sidewalk Improvements |  |  |  |  |
| Non-compliant sidewalk | Reconstruct existing sidewalk/paved shoulder walkway | 56,005 SY | \$145 | \$8,121,000 |
| Non-compliant driveway | New driveway with sidewalk | 326 EA | \$2,900 | \$946,000 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$9,067,000 |
| Maintenance/Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |
| Non-compliant vertical discontinuity ( $>1 / 4$ in - < $=1 / 2$ in w/out bevel) | Sidewalk grinding (5 LF of sidewalk). | 349 EA | \$250 | \$88,000 |
| Non-compliant vertical discontinuity ( $>1 / 2 \mathrm{in}$ ) | Replace two adjacent sidewalk panels ( 5 ft x 5 ft panels) | 170 EA | \$806 | \$137,000 |
| Non-compliant horizontal discontinuity | Sidewalk crack sealing/grouting (5LF per occurrence) | 9,375 EA | \$5 | \$47,000 |
| Fixed Obstacles | Relocation of obstacles including utility pole, mailbox, tree trunk, etc. | 500 EA | \$3,000 | \$1,500,000 |
| Moveable Obstacles | Relocation of obstacles including tree/bush (prune-able), message boards, parked cars, etc. | 97 EA | \$200 | \$20,000 |
| Protruding Obstacles | Relocation of obstacles including of bush/tree, signs, awnings etc. | 516 EA | \$500 | \$258,000 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$2,050,000 |
| Curb Ramp Improvements |  |  |  |  |
| Missing curb ramps | Install new curb ramp. | 105 EA | \$6,000 | \$630,000 |
| Non-compliant ramp (running slope, cross slope, ramp width, flare slope, lip, grade break, etc.) | Remove and reconstruct existing ramp. | 600 EA | \$6,000 | \$3,600,000 |
| Curb ramps without detectable warning surface (DWS), non-compliant DWS placement, non-compliant DWS depth, or non-compliant DWS Width | Install/replace detectable warning surface. | 9 EA | \$1,030 | \$10,000 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$ \$4,240,000 |
| Pushbutton Improvements |  |  |  |  |
| Non-APS pushbutton and pushbutton is located incorrectly. | Install new APS pushbutton and install new pole. | 72 EA | \$5,900 | \$425,000 |
| APS pushbutton that has noncompliant dimensions and/or programming and located incorrectly. | Reprogram pushbutton, reorient pushbutton, and/or install tactile arrow and install new pole and relocate pushbutton. | 8 EA | \$3,700 | \$30,000 |
| APS pushbutton located incorrectly. | Install new pole and relocate pushbutton. | 3 EA | \$3,500 | \$11,000 |
| APS pushbutton that has non-compliant dimensions and/or programming | Reprogram pushbutton, reorient pushbutton, and/or install tactile arrow. | 1 EA | \$200 | \$1,000 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$467,000 |
| Bus Stop Improvements |  |  |  |  |
| Non-compliant bus shelter turning space cross slope | Replace bus shelter pad (7.5 SY per occurrence). | 23 SY | \$180 | \$5,000 |
| Non-compliant bus stop boarding area (running slope, cross slope, size, and/or condition) | Replace/construct boarding area ( $8 \mathrm{ftx5ft}$ ) and two transition panels ( 5 ftx 5 ft ) - 10 SY per occurrence. | 1,240 SY | \$145 | \$180,000 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$185,000 |
| Accessible Parking Improvements |  |  |  |  |
| Non-compliantparking stall/parking aisleslope | Grind surface and/or add asphalt lift. | 5 EA | \$2,000 | \$10,000 |
| Non-compliant accessible parking stall/parking aisle width or pavement marking. | Install parking stall accessible symbol/aisle pavement markings or resize and restripe stall/aisle. | 2 EA | \$200 | \$1,000 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$11,000 |
|  |  | Contingency @ 20\% |  | \$16,020,000 |
|  |  |  |  | \$3,204,000 |
|  |  | Design @ 12\% |  | \$1,923,000 |
|  |  |  |  | \$1,282,000 |
|  | TESC + Traffic Control @ 12\% |  |  | \$1,923,000 |
|  | Construction Management @ 20\% |  |  | \$3,204,000 |
|  |  | Right-of-Way @ 20\% |  | \$3,204,000 |
|  | Public Righ | -of-Way Tota | 21 Dollars | \$30,760,000 |

Table 4-2 Planning Level Cost Estimate within Parks

| Ada Deficiency | Improvement Types | Quantity | Unit Costs | Total Price |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sidewalk Improvements |  |  |  |  |
| Non-compliant sidewalk | Reconstruct, grind, or patch sidewalk. | 22,035 SY | \$145 | \$3,196,000 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$3,196,000 |
| Maintenance/Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |
| Non-compliant vertical discontinuity ( $>1 / 4$ in $-<=1 / 2$ in w/out bevel) | Sidewalk grinding (5 LF of sidewalk). | 105 EA | \$250 | \$27,000 |
| Non-compliant vertical discontinuity (>1/2in) | Replace two adjacent sidewalk panels ( 5 ft x 5 ft panels) | 70 EA | \$806 | \$57,000 |
| Non-compliant horizontal discontinuity | Sidewalk crack sealing/grouting (5LF per occurrence) | 1,605 LF | \$5 | \$9,000 |
| Fixed Obstacles | Relocation of obstacles including utility pole, mailbox, tree trunk, etc. | 35 EA | \$3,000 | \$105,000 |
| Moveable Obstacles | Relocation of obstacles including tree/bush (prunable), message boards, parked cars, etc. | 18 EA | \$200 | \$4,000 |
| Protruding Obstacles | Relocation of obstacles including of bush/tree, signs, awnings etc. | 88 EA | \$500 | \$44,000 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$246,000 |
| Curb Ramp Improvements |  |  |  |  |
| Missing curb ramps | Install new curb ramp. | 12 EA | \$6,000 | \$72,000 |
| Non-compliant ramp (running slope, cross slope, ramp width, flare slope, lip, grade break, etc.) | Remove and reconstruct existing ramp. | 49 EA | \$6,000 | \$294,000 |
| Curb ramps without detectable warning surface (DWS), non-compliant DWS placement, non-compliant DWS depth, or non-compliant DWS Width | Install/replace detectable warning surface. | 1 EA | \$1,030 | \$2,000 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$368,000 |
| Staircase Improvements |  |  |  |  |
| Non-compliant staircase (riser, tread, slope, etc.) | Replace concrete staircase (per 1ft width of step). | 366 LF | \$100 | \$37,000 |
| Non-compliant handrail or missing handrail (height, diameter, extensions, etc.) | Replace handrail. | 571 LF | \$150 | \$86,000 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$123,000 |
| Wheelchair Ramp Improvements |  |  |  |  |
| Non-compliant ramp (width, slope, landing, etc.) | Replace ramp | 114 SY | \$190 | \$22,000 |
| Non-compliant handrail (height, diameter, extensions, etc.) or missing handrail | Replace handrail | 260 LF | \$150 | \$39,000 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$61,000 |
| Accessible Parking Improvements |  |  |  |  |
| Non-compliant parking stall/ parking aisle slope. | Grind surface and/or add asphalt lift. | 95 EA | \$2,000 | \$190,000 |
| Non-compliant accessible parking stall/parking aisle width or pavement marking. | Install parking stall accessible symbol/aisle pavement markings or resize and restripe stall/aisle. | 23 EA | \$200 | \$5,000 |
| Non-compliant sign height or no sign indicating accessible stall. | Install new sign or adjust existing sign. | 32 EA | \$100 | \$4,000 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | \$199,000 |
|  |  |  | Total | \$4,193,000 |
|  |  | Contingency @ 20\% |  | \$839,000 |
|  |  | Design @ 12\% |  | \$504,000 |
|  |  | Mobilization @ 8\% |  | \$336,000 |
|  | TESC + Traffic Control @ 12\%Construction Management @ 20\% |  |  | \$504,000 |
|  |  |  |  | \$839,000 |
|  | Public Right-of-Way Total 2021 Dollars |  |  | \$7,220,000 |

Table 4-3 Planning Level Cost Estimate within Facilities

| Ada Deficiency | Facility Index Score (FIS) | Total Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 77th Avenue SE Landing | 3 | \$5,195 |
| Aubrey Davis Park | 22 | \$66,994 |
| Bicentennial Park | 8 | \$13,937 |
| Boat Launch | 3 | \$7,201 |
| Calkins Landing | 3 | \$29,157 |
| Clarke Beach | 8 | \$69,963 |
| Community and Events Center | 37 | \$300,258 |
| Deane's Children's Park | 29 | \$24,045 |
| Ellis Pond | 3 | \$478 |
| First Hill Park | 8 | \$4,353 |
| Forest Landing | 3 | \$1,133 |
| Franklin Landing | 3 | \$1,663 |
| Fruitland Landing | 3 | \$8,264 |
| Garfield Landing | 3 | \$8,727 |
| Groveland Beach | 8 | \$62,133 |
| Homestead Park | 8 | \$55,397 |
| Island Crest Park | 15 | \$49,356 |
| Lincoln Landing | 3 | \$4,482 |
| Luther Burbank Park | 22 | \$256,722 |
| Luther Burbank Park Administration Building | 30 | \$30,363 |
| Main Fire Station \#91 | 22 | \$39,730 |
| Maintenance Hall | 10 | \$7,502 |
| Mercer Island City Hall | 37 | \$122,008 |
| Mercerdale Park | 15 | \$24,008 |
| Miller Landing | 3 | \$710 |
| Pioneer Park | 15 | \$6,380 |
| Proctor Landing | 3 | \$1,016 |
| Roanoke Landing | 8 | \$250 |
| Roanoke Park | 8 | \$13,329 |
| Rotary Park | 8 | \$8,232 |
| Secret Park | 8 | \$6,399 |
| Slater Park | 8 | \$4,629 |
| South Fire Station \#92 | 22 | \$3,812 |
| South Mercer Playfields | 15 | \$26,701 |
| Wildwood Park | 8 | \$9,076 |
| Youth \& Family Services Thrift Shop/Recycling Center | 30 | \$29,975 |
|  | Total | \$1,303,577 |
|  | Contingency @ 20\% | \$260,716 |
|  | Design @ 12\% | \$156,429 |
|  | uction Management @ 20\% | \$260,716 |
|  | ht-of-Way Total 2021 Dollars | \$1,981,439 |

Table 4-4 Funding Allocation by Barrier Priority

| Investment <br> Priority | Percent of Funding Allocated <br> to Barrier Removal |
| :--- | :--- |
| Very High | $40 \%$ |
| High | $30 \%$ |
| Medium | $20 \%$ |
| Low | $10 \%$ |
| 4.3.4 Barrier Removal Funding |  |

A requirement of this plan is to forecast available funding that may be used to support plan implementation. The following sections summarize the City's current barrier removal funding sources.

### 4.3.4.1 Public ROW

This plan assumes total annual funding for barrier removal of approximately $\$ 364$,ooo per year for public ROW pedestrian barrier removal. A breakdown of the approximate annual budget resources anticipated to be available to support pedestrian barrier removal implementation follows.

- Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Projects, \$322,000
- ADA Compliance Plan Implementation, \$36,000
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities (PBF)

Plan Implementation, \$6,000
See Section 4.1 for details on these programs. These improvements may address low, medium, high, and very high priority barriers based on the location of a proposed larger project or maintenance program. Assumptions regarding the percentage of total project funding that is applied to barrier removal were determined through coordination with City staff.

### 4.3.4.2 Facilities \& Parks

This plan assumes total annual funding for barrier removal of approximately $\$ 225,000$ per year for pedestrian barrier removal. As described in detail in Section 4.2, this funding is associated with CIP parks projects that include elements of ADA barrier removal.

These improvements may address low, medium, high, and very high priority barriers based on the location of a proposed larger project or maintenance program. Assumptions regarding the percentage of total project funding that is applied to barrier removal were determined through coordination with City staff.

### 4.3.5 Schedule

Based upon the Self-Evaluation, planning-level cost estimates, identified barrier removal methods, and projected budgetary resources that may be available, a barrier removal budget and schedule was developed. Due to the large investment needed to remove accessibility barriers, it is important to identify the highest priority barriers and focus resources to remove them first.

An analysis of the barrier prioritization was completed to determine how many barriers found during the self-evaluation process are classified as 'very high' and 'high', 'medium', and 'low' priority as defined in Section 4.1. Highest priority level represents a significant barrier to accessibility in areas with higher pedestrian demand. Lower priority levels represent lesser barriers to accessibility in areas with lower pedestrian demand. Although some facilities will receive low ratings, all barriers associated with them will still need to be removed and be determined to have been built to the maximum extent feasible. Approximately $35 \%$ of barriers are classified as very high priority, $40 \%$ are classified as high priority, $23 \%$ are classified as medium priority, and $1 \%$ are classified as low priority.

The City should aim to remove the highest priority barriers first as targetable funding becomes available. This will support the goal of providing better access to the most needed programs in the shortest time frame possible.

### 4.3.5.1 Public ROW

A transition plan was developed to target removal of very high priority barriers. It was assumed that a greater percentage of current City funding would be allocated to higher priority barriers. Assumed funding allocation based on barrier priority is summarized in Table 4-4.

## With the City's current funding allocation, approximately 87 transition years would be required to remove all very high priority right-of-way

barriers. An approximately 20 - to 40 -year plan was developed to estimate the additional annual funding required to remove all very high priority barriers. The transition plan is summarized in Table 4-5.

The City should create a two to five-year barrier removal plan with a list of projects to remove specific barriers. This program should focus on the highest priority barriers as funding allows. The purpose of the repeated program is to make progress in barrier removal but also to provide a way to reassess the 20-to-40 year plan and measure incremental progress. In order to inform the two-to-five-year program, a scoping effort should occur that includes site visits for areas identified as a high
priority to determine the severity of the barrier and to brainstorm possible solutions to fix the issue. When selecting projects, site conditions and improvement feasibility should be taken into account. Areas with multiple barriers within close proximity can be grouped together to achieve cost savings. As areas are identified, additional data collection should be completed in the vicinity of the proposed project and added into the facility's GIS database. The additional information will be able to provide the remaining attributes necessary to determine if a facility fully meets PROWAG requirements.

Following completion of each two to five-year plan implementation cycle, lessons learned regarding costs, methods, schedule, and outcomes shall be evaluated to inform the next two-to-five-year cycle of pedestrian barrier removal investments. If progress is slower than anticipated, additional funding may be required. If progress is faster than anticipated, a shorter timeline may be achievable. Several factors may contribute to differences between the estimated transition schedule and the actual rate and cost of implementation. Some of these factors include actual funding acquired, individual project cost, site specific design savings, additional deterioration of pedestrian facilities, and unanticipated capital projects. In addition, it may be determined that some barriers identified through this transition plan are on facilities that have been built to the maximum extent feasible as discussed in Section 5.1. Each project to remove barriers should be evaluated to determine if improvements to the facility are feasible in the engineering design phase.

### 4.3.5.2 Facilities \& Parks

It is recommended that the City take a similar approach to barrier removal in public parks as discussed above for public right-of-way. It is anticipated that the existing level of annual funding for parks barrier removal will remain consistent moving forward.

Public facilities and parks barrier removal will be funded separately from the barrier removal for the public right-of-way and public parks. Table 4-3 summarizes the total amount of funding required to remove all barriers for each public facility included in this report, along with the Facility Index Score (FIS) for each facility. Locations with higher FIS scores should be prioritized before those with lower FIS scores. The costs listed include contingency, design, mobilization, and construction management costs. Each facility will likely be an isolated project to remove all barriers. The FIS can be used to prioritize the order of buildings to be updated. Detailed prioritization criteria is included in Appendix C and detailed FIS scoring is included in Appendix G.

Table 4-5 ADA Very High Barrier Removal Transition

| Transition <br> Years | Additional Annual <br> Investment | Total Annual <br> Investment |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 87 Years | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 364,000$ |
| 40 Years | $\$ 170,000$ | $\$ 534,000$ |
| 30 Years | $\$ 270,000$ | $\$ 634,000$ |
| 20 Years | $\$ 472,000$ | $\$ 836,000$ |

## E Recommendations and Next Steps

### 5.1 Recommended Actions

This chapter provides a set of recommendations intended to inform the implementation of this Transition Plan and ongoing removal of pedestrian barriers. Recommendations are not presented in priority order and represent near-term and longer-term Transition Plan implementation workplan tasks.

Recommendations identified as Pending require additional action from the City to implement. Underway recommendations are in progress at this time. On-going recommendations have been previously established and are continually in progress. Complete recommendations have been completed but may require additional action based on adjustments noted in this section.

## Recommendation 1:

Update City design standards to match ADA Standards

## Status: Underway

A detailed audit of City design standards using Proposed Guidelines for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way 2011 (PROWAG) was conducted to inform Chapter 2. This audit, which is included in Appendix A and recommends specific changes and additions to the City's standard plans and municipal code. Recommendations were identified for updating existing sidewalk, curb ramp, and pushbutton standards and filling in ADA guidelines for areas not covered in the City's standards and code. The City should update these documents to meet PROWAG standards.

Recommendation 2:
Identify an official responsible for Transition Plan implementation within the Public Works Department

## Status: Complete

Lia Klein has been identified as the responsible official. This position, often referred to as the "ADA Coordinator," is one of the four major federal requirements for every ADA transition plan. The ADA Coordinator is responsible for facilitating transition planning such as responding to grievance requests. They also function as a central figure for organizing the various programs within the City to maintain a consistent approach to barrier removal and achieving ADA standards across capital, maintenance, and operational activities.

Roads Official Responsible for Plan Implementation:
Lia Klein
ADA Coordinator
9611 SE 36th Street
Mercer Island, WA 98040
206-275-7600
TTY Relay Service: 711
Lia.Klein@mercerisland.gov

## Recommendation 3:

Adopt a Citywide Accessible
Pedestrian Signal (APS) policy

## Status: Pending

Accessible Pedestrian Signal (APS) policies serve as a means for cities to be consistent with ADA requirements at traffic signals. The APS policy covers when installation of APS devices that "communicate information about pedestrian timing in nonvisual formats such as audible tones, verbal messages, and/or vibrating surfaces" (MUTCD) is required. The recommended APS policy is included in Appendix G.

## Recommendation 4:

Educate City staff, consultants, and contractors on ADA standards

## Status: On-Going

Transition plans are often a learning experience for City staff, consultants, and contractors alike since they change existing practices and expectations. The City should use updates to the City's design standards as
an opportunity to teach and learn about accessibility and the barriers that those with limited mobility or sight experience when traveling in the City's public right-of-way. This should include clarifying guidance from the Department of Justice, for example, that when pedestrian facilities (curb ramps, sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian signals, etc.) within the public right-of-way are altered, they must be revised/replaced to meet current ADA standards. Education can take many forms from review of updated design standards with key individuals such as field inspectors and contractors, development and review of City specific design standards or checklists with City engineers, or training from groups that serve those with disabilities.

## Recommendations 5:

Develop a standard grievance process for barriers to accessibility

## Status: Pending

Public entities subject to Title II of the ADA are required to adopt and publish a grievance procedure as part of their transition plan. A grievance process allows community members to formally report denial of access to a City facility, program, or activity on the basis of disability.

Currently, the City has an established process to file a service request via the Public Works Department web page or the general City contact web page. The Public Works Maintenance Service Request can be found at https://www.mercerisland.gov/ publicworks/page/submit-service-request and includes mobile reporting and online reporting tools with the ability to select a specific location.

The general City contact can be found at https:// www.mercerisland.gov/contact and includes an open-ended question or comment submittal form.

It is recommended that the City establish a grievance procedure specifically for ADA accessibility barriers. A template for an example grievance procedure specific to accessibility barriers can be found in Appendix H.

The following adjustments are recommended to the City's existing service request process:

- Make the ADA grievance process easily navigable from the City's main website, and streamline the process on the website and through the City's mobile app. The ADA grievance request process should be clearly labeled and available via the City's Request City Services web page.
- Clarify whether a grievance specific to accessibility barriers can be submitted via the existing Public Works Service Request web page. If so, connect the ADA grievance request to the Public Works Maintenance Service Request page. If not, establish an ADA grievance request web page with location reporting similar to the Public Works Maintenance Service Request process.
- Connect the reporting tool used in the public engagement effort for this plan to the Public Works Service Request web page.


## Recommendation 6:

Develop a consistent and centralized MEF documentation database

## Status: Pending

The ADA dictates that alterations that could affect the usability of a facility must be made in an accessible manner to the maximum extent feasible (MEF). ADA Standards for Accessible Design (2010) dictates that:

Each facility or part of a facility altered by, on behalf of, or for the use of a public entity in a manner that affects or could affect the usability of the facility or part of the facility shall, to the maximum extent feasible, be altered in such manner that the altered portion of the facility is readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, if the alteration was commenced after January 26, 1992.

The City should document newly constructed or altered facilities that have been built to the maximum extent feasible rather than full ADA standards using standard template. An example template is included in Appendix I. Each project is to be evaluated to determine if improvements to the facility are feasible in the engineering design phase.

The reason for any variation from accessibility standards when it is infeasible to fully remove any barriers should be documented. To help organize MEF documentation, a central location for all MEF documentation can be established and geocoded to the facility location and ensure consistency of data for facilities designed and constructed by others. Consolidation of past MEF records into this data is also recommended.

## Recommendation 7:

Develop performance measures and processes to track removal of barriers

## Status: Pending

The primary purpose of an ADA transition plan is to develop a plan for removal of accessibility barriers. To show progress towards this requirement, the City should develop a process of tracking barrier removal on an annual basis. It is recommended that the City actively update the GIS ADA self-evaluation database developed for this plan, tracking how and when ADA barriers are removed. This data can be used to provide two-to-fiveyear updates on progress and demonstrate to the public as well as federal regulators that the City is making progress to meet Title II requirements. These updates should coincide with the two-to-five-year planning efforts completed to outline future barrier removal efforts.

## Recommendations 8:

Continue data collection for pedestrian features in the public right-of-way

## Status: Pending

The City should continue their data collection efforts to complete their database of pedestrian facilities in the public right-of-way. Attributes that are part of the PROWAG standards but not included in the first round of collection should be added to the GIS database as well as new types of facilities not inventoried like street parking, crosswalks, and bus stops. As construction projects within the City enter into the as-built phase, pedestrian facility data should be collected and entered into the GIS Database to enhance the barrier removal tracking process.

## Recommendation 9:

Review and clarify policies relating to accessibility and implementation of accessible features in construction projects

## Status: Pending

Work zones must provide the same level of accessibility as permanent pedestrian facilities covered by ADA requirements. Pedestrian accessibility must be maintained in areas of street construction and maintenance. The City should review its standards and policies to ensure that temporary, alternative walking routes are available within designated construction zones.

The City should develop and publish guidelines for replacing pedestrian facilities that are impacted by construction projects. When facilities are altered by construction, they should be reconstructed within ADA compliance to the maximum extent feasible. The City's guidelines would outline expectations for reconstructed facilities and who holds responsibility for reconstruction.

## Recommendation 10:

Evaluate all City Programs and
Activities as they relate to the ADA

## Status: Pending

The focus of the initial self-evaluation was on ADA barriers related to the public right-of-way within the City. The requirements for accessibility found in Title II of the ADA apply to many functions, programs, and activities the City may provide or engage in. In addition to the public right-of-way, self-evaluation and transition planning related to activities such as hiring communications, recreational programs, physical facilities, etc. should be performed to identify barriers within these programs and activities.

## Appendix A - Standards Review Barrier Audit

## TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

| Date: | December 1, 2021 | TG: | 1.21012 .00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| To: | Lia Klein, City of Mercer Island |  |  |
| From: | Patrick Lynch, AICP, Transpo Group |  |  |
| Subject: | Barrier Removal Audit - City of Mercer Island ADA Transition Plan |  |  |

The City of Mercer Island maintains road design standards and municipal code covering pedestrian facilities. The design standards are used for City funded projects as well as privately designed and constructed projects within City public right-of-way. This memorandum describes design guidelines that meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), common accessibility design issues, and references to specific design guidelines. The audit of the City's roadway design standards and municipal code as they relate to pedestrian features within the public right-of-way include the City of Mercer Island Standard Details (MI Std.) and Mercer Island City Code (MIC).

## Design Guidelines

There are several key design measurements that ADA design guidelines address. These measures are used because they are important to the accessibility and safety of the facility. When pedestrian facility designs cannot be constructed to full design requirements, they should be built to conform to the maximum extent feasible. When this arises, the City should identify the location this occurs, provide justification, and document for future reference.

Several guidelines and references are available to assist the City of Mercer Island in adhering to accessible design standards based on the needs for various projects. There are many opportunities to improve pedestrian conditions by identifying areas of need and establishing the appropriate accessibility design requirements.

## 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design (ADAS) (September 2010)

The Department of Justice published revised regulations for Titles II and III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 "ADA" in the Federal Register on September 15, 2010. These regulations adopted revised, enforceable accessibility standards called the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design "2010 Standards". The 2010 Standards set minimum requirements - both scoping and technical - for newly designed and constructed or altered State and local government facilities, public accommodations, and commercial facilities to be readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities.

## Proposed Guidelines for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public Right-of Way (PROWAG) (November 2011)

The United States Access Board is the rule making body that guides ADA compliance across the US. Since the late 2000's the US Access Board has been in the process of updating its Guidelines for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public Rights-of-Way. These draft guidelines focus on accessibility of sidewalks, curb ramps and in the soon to be released versions address shared-use trails. The draft guidelines cover legislative background, administration requirements, and design requirements.

Many public entities currently use the 2005 draft PROWAG as 'best practice' for features within the public right-ofways. This practice has been endorsed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the US Access Board, and is the standard the Washington Department of Transportation adheres to. The City's standards and codes were evaluated against 2011 PROWAG as this is the latest guideline developed by the Access Board. PROWAG sections referenced in this memo refer to 2011 PROWAG sections. When these standards conflicted with the 2010 ADA, the PROWAG standard is recommended.

## Design Requirements

Although the City of Mercer Island has standards in place it is important for the standards to be consistent and compliant with the above standards and guidelines. To that end, this memo will provide recommendations to improve and clarify the

## DRAFT

existing city documents. Recommended actions are included where necessary to meet ADA design standards and best practice. The tables below describe requirements for specific design elements, how they are addressed in City standards, and recommendations for modifications. In addition to the following tables, Attachment A includes markups on the city standard details to expand on the recommendations below.
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## Sidewalks and Pathways

Sidewalks are mentioned in the City's standard details and city code. These standards cover desired dimensions and materials to be used for construction of these facilities. Sidewalks are a common element found in a pedestrian access route (PAR).

| Design Element | Requirement | Review | Recommendations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian Access Route (PAR) and Pedestrian Circulation Path (PCP) | Various | Sidewalks, pathways, and trails shown on multiple standard details. | N/A |
| Sidewalk Width | Minimum clear width of PAR is 4 ft . excluding the curb; however, on PAR less than 5 ft . wide, passing space of 5 ft . by 5 ft . is required every 200 ft . minimum (PROWAG R302.3 and R302.4) <br> Clear width of walking surfaces shall be 36 inches minimum. The clear width shall be permitted to be reduced to 32 inches minimum for a length of 24 inches maximum provided that reduced width segments are separated by segments that are 48 inches long minimum and 36 inches wide minimum. Additional space is required at turns (ADAS 403.5.1). | 5 ft . minimum sidewalk width (MI Std. Detail ST-19). <br> Passing width around mailbox cluster shown as 5' recommended and 3'-6" minimum (MI Std. Detail ST27B). <br> 4 ft . min. shoulder walkway width (MI Std. Detail T-5). <br> 8 ft . min. pathway width (MI Std. Detail T-8). <br> 6 ft min. to 8 ft . max. pathway width (MI Std. Detail T-9). <br> 6 ft min . to 10 ft . max. pathway width (MI Std. Detail T-10). <br> 5 ft . sidewalk width (MI Std. Detail T-16A). | Revise minimum passing width to 4 ft . (MI Std. Detail ST-27B). <br> Revise minimum width to 5 ft . (MI Std. Detail T-5). |
| Sidewalk <br> Running Slope | Where the PAR is contained within a street or highway right-of-way, its grade shall not exceed the general grade established for the adjacent street or highway. When the PAR is not contained within the street or highway right-of-way, the grade of shall not exceed 5 percent (PROWAG R302.5). <br> The running slope of walking surfaces shall not be steeper than 1:20 (ADAS 403.3). | Not mentioned. | Add note to MI Std. Detail T-16A, the running slope for a sidewalk along the roadway shall not exceed the general grade of the roadway. Sidewalks not adjacent to a roadway shall not have a running slope greater than $5 \%$. |
| Sidewalk Cross Slope | The cross slope of a PAR shall be 2 percent maximum (PROWAG R302.6). <br> The cross slope of walking surfaces shall not be steeper than 1:48 (ADAS 403.3). | Sidewalk cross slope shown as 0.02 ft /ft. (MI Std. Details ST-10, ST-16, ST-37, ST-38, ST-39, T7). <br> Cross slope to match existing roadway (MI Std. Details T-5, T-8 \& T-9). <br> Cross slope to be minimum $2 \%$ (MI Std. Detail T-10). | Recommend including a desired cross slope of 1.5 percent or flatter to allow for construction tolerances with $2 \%$ as the maximum cross slope. <br> Update slope units to be consistent across standard details. <br> Show maximum cross slope of $2 \%$ instead of matching existing roadway (MI Std. Details T-5, T-8 \& T-9). |
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|  |  | Cross slope shown as 2\% (MI Std. Detail T-16A). |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Protruding Objects | Objects with leading edges more than 2.25 ft . and not more than 6.7 ft . above the finish surface shall protrude 4 in . maximum horizontally into the pedestrian circulation path (PCP) (PROWAG R402.2 \& ADAS 307.2). <br> Objects mounted on free-standing posts or pylons more than 2.25 ft . and not more than 6.7 ft . above the finish surface shall overhang pedestrian circulation paths 4 in. maximum measured horizontally from the post or pylon base. The base dimension shall be 2.5 in. thick minimum. Where objects are mounted between posts or pylons and the clear distance between the posts or pylons is greater than 1.0 ft , the lowest edge of the object shall be 2.25 ft . maximum or 6.7 ft . minimum above the finish surface (PROWAG R402.3). <br> Free-standing objects mounted on posts or pylons shall overhang circulation paths 12 inches maximum when located 27 inches minimum and 80 inches maximum above the finish floor or ground. Where a sign or other obstruction is mounted between posts or pylons and the clear distance between the posts or pylons is greater than 12 inches, the lowest edge of such sign or obstruction shall be 27 inches maximum or 80 inches minimum above the finish floor or ground (ADAS 307.3). | Bottom sign should be mounted at 7 ft . (MI Std. Details TR-4 and TR-13). <br> When sidewalk is present, edge of sign shall be located adjacent to back of sidewalk (MI Std. Detail TR-4). <br> Passing width around mailbox cluster shown as 5 ' recommended and $3^{\prime}-6$ " minimum (MI Std. Detail ST27B). <br> Tree branches to be trimmed a minimum 8 ft . clearance above walkway (MI Std. Detail UF-4 and MIC 19.10.140). <br> Shrubs to be pruned to allow 6 inches of clearance behind sidewalk (MI Std. Detail UF-4). <br> Placement of poles and associated equipment shall comply with regulations including ADA (MIC 19.06.075). <br> Projecting Signs should clear the sidewalk by a minimum of eight feet (MIC 19.11.140). | Add a horizontal dimension to bottom sign showing the maximum protrusion into pathway the sign can extend (MI Std. Detail TR-13). <br> Add note discussing protrusion requirements/cane detection requirements when mailbox is along a pedestrian circulation route (MI Std. Detail ST-27A). |
| Surface Discontinuities | Vertical surface discontinuities shall not exceed 0.5 in . maximum. Vertical discontinuities between 0.25 in . and 0.5 in. maximum shall be beveled not steeper than 50 percent (PROWAG R302.7.2) <br> Horizontal openings shall not permit passage of a sphere more than 0.5 in. in diameter. Elongated openings in grates shall be placed so that the long dimension is perpendicular to the dominate travel direction (PROWAG R302.7.3). <br> Vertical. Changes in level of $1 / 4$ inch high maximum shall be permitted to be vertical. Changes in level between $1 / 4$ inch high minimum and $1 / 2$ inch high maximum shall be beveled with a slope not steeper than 1:2 (ADAS 302.2 \& 302.3). | Expansion joints shall be $1 / 4$ in. "V" groove (MI Std. Detail T16B2). | Add requirement that utility boxes located in sidewalks shall have nonslip lids. |

## DRAFT

## Sidewalks and Pathways

## Crossings

Crosswalks are part of the PAR at intersections, midblock crossings, and pedestrian refuge islands. These are important connections across streets to enable pedestrians travelling from one side to the other.

| Design Element | Requirement | Review |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

## DRAFT

## Curb Ramps

Curb ramps are the immediate junctions between the sidewalk and street crosswalk. Perpendicular and diagonal curb ramps have a running slope that cuts through the curb at right angles, while parallel curb ramps have a running slope that is in-line with the sidewalk. Combination ramps include elements of both parallel and perpendicular curb ramps.

| Design Element | Requirement | Review | Recommendations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ramp Width | The clear width of curb ramp runs and blended transitions, excluding flares, shall be 4.0 ft . minimum (PROWAG R304.5.1). | Curb ramp run width shown as 4 ft . minimum and match sidewalk width (Std. Details ST-22A, ST22B, ST-22D-1, and ST-22D-2). | Add "match sidewalk" to curb ramp run width label (Std. Details ST-22E-1 and ST-22E-2). |
|  | The clear width of a ramp run shall be 36 inches minimum (ADAS 405.5). | Curb ramp run width shown as 4ft. minimum (Std. Details ST-22C-1, ST-22C-2, ST-22E-1 and ST-22E-2). |  |
| Running Slope | The running slope shall be 5 percent minimum and 8.3 percent maximum but shall not require the ramp length to exceed 15.0 ft . (PROWAG R304.2.2). | Curb ramp running slope is shown as $8.3 \%$ maximum (MI Std. Details ST-22A, ST-22B, ST-22C-1, ST-22C-1, ST-22D-1, ST-22D-2, ST-22E-1, and ST-22E-2). <br> The following note is included "Curb ramp maximum running shall not require the ramp length to exceed 15 feet to avoid chasing the slope indefinitely when connecting to steep grades. When applying the 15 foot maximum length, the running slope of the curb ramp shall be as flat as feasible." (MI Std. Details ST-22A, ST-22B, ST-22C-1, ST-22C-1, ST-22D-1, ST-22D-2, ST-22E-1, and ST-22E-2). | Recommend including a desired running slope of 7.5 percent or flatter to allow for construction tolerances with 8.3 percent as the maximum running slope. |
|  | The running slope of blended transitions shall be 5 percent maximum (PROWAG R304.4.1). |  |  |
|  | Ramp runs shall have a running slope not steeper than 1:12. In existing sites, buildings, and facilities, ramps shall be permitted to have running slopes steeper than 1:12 complying with Table 405.2 where such slopes are necessary due to space limitations (ADAS 405.2). |  |  |
| Cross Slope | The cross slope shall be 2 percent maximum. At pedestrian street crossing without yield or stop control and at midblock pedestrian street crossings, the cross slope shall be permitted to equal the street or highway grade (PROWAG R304.5.3). <br> Cross slope of ramp runs shall not be steeper than 1:48 (ADAS 405.3). | Curb ramp cross slope is shown as $2.0 \%$ max. (MI Std. Details ST-22A, ST-22B, ST-22D-1, ST-22E-1, and ST-22E-2). | Recommend including a desired cross slope of 1.5 percent or flatter to allow for construction tolerances with 2.0 percent as the maximum cross slope. <br> Consider adding allowance for cross slope of curb ramps to match roadway grade for street crossings without yield or stop control and at midblock crossings. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Flared Sides | Flared sides with a slope of 10 percent maximum, measured parallel to the curb line, shall be provided where a pedestrian circulation path crosses the curb ramp (PROWAG R304.2.3). | Flare slope is shown as $10 \%$ maximum measured parallel to curb (MI Std. Detail ST-22C-1). | N/A |
|  | Curb ramp flares shall not be steeper than 10 percent (ADAS 406.3). |  |  |
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Curb Ramps

| Design Element | Requirement | Review | Recommendations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Direction | Perpendicular curb ramps shall have a running slope that cuts through or is built up to the curb at right angles or meets the gutter grade break at right angles. <br> Parallel curb ramps shall have a running slope that is in-line with the direction of sidewalk travel (PROWAG Advisory R304.1). | Curb ramp figures labeled correctly for the type of curb ramps shown (MI Std. Details ST-22A, ST-22B, ST-22C-1, ST-22C-2, ST-22D-1, ST-22D-2, ST-22E-1, and ST-22E-2). | N/A |
| Counter Slope | The counter slope of the gutter or street at the foot of curb ramp run, blended transitions, and turning space shall be 5 percent maximum (PROWAG R304.5.4). <br> Counter slopes of adjoining gutters and road surfaces immediately adjacent to the curb ramp shall not be steeper than $5 \%$. The adjacent surfaces at transitions at curb ramps to walks, gutters, and streets shall be at the same level (ADAS 406.2). | Counter slope is shown as $5.0 \%$ maximum (MI Std. Details ST22A, ST-22C-1, ST-22C-2, ST-22D-1, and ST-22E-1). | Add additional section views to show cross slope per Attachment A markups. |
| Grade Breaks | Grade breaks at the top and bottom of curb ramps shall be perpendicular to the direction of ramp run. Grade breaks shall not be permitted on the surface of ramp runs and turning spaces. Surface slopes that meet at grade breaks shall be flush (PROWAG R304.5.2). <br> Changes in level other than the running slope and cross slope are not permitted on ramp runs (ADAS 405.4). | The following note is included "Where "grade break" is called out, the entire length of the grade break between the two adjacent surface planes shall be flush." (MI Std. Details ST-22A, ST-22B, ST-22C-1, ST-22C-2, ST-22D-1, ST-22D-2, ST-22E-1, and ST-22E-2). | N/A |
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## Curb Ramps

| Design Element | Requirement | Review | Recommendations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Turning Space/Landing Size | For perpendicular curb ramps, a turning space 4.0 ft . by 4.0 ft . minimum shall be provided at the top of the curb ramp. If the turning space is constrained at the back of sidewalk, the turning space shall be 4.0 ft . by 5.0 ft . minimum. The 5.0 ft . dimension shall be provided in the direction of the ramp run. (PROWAG R304.2.1). <br> For parallel curb ramps, a turning space 4.0 ft . by 4.0 ft . minimum shall be provided at the bottom of the curb ramp. If the turning space is constrained on 2 or more sides, the turning space shall be 4.0 ft . by 5.0 ft . minimum. The 5.0 ft . dimension shall be provided in the direction of the pedestrian crossings. (PROWAG R304.3.1). <br> The landing clear length shall be 36 inches minimum. The landing clear width shall be at least as wide as the curb ramp, excluding flared sides, leading to the landing (ADAS 406.4). | Turning space required to be 4 ft . by 4 ft . minimum (MI Std. Details ST-22C-1, ST-22C-2, ST-22D-1, ST-22D-2, ST-22E-1, and ST-22E-2). <br> Turning space required to be 4 ft . by 5 ft . minimum (MI Std. Details ST-22A and ST-22B). | Recommend including a desired cross slope of 1.5 percent or flatter to allow for construction tolerances with 2.0 percent as the maximum cross slope. <br> Add note to discuss landing dimensions for when a landing is constrained to curb ramp standard figures. <br> Perpendicular and Combination Curb Ramps: If the turning space is constrained at the back of sidewalk, the turning space shall be 4.0 ft by 5.0 ft minimum. The 5.0 ft dimension shall be provided in the direction of the ramp run (MI Std. Details ST-22C-1, ST-22C-2, ST-22D-1, and ST-22D-2). <br> Parallel Curb Ramps: If the turning space is constrained at the back of sidewalk, the turning space shall be 4.0 ft by 5.0 ft minimum. The 5.0 ft dimension shall be provided in the direction of the pedestrian crossing (MI Std. Details ST-22E-1 and ST-22E-2). Recommend including a 5.0 ft . by 5.0 ft turning space for parallel curb ramps as the dimension of the turning space that should be 5.0 ft is ambiguous in the guidelines. |
| Turning Space/Landing Slope | The running slope of turning spaces shall be 2 percent maximum (PROWAG R402.2 \& PROWAG R304.3.2). <br> The cross slopes of turning spaces shall be 2 percent maximum. At pedestrian street crossings without yield or stop control and at midblock pedestrian street crossings, the cross slope shall be permitted to equal the street or highway grade. (PROWAG R304.5.3). | Landing cross slope and run slope for curb ramps shown as 2.0\% maximum (MI Std. Details ST-22A, ST-22C-1, ST-22C-2, and ST-22E-1). <br> Either landing cross slope or run slope for curb ramps shown as 2.0\% maximum (MI Std. Details ST-22B, ST-22D-1, ST-22D-2, and ST-22E-2). | Recommend including a desired cross slope of 1.5 percent or flatter to allow for construction tolerances with 2.0 percent as the maximum cross slope. <br> Add missing cross/running slope label to landing of curb ramp (MI Std. Details ST-22B, ST-22D-1, ST-22D-2, and ST-22E-2). <br> Consider adding allowance for cross slope of turning spaces to match roadway grade for street crossings without yield or stop control and at midblock crossings. |
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## Curb Ramps

| Design Element | Requirement | Review | Recommendations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clear Space | Beyond the bottom grade break, a clear space 4.0 ft . by 4.0 ft . minimum shall be provided within the width of the pedestrian crossing and wholly outside the parallel vehicle travel lane (R304.5.5). | Clear space of 48" min. required at base of ramp within roadway (MI Std. Detail ST-21). | Add clarity to note that the 48" clear space should be outside of parallel travel lane (MI Std. Detail ST-21). |
|  | Diagonal or corner type curb ramps with returned curbs or other welldefined edges shall have the edges parallel to the direction of pedestrian flow. The bottom of diagonal curb ramps shall have a clear space 48 inches minimum outside active traffic lanes of the roadway. Diagonal curb ramps provided at marked crossings shall provide the 48 inches minimum clear space within the markings. Diagonal curb ramps with flared sides shall have a segment of curb 24 inches long minimum located on each side of the curb ramp and within the marked crossing (ADAS 406.6). |  |  |
| Detectable <br> Warning Surfaces | Detectable warning surfaces shall extend 2.0 ft . minimum in the direction of pedestrian travel and the full width of the curb ramp (exclusive of flares), the turning space, or the blended transition. (PROWAG R305.1.4). | Ramp texturing shown as a diamond grid pattern (MI Std. Detail ST-22). <br> Truncated domes in the detectable warning surface dimensions shown as 0.45 in . min . and 0.90 in . max. top | Remove MI Std. Detail ST-22. |
|  | The truncated domes in a detectable warning surface shall have a base diameter of 0.9 in . minimum and 1.4 in. maximum, a top diameter of 50 percent of the base diameter minimum and 65 percent of the base diameter maximum, and a height of 0.2 in. (PROWAG R305.1.1 \& ADAS 705.1.1). | diameter, 0.90 in . min . and 1.40 in. max. bottom diameter, and 0.2 in, height. <br> Center-to-center spacing between truncated domes shown as 1.60 in . to 2.40 in . Distance from base-to-base of truncated domes shown as 0.65 in . |  |
|  | The truncated domes shall have a center-to-center spacing of 1.6 in. minimum and 2.4 in . maximum, and a base-to-base spacing of 0.65 in . minimum, measured between the most adjacent domes (PROWAG R305.1.2 \& ADAS 705.1.2) | Color of surface is per standard specifications. <br> (MI Std. Detail ST-22F) |  |
|  | Detectable warning surfaces shall contrast visually with adjacent gutter, street or highway, or walkway surfaces, either light-on-dark or dark-on-light (PROWAG R305.1.3). |  |  |
|  | Detectable warning surfaces shall contrast visually with adjacent walking surfaces either light-on-dark, or dark-on-light (ADAS 705.1.3). |  |  |
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## Curb Ramps

| Design Element | Requirement | Review | Recommendations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detectable Warning Surface Placement | On perpendicular curb ramps, detectable warning surfaces shall be placed as follows: <br> - Where the ends of the bottom grade break are in front of the back of curb, detectable warning surfaces shall be placed at the back of curb. <br> - Where the ends of the bottom grade break are behind the back of curb and the distance from either end of the bottom grade brake to the back of curb is 5.0 ft . or less, detectable warning surfaces shall be placed on the ramp run within one dome spacing of the bottom grade break. <br> - Where the ends of the bottom grade break are behind the back of curb and the distance from either end of the bottom grade brake to the back of curb is more than 5.0 ft , detectable warning surfaces shall be placed on the lower landing at the back of curb. <br> (PROWAG R305.2.1). <br> On parallel curb ramps, detectable warning surfaces shall be placed on the turning space at the flush transition between the street and sidewalk at the back of curb. (PROWAG R305.2.2). <br> On blended transitions, detectable warning surfaces shall be placed at the back of curb. Where raised pedestrian street crossings, depressed corners, or other level pedestrian street crossings are provided, detectable warning surfaces shall be placed at the flush transition between the street and the sidewalk (PROWAG R305.2.3). | Following note included, "Detectable warning surface shall be placed at the back of curb, and need not follow the radius" (MI Std. Detail ST-22F). <br> Following note included, "When the grade break between the curb ramp and the landing is less than or equal to 5 ft . from the back of curb at all points, place the detectable warning surface on the bottom of the curb ramp" (MI Std. Detail ST-22F). | Revise note 8 per markups in Attachment A. |
| Receiving Ramp | A crosswalk served by a curb ramp must also have an existing curb ramp in place on the receiving end unless there is no curb or sidewalk on that end of the crosswalk Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 35.68.075. | When ramps are constructed on one side of the street, ramps shall be constructed at corresponding location on opposite side of street (MI Std. Detail ST-21). | Revise note to include a receiving ramp on opposite side of street except where there is no curb or sidewalk (MI Std. Detail ST-21). |
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## Signals

Signals are important connections in the pedestrian network that provide crossings at intersections for all roadway users. Where pedestrian signals are provided at pedestrian street crossings, they shall include accessible pedestrian signals and pedestrian pushbuttons complying with sections 4E. 08 through 4E. 13 of the MUTCD (PROWAG R209.1).

| Design Element | Requirement | Review | Recommendations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accessible Pedestrian Signals and Pedestrian Pushbuttons | Where pedestrian signals are provided at pedestrian street crossings, they shall include accessible pedestrian signals and pedestrian pushbuttons complying with sections 4E. 08 through 4E. 13 of the MUTCD. An accessible pedestrian signal and pedestrian pushbutton is an integrated device that communicates information about the WALK and DON'T WALK intervals at signalized intersections in non-visual formats (i.e., audible tones and vibrotactile surfaces) to pedestrians who are blind or have low vision. (PROWAG R209.1). <br> Existing pedestrian signals shall comply with R209.1 when the signal controller and software are altered, or the signal head is replaced (PROWAG R209.2). | Pedestrian push button to be mounted at 3 '-6" from sidewalk to bottom of button assembly (MI Std. Detail TR-9). | Refer to WSDOT Design Manual Chapters 1330 and 1510, and MUTCD for APS standards (MI Std. Detail TR-9). |
| Accessible Pedestrian Pushbuttons Clear Space | Clear spaces shall be 2.5 ft . minimum by 4.0 ft . minimum with additional space needed if it is confined on all or part of three sides (PROWAG R404.3). <br> One full unobstructed side of a clear space shall adjoin a pedestrian access route or adjoin another clear space (PROWAG R404.6). | Not mentioned. | Refer to WSDOT Design Manual Chapters 1330 and 1510, and MUTCD for APS standards (MI Std. Detail TR-9). |
| Accessible <br> Pedestrian <br> Pushbutton Reach Ranges | Where a forward reach is unobstructed, the high forward reach shall be 4.0 ft . maximum and the low forward reach shall be 1.25 ft . minimum above the finish surface. Forward reach over an obstruction is not permitted (PROWAG R406.2). <br> Where a clear space allows a parallel approach to an element and the side reach is unobstructed, the high side reach shall be 4.0 ft . maximum and the low side reach shall be 1.25 ft . minimum above the finish surface. An obstruction shall be permitted between the clear space and the element where the depth of the obstruction is 10 in . maximum (PROWAG R406.3). | Not mentioned. | Refer to WSDOT Design Manual Chapters 1330 and 1510, and MUTCD for APS standards (MI Std. Detail TR-9). |
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| Design Element | Requirement | Review | Recommendations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian Crossing Times | All pedestrian signal phase timing shall comply with section 4E. 06 of the MUTCD, shall be based on a pedestrian clearance time that is calculated using a pedestrian walking speed of $3.5 \mathrm{ft} . / \mathrm{s}$. or less (PROWAG R306.2). | Not mentioned. | Refer to WSDOT Design Manual Chapters 1330 and 1510, and MUTCD for APS standards (MI Std. Detail TR-9). |
| At Roundabouts | At roundabouts with multi-lane pedestrian street crossings, a pedestrian activated signal shall be provided for each multi-lane segment of each pedestrian street crossing, including the splitter island (PROWAG R306.3.2). | Not mentioned. | Refer to WSDOT Design Manual Chapters 1330 and 1510, and MUTCD for APS standards (MI Std. Detail TR-9). |
| At multi-lane channelized turn lanes | At signalized intersections and roundabouts with multi-lane channelized turn lane crossings, pedestrian activated signals shall be provided (PROWAG R306.4 \& PROWAG R306.5). | Not mentioned. | Refer to WSDOT Design Manual Chapters 1330 and 1510, and MUTCD for APS standards (MI Std. Detail TR-9). |
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## Other Pedestrian Areas

Other pedestrian areas include transit stops and work zones. Transit provides a critical lifeline of access and independence for those with limited mobility or vision. Transit stops have additional width requirements for boarding and alighting passengers, and work zones should provide the same level of accessibility as permanent pedestrian facilities.

| Design Element | Requirement | Review |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Boarding and <br> Alighting Area <br> Dimensions | Bus stop boarding and alighting <br> areas shall provide a clear length of <br> 8.0 ft. minimum, measured <br> perpendicular to the curb or vehicle <br> street or highway edge, and a clear <br> width of 5.0 ft. minimum, measured <br> parallel to the vehicle street or <br>  | Not mentioned. |

DRAFT

| Parking |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parking Spaces | Where parking spaces are marked with lines, width measurements of parking spaces and access aisles shall be made from the centerline of the markings (ADAS 502.1). <br> Car parking spaces shall be 96 inches wide minimum and van parking spaces shall be 132 inches wide minimum, shall be marked to define the width, and shall have an adjacent access aisle (ADAS 502.2). <br> Van parking spaces shall be permitted to be 96 inches wide minimum where the access aisle is 96 inches wide minimum (ADAS 502.2 Exception). | Off-street parking shall meet the relevant state design standards for the physically disabled (MIC 19.03.020, 19.04.040, 19.05.020). | Add a statement in a location TBD that states 'For the design and construction of pedestrian facilities, in the absence of a City of Mercer Island standard, WSDOT design standards shall be followed.' |
| Parking Access Aisles | Access aisles shall adjoin an accessible route. Two parking spaces shall be permitted to share a common access aisle (ADAS 502.3). <br> Access aisles serving car and van parking spaces shall be 60 inches wide minimum (ADAS 502.3.1). <br> Access aisles shall extend the full length of the parking spaces they serve (ADAS 502.3.2). <br> Access aisles shall be marked so as to discourage parking in them (ADAS 502.3.3). <br> Access aisles shall not overlap the vehicular way. Access aisles shall be permitted to be placed on either side of the parking space except for angled van parking spaces which shall have access aisles located on the passenger side of the parking spaces (ADAS 502.3.4). | Off-street parking shall meet the relevant state design standards for the physically disabled (MIC 19.03.020, 19.04.040, 19.05.020). | Add a statement in a location TBD that states 'For the design and construction of pedestrian facilities, in the absence of a City of Mercer Island standard, WSDOT design standards shall be followed.' |
| Parking identification. | Parking space identification signs shall include the International Symbol of Accessibility complying with 703.7.2.1. Signs identifying van parking spaces shall contain the designation "van accessible." Signs shall be 60 inches minimum above the finish floor or ground surface measured to the bottom of the sign (ADAS 502.6). | Off-street parking shall meet the relevant state design standards for the physically disabled (MIC 19.03.020, 19.04.040, 19.05.020). | Add a statement in a location TBD that states 'For the design and construction of pedestrian facilities, in the absence of a City of Mercer Island standard, WSDOT design standards shall be followed.' |
| Parallel Parking Spaces | Where the width of the adjacent sidewalk or available right-of-way exceeds 14.0 ft , an access aisle 5.0 ft . wide minimum shall be provided at street level the full length of the parking space and shall connect to a pedestrian access route. The access aisle shall comply with R302.7 and | Off-street parking shall meet the relevant state design standards for the physically disabled (MIC 19.03.020, 19.04.040, 19.05.020). | Add a statement in a location TBD that states 'For the design and construction of pedestrian facilities, in the absence of a City of Mercer Island standard, WSDOT design standards shall be followed.' |


|  | shall not encroach on the vehicular travel lane (PROWAG R309.2.1). <br> In alterations where the street or sidewalk adjacent to the parking spaces is not altered, an access aisle shall not be required provided the parking spaces are located at the end of the block face (PROWAG R309.2.1.1). <br> An access aisle is not required where the width of the adjacent sidewalk or the available right-ofway is less than or equal to 14.0 ft . When an access aisle is not provided, the parking spaces shall be located at the end of the block face (PROWAG R309.2.2). |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Perpendicular or Angled Parking Spaces | Where perpendicular or angled parking is provided, an access aisle 8.0 ft . wide minimum shall be provided at street level the full length of the parking space and shall connect to a pedestrian access route. The access aisle shall comply with R302.7 and shall be marked so as to discourage parking in the access aisle. Two parking spaces are permitted to share a common access aisle (PROWAG R309.3). | Off-street parking shall meet the relevant state design standards for the physically disabled (MIC 19.03.020, 19.04.040, 19.05.020). | Add a statement in a location TBD that states 'For the design and construction of pedestrian facilities, in the absence of a City of Mercer Island standard, WSDOT design standards shall be followed.' |
| Alternative Pedestrian Access Routes |  |  |  |
| Alternate <br> Pedestrian Access <br> Route | When a pedestrian circulation path is temporarily closed by construction, alterations, maintenance operations, or other conditions, an alternate pedestrian access route complying with sections 6D.01, 6D.02, and 6G. 05 of the MUTCD shall be provided. Where provided, pedestrian barricades and channelizing devices shall comply with sections 6F.63, 6F.68, and 6F. 71 of the MUTCD (PROWAG R205). | Not mentioned. | Add a statement in a location TBD that states 'For the design and construction of pedestrian facilities, in the absence of a City of Mercer Island standard, WSDOT design standards shall be followed.' |
| Driveways |  |  |  |
| Driveways | The cross slope shall be 2 percent maximum (PROWAG R304.5.3). <br> Cross slope of ramp runs shall not be steeper than 1:48. (ADAS 405.3) <br> The running slope shall be 5 percent minimum and 8.3 percent maximum but shall not require the ramp length to exceed 15.0 ft . (PROWAG R304.2.2). | MI Std. Detail ST-19 shows grade breaks that are not perpendicular to the path of travel. <br> MI Std. Detail ST-20 shows no ramping down of sidewalk to driveway grade. | Remove driveway options shown in MI Std. Details ST-19 and ST-20. <br> Add a statement in a location TBD that states 'For the design and construction of pedestrian facilities, in the absence of a City of Mercer Island standard, WSDOT design standards shall be followed.' |
| Ramps |  |  |  |

## DRAFT

## Other Pedestrian Areas

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{ll}\text { Ramp Width } & \begin{array}{l}\text { The clear width of a ramp run and, } \\
\text { where handrails are provided, the } \\
\text { clear width between handrails shall }\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{ll}\text { be } 3.0 \text { ft. minimum (PROWAG }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Add a statement in a location TBD } \\
\text { R407.4 \& ADAS 405.5). }\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{ll}\text { that states 'For the design and } \\
\text { construction of pedestrian facilities, in }\end{array}
$$ <br>

the absence of a City of Mercer\end{array}\right]\)| Island standard, WSDOT design |
| :--- |
| standards shall be followed.' |


|  | 4 in. high minimum and 7 in. high maximum. Treads shall be 11 in . deep minimum (PROWAG R408.2 \& ADAS 504.2). <br> Open risers are not permitted (PROWAG R408.3 \& ADAS 504.3). <br> The radius of curvature at the leading edge of the tread shall be 0.5 in. maximum. Nosings that project beyond risers shall have the underside of the leading edge curved or beveled. Risers shall be permitted to slope under the tread at an angle of 30 degrees maximum from vertical. The permitted projection of the nosing shall extend 1.5 in. maximum over the tread below (PROWAG R408.5 \& ADAS 504.5). | Note states "Risers: 7 1/2" max., 5" min." <br> Note states "Treads" 12" max., $11 " \mathrm{~min}$. with transverse 0.01 ft./ft. slope" <br> Stair projection shown as $3 / 4$ " <br> (MI Standard Detail ST-24). <br> Risers shown as 7 in (MI Standard Detail ST-25). | Add tread minimum depth dimension (MI Std. Detail ST-25). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Handrails |  |
| Handrails | Stairways shall have handrails (PROWAG R408.6). <br> Handrails are required on ramp runs with a rise greater than 6 in . and on certain stairways (PROWAG R407.8 \& ADAS 405.8). <br> Edge protection complying shall be provided on each side of ramp runs and landings (PROWAG R407.9 \& ADAS 405.9). <br> Where required handrail shall be provided on both sides of ramps and stairways (PRWOAG R409.2 \& ADAS 505.2). <br> Top of gripping surfaces of handrails shall be 2.8 ft . minimum and 3.2 ft . maximum vertically above walking surfaces, ramp surfaces, and stair nosings. Handrails shall be at a consistent height above walking surfaces, ramp surfaces, and stair nosings (PROWAG R409.4 \& ADAS 505.4). <br> Clearance between handrail gripping surfaces and adjacent surfaces shall be 1.5 in . minimum (PROWAG R409.5 \& ADAS 505.5). <br> Handrail gripping surfaces shall be continuous along their length and shall not be obstructed along their tops or sides. The bottoms of handrail gripping surfaces shall not be obstructed for more than 20 percent of their length. Where provided, horizontal projections shall occur 1.5 in . minimum below the bottom of the handrail gripping | Note states "A handrail is required on one side only as per U.B.C." (MI Standard Detail ST24). | Add reference to MI Standard Detail ST-24 to follow WSDOT Design Manual Chapter 1510 for handrail requirements in the public right-ofway. |

DRAFT

| surface (PROWAG R409.6 \& ADAS 505.6). |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Handrail Extension on Ramps | Ramp handrails shall extend horizontally above the landing for 1.0 ft . minimum beyond the top and bottom of ramp runs. Extensions shall return to a wall, guard, or the landing surface, or shall be continuous to the handrail of an adjacent ramp run. (PROWAG R409.10.1 \& ADAS 505.10.1). | Not mentioned. | Add reference to MI Standard Detail ST-23 to follow WSDOT Design Manual Chapter 1510 for handrail requirements in the public right-ofway. |
| Handrail Extension on Stairways | At the top of a stair flight, handrails shall extend horizontally above the landing for 1.0 ft . minimum beginning directly above the first riser nosing. Extensions shall return to a wall, guard, or the landing surface, or shall be continuous to the handrail of an adjacent stair flight (PROWAG R409.10.2 \& ADAS 505.10.2). <br> At the bottom of a stair flight, handrails shall extend at the slope of the stair flight for a horizontal distance at least equal to one tread depth beyond the last riser nosing. Extensions shall return to a wall, guard, or the landing surface, or shall be continuous to the handrail of an adjacent stair flight. (PROWAG R409.10.3 \& ADAS 505.10.3). | Bottom extension shown as horizontal and $1^{\prime}-6$ ". No top extension dimension shown (MI Std. Detail ST-24). <br> Top extension shown horizontally for 1' - 9". No Bottom extension dimension shown (MI Std. Detail ST-25). | Add reference to MI Standard Details ST-24 and ST-25 to follow WSDOT Design Manual Chapter 1510 for handrail requirements in the public right-of-way. <br> Show bottom extension parallel with slope of stairs for one tread length (MI Std. Detail ST-24). <br> Add bottom extension dimension (MI Std. Detail ST-25). |
| Handrail Cross Section | Handrail gripping surfaces with a circular cross section shall have an outside diameter of 1.25 in . minimum and 2 in . maximum (PROWAG R409.7.1 \& ADAS 505.7). <br> Handrail gripping surfaces with a non-circular cross section shall have a perimeter dimension of 4 in . minimum and 6.25 in . maximum, and a cross-section dimension of 2.25 in. maximum (PROWAG R409.7.2 \& ADAS 505.7). | Handrail to be 1.5" (MI Std. Detail ST-25). | Add reference to MI Standard Details ST-24 and ST-25 to follow WSDOT Design Manual Chapter 1510 for handrail requirements in the public right-of-way. |
| Railways |  |  |  |
| Railroad Flangeway Gaps | Flangeway gaps at pedestrian atgrade rail crossings shall be 2.5 in . maximum or non-freight rail track and 3 in . maximum on freight rail track (PROWAG R302.7.4). <br> Where a circulation path serving boarding platforms crosses tracks, it shall comply with 402 . Openings for wheel flanges shall be permitted to be $21 / 2$ inches maximum (ADAS 810.10). | Not mentioned. | No recommendation as there are no railroad crossings with pedestrian facilities in City of Mercer Island. |

## DRAFT

## Other Pedestrian Areas

| Detectable <br> Warning Surfaces <br> at Rail Crossings | At pedestrian at-grade rail crossings not located within a street or highway, detectable warning surfaces shall be placed on each side of the rail crossing. The edge of the detectable warning surface nearest the rail crossing shall be 6.0 ft . minimum and 15.0 ft . maximum from the centerline of the nearest rail. Where pedestrian gates are provided, detectable warning surfaces shall be placed on the side of the gates opposite the rail. (PROWAG R305.2.5). | Not mentioned. | No recommendation as there are no railroad crossings with pedestrian facilities in City of Mercer Island. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Detectable Warning Surfaces at Rail Boarding Areas | At boarding platforms for rail vehicles, detectable warning surfaces shall be placed at the boarding edge of the platform (PROWAG R305.2.6). <br> At boarding and alighting areas at sidewalk or street level transit stops for rail vehicles, detectable warning surfaces shall be placed at the side of the boarding and alighting area facing the rail vehicles (PROWAG R305.2.7). | Not mentioned. | No recommendation as there are no railroad crossings with pedestrian facilities in City of Mercer Island. |

## Facilities \& Parks

The design of facilities and parks are governed by a variety of state, national, and international building codes. Since the majority of these codes are developed on a national or international level, it was assumed that these codes comply with relevant ADA standards.

## Attachments:

Attachment A: City of Mercer Island Standard Detail Markups



## EXTRUDED ASPHALT OR CEMENT CONCRETE CURB



CEMENT CONCRETE ROLLED CURB


ASPHALT THICKENED EDGE

## NOTES:

1. SEE DETAIL ST-14 FOR JOINT REQUIREMENTS.
2. ROLL GUTTER TO MATCH POSITIVE SUPERELEVATION.
3. SEE DRAWING NO. T-15A FOR CONFIGURATION OF FILL \& WALKWAY BEHIND CURB IF REQUIRED.
4. FOR INTEGRAL POUR CONSTRUCTION, 1/4" EDGED GROOVE MAY REPLACE EXPANSION JOINT AT INTERFACE BETWEEN THE CURB AND AND ADJACENT SIDEWALK.

|  | CITY OF MERCER ISLAND STANDARD DETAILS STREETS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CURB DETAILS |  |  |
| 11/23/99 | Na SCALE | ST-16 |



NOTES

1. DRIVEWAYS SHALL BE CDNSTRUCTED IN ACCDRDANCE WITH SECTIDN 5.03.3(18) DF THE STANDARD SPECIFICATIINS AND THIS STANDARD DETAIL.
2. WHERE DRIVEWAY EXCEEDS $16^{\prime}$ IN WIDTH, A CDNTRZL JDIN SHALL BE PLACED LUNGITUDINALLY AT THE CENTER DF THE DRIVEWAY. CLEAN AND EDGE ALL JOINTS. TRANSVERSE DRIVEWAY JDINTS SHALL BE AS SHOWN $\square R$ AS DIRECTED BY THE CITY ENGINEER.
3. SIDEWALK AND DRIVEWAY SHALL BE A MINIMUM DF 6" THICK.
4. THE CDNCRETE PAVEMENT SHALL BE TRANSVERSELY BRUSH FINISHED WITH A FIBER GR WIRE BRUSH $\square F$ A TYPE APPRIVED BY THE CITY ENGINEER.
5. THE RECDMMENDED DRIVEWAY GRADE IS 6\%. THE MAXIMUM ALGEBRAIC CHANGE IN GRADE FRR VERTICAL CREST AND SAG CURVES, SHALL BE $10 \%$, WITH A $10^{\prime}$ VERTICAL CURVE.
6. REMIVE THE EXISTING SIDEWALK AND EXISTING CURB AND GUTTER AT AN EXISTING EXPANSIDN JUINT.
7. THE SUBBASE SHALL BE A MINIMUM $4^{\prime \prime}$ पF $5 / 8^{\prime \prime}(-)$ GRAVEL BASE DESIGNED Tロ ACCDMmDDATE H-20 LDADING.
8. THE DRIVEWAY SHALL BE CZNSTRUCTED DF 5-3/4 SACK, HIGH EARLY STRENGTH, 4,000 P.S.I. CLNCRETE.
9. MAXIMUM SLIPE 6:1 TU MATCH STATE STANDARDS FZR WHEELCHAIRS.
10. A REVERSE DRIVEWAY IS SUBJECT TI APPRRVAL BY THE CITY ENGINEER.
11. CDMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL DRIVEWAYS WIDER THAN $30^{\prime}$ MAY BE APPRIVED CLNSIDERING TRAFFIC SAFETY AND NEEDS DF THE ACTIVITY SERVED. ALL CDMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL DRIVEWAYS SHALL HAVE AN EXPANSIDN JUINT LDCATED MID-WIDTH.
12. A STURM DRAIN INLET SHALL BE LQCATED WITHIN $20^{\prime}$ BUT ND CLQSER THAN $10^{\prime}$ UPGRADE FRDM THE NEAREST EDGE DF CURB TAPER.

|  | CITY OF MERCER ISLAND STANDARD DETAILS STREETS |
| :---: | :---: |
| Remove Standard Detail | DRIVEWAY CROSS-SECTION ALTERNATE "A" |
|  | 11/23/99 |



## NOTES

1. 3/8" THRU JDINT MATERIAL.
2. 2" TRANSVERSE DUMMY JQINT ZN DRIVEWAY CENTERLINE ZN DRIVEWAYS $20^{\prime}$ AND QVER.
3. THE DRIVEWAY SHALL BE CDNSTRUCTED DF 5-3/4 SACK, HIGH EARLY STRENGTH, 4,000 P.S.I. CDNCRETE.
4. SIDEWALK TI BE A 4" THICK, EXCEPT IN DRIVEWAY AREA.
5. 2 $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ DEFGRMED REBARS $30^{\prime \prime}$ LZNG PER ASTM A-15, EACH END. $11 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ DEFDRMED REBAR FULL WIDTH DF DRIVEWAY.
6. RULLED CURBING.
7. SAW CUT THRU SIDEWALK AND CURB ALING SCDRE MARK IS MANDATDRY,
8. IPTIUNAL SAWCUT WHERE SIDEWALK HAS LQNGITUDINAL SCIRING.



CURB CUT DETAIL


RAMP TEXTURE DETAIL


## NOTES

1. ALL RAMP CDNSTRUCTIDN SHALL CDNFIRM TV THE CURRENT ADA REQUIREMENTS.
2. RAMP TEXTURING TD BE DUNE WITH EXPANDED METAL GRATE PLACED AND REMUVED FRDM WET CDNCRETE TU LEAVE A DIAMDND PATTERN AS SHZWN. THE LUNG AXIS DF THE DIAMDND PATTERN SHALL BE PERPENDICULAR TV THE CURB. GRIUVES SHALL BE $1 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ DEEP AND $1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ WIDE.
3. CURB RAMP SHALL NDT BE PQURED INTEGRAL WITH SIDEWALK $\square R$ PAVEMENT AND SHALL BE ISDLATED BY EXPANSIDN JDINT MATERIAL.



4. THIS PLAN IS TO BE USED WHERE PEDESTRIAN CROSSING IN ONE DIRECTION IS NOT PERMITTED.
5. CURB RAMP LOCATION SHALL BE PLACED WITHIN THE WIDTH OF THE ASSOCIATED CROSSWALK, OR AS SHOWN IN THE CONTRACT PLANS.
6. WHERE "GRADE BREAK" IS CALLED OUT, THE ENTIRE LENGTH OF THE GRADE BREAK BETWEEN THE TWO ADJACENT SURFACE PLANES SHALL BE FLUSH.
7. DO NOT PLACE GRATINGS, JUNCTION BOXES, ACCESS COVERS OR OTHER APPURTENANCES IN FRONT OF THE CURB RAMP OR ON ANY PART OF THE CURB RAMP OR LANDING.
8. THE CURB RAMP MAXIMUM RUNNING SLOPE SHALL NOT REQUIRE THE RAMP LENGTH TO EXCEED 15 FEET TO AVOID CHASING THE SLOPE INDEFINITELY WHEN CONNECTING TO STEEP GRADES. WHEN APPLYING THE 15 FOOT MAXIMUM LENGTH, THE RUNNING SLOPE OF THE CURB RAMP SHALL BE AS FLAT AS FEASIBLE.
9. CURB RAMPS AND LANDINGS SHALL RECEIVE BROOM FINISH.
10. PEDESTRIAN CURB MAY BE OMITTED IF THE GROUND SURFACE AT THE BACK OF THE CURB RAMP AND/OR LANDING WILL BE AT THE SAME ELEVATION AS THE CURB RAMP OR LANDING AND THERE WILL BE NO MATERIAL TO RETAIN.


11. PROVIDE A SEPARATE CURB RAMP FOR EACH MARKED OR UNMARKED CROSSWALK. CURB RAMP LOCATION SHALL BE PLACED WITHIN THE WIDTH OF THE ASSOCIATED CROSSWALK OR AS SHOWN IN THE CONTRACT PLANS.
12. WHERE "GRADE BREAK" IS CALLED OUT, THE ENTIRE LENGTH OF THE GRADE BREAK BETWEEN THE TWO ADJACENT SURFACE PLANES SHALL BE FLUSH.
13. DO NOT PLACE GRATINGS, JUNCTION BOXES, ACCESS COVERS, OR OTHER APPURTENANCES IN FRONT OF THE CURB RAMP OR ON ANY PART OF THE CURB RAMP OR LANDING.
14. THE CURB RAMP MAXIMUM RUNNING SLOPE SHALL NOT REQUIRE THE RAMP LENGTH TO EXCEED 15-FEET TO AVOID CHASING THE SLOPE INDEFINITELY WHEN CONNECTING TO STEEP GRADES. WHEN APPLYING THE 15-FOOT MAXIMUM LENGTH, THE RUNNING SLOPE OF THE CURB RAMP SHALL AS FLAT AS FEASIBLE.
15. CURB RAMP, LANDING, AND FLARES SHALL RECEIVE BROOM FINISH.









## NOTES

1. RAILING SHALL BE GALVANIZED STEEL $\square R$ ALUMINUM DR APPRZVED EQUAL. INSTALLATIUN PER MANUFACTURES RECDMMENDATIDNS.
2. SHIP DRAWINGS GF RAILING SHALL BE SUBMITTED FGR APPRIVAL SHZWING CIMPLETE DIMENSIDNS AND DETAILS $\square F$ FABRICATIUN AND INCLUDING AN ERECTIDN DIAGRAM, MATERIALS BEING USED SHALL BE SPECIFIED IN THE SHDP DRAWINGS.
3. ALL ALUMINUM PART SHALL BE GIVEN A CLEAR ANDDIC CDATING AT LEAST 0.0006 INCH THICK AND HDT WATER SEALED AND SHALL HAVE A UNIFGRM FINISH.
4. PIPE RAILING AND PIPE RAILING SPLICES MAY BE HEATED TQ NDT MLRE THAN $400^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ FDR A PERIUD NDT TV EXCEED 30 MINUTES TV FACILITATE FGRMING $\square R$ BENDING.
5. CUTTING SHALL BE DINE BY SAWING $\quad$ RR MILLING AND ALL CUTS SHALL BE TRUE AND SMDCTH. FLAME CUTTING WILL NDT BE PERMITTED.
6. PIPE RAILING, PIPE BALUSTERS AND PIPE RAILING SPLICES SHALL BE ADEQUATELY WRAPPED TI ENSURE SURFACE PRDTECTIDN DURING HANDLING AND TRANSPIRATIDN TD THE JUB SITE.
7. WELDS SHALL BE SMDDTH SURFACE IN ACCDRDANCE WITH SECTIDN 5 DF THE LATEST AASHTD STANDARDS SPECIFICATIUNS FIR STRUCTURAL SUPPDRTS FDR HIGHWAY SIGNS, LUMINARIES AND TRAFFIC SIGNALS.
8. ALLIW FIR EXPANSIDN AT APPRIXIMATELY EVERY FIURTH PZST.
9. RAILS, PUSTS AND FDRMED ELBZWS SHALL BE A.S.T.M. B-241 DR B-429 ALLDW 6063-T6 SCHEDULE 40 (STD. PIPE). BRACKETS, END CAPS AND DTHER FITTINGS SHALL BE A.S.T.M. 6063-T5. SPLICES AND REINFDRCING SLEEVES SHALL BE DRAWN ALUMINUM TUBING 6063-T832.

|  | CITY OF MERCER ISLAND STANDARD DETAILS STREETS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PIPE HANDRAIL DETAILS |  |  |
| 11/23/99 | no SCale | ST-23 |

= 51









## NOTES

1. INSTALLATIDN SHALL BE PER M.U.T.C.D.
2. $31 / 4^{\prime \prime} \times 5 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ GALVANIZED CR PLATED LAG SCREW AND $3 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ I.D. $\times 1^{\prime \prime}$ I.D. NYLUN WASHER.
3. CAP SHALL BE THE SAME MATERIAL AS THE SURRDUNDING SURFACE.
4. INSTALL \#300 GALVANIZED CDMMDN SPIKE ZN THE FACE SIDE DF PDST AS DIRECTED BY THE ENGINEER. SPIKE SHALL BE 8" ABDVE BDTTDM DF PDST AND SHALL PRDTRUDE 2" FRDM PDST

## sult CITY OF MERCER ISLAND STANDARD DETAILS TRAFFIC

STANDARD SIGN INSTALLATION

| $1-1-2000$ | ND SCALE | TR-4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |



1. SEE STANDARD DETAIL TR-4 FRR SIGN INSTALLATION DETAILS.
2. PRIVIDE SIGNS AND SYMBDLS AT ALL HANDICAPPED PARKING STALLS AS INDICATED UN THE SITE PLAN.
3. ALL SIGNS AND MARKINGS SHALL CDNFIRM TI THE M.U.T.C.D. MANUAL


4. USE WHITE THERMOPLASTIC UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY CITY TRAFFIC ENGINEER.
5. INSTALLATION OF OFFSET STOP BAR SHALL BE TRAFFIC ENGINEER-APPROVED.
6. FOR USE AT SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS AND INTERSECTIONS IN THE TOWN CENTER.

| CITY OF MERCER ISLAND STANDARD DETAILS TRAFFIC | CITY OF MERCER ISLAND STANDARD DETAILS TRAFFIC |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CROSSWALK STRIPING <br> SIGNALIZED I/S \& TOWNCENTER |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 3/06/2015 | No SCALE | TR-7C1 |




## NOTES

1. VEHICLE SIGNAL HEAD: DIE CAST ALUMINUM, WSDIT FIREST GREEN.
2. STREET NAME SIGN: 6" WHITE REFECTURIZED LETTERS $\quad$ aN A GREEN BACKGRDUND. SEE STANDARD DETAIL TR-5.
3. EMERGENCY VEHICLE PRE-EMPT IDN DETECTIR.
4. EMERGENCY VEHICLE PRE-EMPT IDN INDICATDR.
5. PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL HEAD: WSDCT FGREST GREEN.
6. PEDESTRIAN PUSH BUTTEN.
7. LUMINAIRE: DARK ANDDIC BRDNZE, SHDEBDX STYLE PER STANDARD DETAIL IL-1.
8. SIGNAL STANDARD: NDN-PAINTED GALVANIZED STEEL.
9. THE FILLIWING WSDIT STANDARD PLANS ARE ADOPTED BY REFERENCE J-5e, J-5f,
$J-6 h$ AND $J-7 a$.

|  | CITY OF MERCER ISLAND STANDARD DETAILS TRAFFIC |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TRAFFIC SIGNALS |  |  |
| 1-1-2000 | ND SCALE | TR-9 |



DETAIL A-A

## NOTES

1. SIGN PGST SHALL BE $2^{\prime \prime} \times 10^{\prime} 10$ GAUGE GALVANIZED STEEL NDN-PERFGRATED WITH A BALL CAP. THE PDST SHALL BE POWDER CDATED WITH PANATDNE 5650U DARK GREEN.
2. THE ANCHOR SHALL BE $2^{\prime} \times 2$ 1/4" 12 GAUGE PERFDRATED GALVANIZED STEEL.
3. THE STIFFENER SLEEVE SHALL BE $18^{\prime \prime} \times 21 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ 12 GAUGE PERFGRATED GALVANIZED STEEL PIWDER CDATED WITH PANATENE $5650 \cup$ DARK GREEN.
4. THE POST SHALL HAVE A $2^{\prime \prime}$ BALL TYPE TOP AS MANUFACTURED BY MDNUMENTAL IRDN AND SUPPLIED BY ANCHDR FENCE DF WUODINVILLE, WASHINGTDN.

|  | CITY OF MERCER ISLAND STANDARD DETAILS TRAFFIC |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TYPICAL METAL POST <br> TRAFFIC SIGN - CBD |  |  |
| 1-1-2000 | No Scale | TR-13 |



## NOTES

1. THIS SEATTLE TQ BELLEVUE TRAIL (MARYMIDR PARK) WAS CUNSTRUCTED BY THE I-90 PRDJECT AND HAS BEEN DESIGNED IN ACCDRDANCE TO FEDERAL AND STATE DESIGN GUIDELINES FGR BICYCLE TRAILS. IT HAS THE FQLLDWING CHARACTERISTICS
A. $12^{\prime}$ WIDE ASPHALT TRAIL
B. MAXIMUM GRADE 7\%
2. ASPHALT CDNCRETE PAVEMENT, CLASS "B", 0.25" CDMPACTED DEPTH.
3. CRUSHED SURFACING TUP CZURSE, $0.15^{\prime}$ CDMPACTED DEPTH.
4. GRAVEL BASE, $0.35^{\prime}$ CIMPACTED DEPTH.
5. CRUSHED SURFACING TIP CDURSE, 0.75' CDMPACTED DEPTH.
6. GRAVEL BGRRDW, VARIABLE CDMPACTED DEPTH.
7. SEE STANDARD DETAIL UF-4 FDR TRIMMING REQUIREMENTS.

| CITY OF MERCER ISLAND STANDARD DETAILS TRAILS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REGIONAL TRAIL PEDESTRIAN-BICYCLE |  |  |
| 11/23/99 | no scale | T-2 |



## NOTES

1. SLDPE TD MATCH EXISTING RZADWAY.
2. ALL DEPTHS ARE CDMPACTED DEPTHS.
3. IN FILL SLIPES, A HANDRAIL $\square R$ ITHER APPRZVED PRDTECTIVE DEVICE MUST BE PRZVIDED IF A SLIPE DF GREATER THAN TWI FEET HZRIZUNTAL TU UNE FIDT VERTICAL IS LDCATED WITHIN 3 FEET DF THE EDGE DF THE TRAIL, SEE STANDARD DETAIL ST-23.
4. CLEARANCE VERTICAL $10^{\prime}$, HZRIZDNTAL $2^{\prime}$ BEYOND TRAIL EDGE. SEE STANDARD DETAIL UF-4.

|  | CITY OF MERCER ISLAND STANDARD DETAILS TRAILS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SHOULDER TRAIL |  |  |
| 11/23/99 | Na SCALE | T-5 |



## NOTES

1. SLDPE RDADWAY TD A MINIMUM DF $2 \%$
2. ALL DEPTHS ARE CDMPACTED DEPTHS.
3. IN FILL SLDPES, A HANDRAIL DR QTHER APPRDVED PRDTECTIVE DEVICE MUST BE PRDVIDED IF A SLDPE OF GREATER THAN TWD FEET HORIZQNTAL TD ONE FOUT VERTICAL IS LICATED WITHIN 3 FEET $\square F$ THE EDGE OF THE TRAIL. SEE STANDARD DETAIL ST-23.
4. CLEARANCE VERTICAL $10^{\prime}$, HORIZGNTAL $2^{\prime}$ bEYロND TRAIL EDGE. SEE STANDARD DETAIL UF-4.
5. SEE STANDARD DETAIL T-15A\&B FGR SIDEWALK DETAILS.



## NOTES

1. SLIPE tD match existing rdadway.
2. ALL DEPTHS ARE CDMPACTED DEPTHS.
3. IN FILL SLIPES, A HANDRAIL QR OTHER APPROVED PROTECTIVE DEVICE MUST BE PROVIDED If a slape af Greater than Twa feet harizantal ta ane fait vertical is lacated WITHIN 3 FEET a the edge aF THE TRAIL. SEE STANDARD DETAIL ST-23.
4. CLEARANCE VERTICAL 10', HORIZONTAL $2^{\prime}$ BEYロND TRAIL EDGE. SEE STANDARD DETAIL UF-4.

|  | CITY OF MERCER ISLAND STANDARD DETAILS TRAILS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SEPARATED PATH |  |  |
| 11/23/99 | ND SCALE | T-8 |




## NOTES

1. MINIMUM SLIPE SHDULD BE $2 \%$.
2. ALL DEPTHS ARE CIMPACTED DEPTHS.
3. IN FILL SLDPES, A HANDRAIL QR पTHER APPRDVED PRDTECTIVE DEVICE MUST BE PRDVIDED
 WITHIN 3 FEET DF THE EDGE DF THE TRAIL. SEE STANDARD DETAIL ST-23.
4. CLEARANCE VERTICAL 10 ', HZRIZZNTAL $2^{\prime}$ BEYロND TRAIL EDGE. SEE STANDARD DETAIL UF-4.
5. RECDMMENDED SURFACES; NATURAL, WIUD CHIPS $\square R$ CIMPACTED EARTH WHERE APPRDPRIATE.
6. EQUESTRIAN TRAILS SHALL BE SEPARATED FRDM DTHER TRAILS BY A MINIMUM DF 4 FEET.
7. MINIMUM WIDTH םNE-WAY USAGE BY HIRSE AND RIDER $2^{\prime}$ MINIMUM, 6' RECDMMENDED. 2-WAY WIDTH 8 TD 10 FEET (2’ MINIMUM TRAIL TREAD WITH 4' SIDE CLEARANCE).
8. MINIMUM SLDPES SAME AS WALKING TRAILS.
9. RZUGH CLEARED TRAILS SHZULD TAKE INTD ACCDUNT LDCAL TERRAIN PRDBLEMS TD AVDID seridus drainage and maintenance PREBLEMS.

|  | CITY OF MERCER ISLAND STANDARD DETAILS TRAILS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EQUESTRIAN TRAILS |  |  |
| 11/23/99 | N SCALE | T-10 |



NOTES

1. FUR SPECIFIC DESIGN REQUIREMENTS SEE STANDARD DETAIL ST-24 \& 25.


6-27



TYPE A - SEPARATED WALK


TYPE B - ADJACENT WALK


## CEMENT CONCRETE WALK

## NOTES

1. BRUSH FINISH TRANSVERSE TO SIDEWALK DIRECTION. TROWEL SMIDTH FIRST $2^{\prime \prime}$ AT ALL EDGES AND JUINTS WITH EDGAR.
2. INSTALL EXPANSION JDINTS AS PER STANDARD DETAIL T-16B2.
3. ALL JIINTS AND EDGES SHALL BE CLEAN AND BE RZUNDED TI 1/4" RADIUS, EXCEPT 1/2" RADIUS AT SIDEWALK EDGES. JUINTS SHALL BE FLUSH WITH THE FINISHED SURFACE.
4. ALL UTILITY PQLES, METER BQXES, ETC. IN SIDEWALK AREA SHALL HAVE A 3/8" PREMILDED JUINT FILLER, FULL DEPTH, PLACED ARIUND THEM BEFIRE PLACING CINCRETE.
5. ALL WDRK SHALL CENFORM TD THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATICNS.


## CITY OF MERCER ISLAND STANDARD DETAILS

TRAILS
DETAILS
CEMENT CONCRETE SIDEWALK

| $11 / 23 / 99$ | NO SCALE | T-16A |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |






## NOTES:

1. PRUNE MINIMALLY ZN INSTALLATION AND ZNLY AS NEEDED.
2. BRANCHES $\square N$ NEWLY PLANTED TREES MAY BE HEADED BACK TD PRDVIDE CLEARANCE AND RETAIN LEAF AREA.
3. PRUNING ESTABLISHED TREES SHALL CZNFDRM TI ANSI A300.


## Appendix B - Existing Data Inventory










## Appendix C - Prioritization Criteria

## DRAFT ADA Transition Plan Prioritization Process

## Public Right-of-Way

To focus efforts toward facilities that pose the largest barrier within the public right-of-way, an analysis of the accessibility of each pedestrian facility and its proximity to public destinations such as schools, libraries, parks, transit, and city buildings will be completed. The result of this analysis is a prioritized list of projects, with the highest benefit projects identified for removal first.

To complete this assessment, a multi-criteria analysis is conducted to determine which facilities do not meet existing sidewalks and curb ramp standards. Each attribute collected in the field is compared against PROWAG requirements.

If the facility does not meet PROWAG criteria or is located near public destinations, points are assigned, with the number of points dependent on the relative importance or proximity. Sidewalks or curb ramps with poor PROWAG compliance and a number of proximate destinations receive a high score and are prioritized for removal while PROWAG compliant ramps far from public destinations have a score of zero. Missing curb ramps are assigned the greatest number of points.

## Accessibility Prioritization (aka Accessibility Index Score)

A number of criteria are used to establish the extent to which each pedestrian facility did or did not present a barrier to accessible mobility. Table shows these criteria, the threshold used to identify them as a barrier, and the score used to indicate the severity of each barrier relative to each other. Pedestrian facilities with a higher Accessibility Index Score (AIS) presented a large accessibility barrier and have a higher score. Facilities with fewer or no barriers have a lower score.

Below is an example of typical weighted values to equal a total possible score of 30

| ACCESSIBILITY <br> INDEX SCORE | CRITERIA | THRESHOLD | SCORE | MAX. POSSIBLE SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sidewalks | Width | In ROW, < 48 inches or $>=48-<60$ inches w/ out pullouts. On-Site, <36 inches | 4 | 4 |
|  | Run Slope | $>5 \%$ (and not similar to roadway grade if in ROW) | 3 | 3 |
|  | Cross Slope Issue | > $2 \%$ | 1 | 3 |
|  | Cross Slope Issue | > $2.4 \%$ | 1 |  |
|  | Cross Slope Issue | > 3\% | 1 |  |
|  | Condition | < Average | 2 | 2 |
|  | Vertical Discontinuity Issue <br> $>1 / 4$ inch and < $=1 / 2$ inch without bevel or $>1 / 2$ inch | Barriers Present >=1 | 1 | 3 |
|  | Vertical Discontinuity Issue | Barriers Present >=5 | 1 |  |
|  | Vertical Discontinuity Issue | Barriers Present $>=10$ | 1 |  |
|  | Horizontal Discontinuity Issue | Barriers Present >=1 | I | 3 |


| ACCESSIBILITY <br> INDEX SCORE | CRITERIA | THRESHOLD | SCORE | MAX. POSSIBLE SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $>1 / 2$ inch |  |  | 3 |
|  | Horizontal Discontinuity Issue | Barriers Present >=5 | I |  |
|  | Horizontal Discontinuity Issue | Barriers Present >=10 | I |  |
|  | Fixed Obstacles | Barriers Present >=1 | I |  |
|  | Fixed Obstacles | Barriers Present > $=2$ | I |  |
|  | Fixed Obstacles | Barriers Present >=3 | I |  |
|  | Moveable Obstacles | Barriers Present > $=1$ | I | 3 |
|  | Moveable Obstacles | Barriers Present > $=2$ | I |  |
|  | Moveable Obstacles | Barriers Present >=3 | 1 |  |
|  | Protruding Obstacles | Barriers Present > ${ }^{\text {l }}$ | 1 | 3 |
|  | Protruding Obstacles | Barriers Present >=2 | I |  |
|  | Protruding Obstacles | Barriers Present >=3 | I |  |
|  | Non-Compliant Driveways Non-Compliant >2\% cross-slope, and/or <br> Non-Concurrent Grade Break and/or >8.3\% Running Slope | Barriers Present >=1 | I | 3 |
|  | Non-Compliant Driveways | Barriers Present > $=2$ | I |  |
|  | Non-Compliant Driveways | Barriers Present >=3 | I |  |
|  | Maximum Sidewalk (AIS) S | ore |  | 30 |
| Curb Ramps (Max. Score) | Ramp Width | $<48$ inches | 30 | 30 |
|  | Ramp Running Slope | $\begin{aligned} & >8.3 \% \text { (less than } 15-\mathrm{ft} \text { ) or } \\ & >5 \% \text { (Blended) } \end{aligned}$ | 30 | 30 |
|  | Ramp Cross Slope Issue | $>2 \%$-<=3\% | 20 | 30 |
|  | Ramp Cross Slope Issue | > 3\% | 10 |  |
|  | Curb Ramp Type | Non-Compliant Type | 30 | 30 |
| Curb Ramps | Accessible Path | No | 2 | 2 |
|  | Turning Space | None or width < full width of ramp or length < 48 inches | 5 | 5 |
|  | Turning Space Cross Slope | $>2 \%$ | 3 | 3 |
|  | Flare Slope | >10\% | 2 | 2 |
|  | Receiving Ramp | No | 2 | 2 |
|  | Truncated Domes (DWS) | No | 3 | 3 |
|  | Truncated Domes (DWS) Placement | Other than Back of Curb | I | 3 |
|  | Truncated Domes (DWS) Depth | $<2$ feet | I |  |
|  | Truncated Domes (DWS) Width | Less than Full Width | I |  |
|  | Grade Break | Not Concurrent | 2 | 2 |
|  | Counter Slope | >5\% | 2 | 2 |
|  | Lip | > $1 / 4$ inch | 2 | 2 |


| ACCESSIBILITY <br> INDEX SCORE | CRITERIA | THRESHOLD | SCORE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MAX. } \\ & \text { POSSIBLE } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | End inside of Marked Crosswalk if present | No | 2 | 2 |
|  | Roadway Clear Space | $<4 \mathrm{ft} \times 4 \mathrm{ft}$ | 2 | 2 |
|  | Maximum Sidewalk (AIS) Score |  |  | 30 |
| Signal Pushbuttons | Curb Distance | Pushbutton less than 10 feet from curb $=$ No | 2 | 2 |
|  | Crosswalk Extension Distance | Pushbutton less than 5 feet from the extension of the crosswalk line $=$ No | 2 | 2 |
|  | Force Less Than 5lbs | Pushbutton Force less than 5 pounds $=$ No | 2 | 2 |
|  | Vibe Feedback | Pushbutton provides vibratory feedback when pushed = No | 2 | 2 |
|  | Button Size and Visual Contrast | Pushbutton size meets minimum 2-inch diameter with visual contrast from housing $=$ No | 2 | 2 |
|  | Distance of 2 Buttons on Same Corner | Distance between pushbuttons on the same corner less than 10 feet and audible indication of WALK interval in speech = No | 2 | 2 |
|  | Reach Depth from Landing | Reach depth from pushbutton to the landing is less than 10 inches $=$ No | 2 | 2 |
|  | Mounting Height | Mounting height of pushbutton from landing area is $<42$ inches or $>48$ inches | 2 | 2 |
|  | Tactile Arrow | Tactile Arrow provided = No | 2 | 2 |
|  | Directional Arrow | Directional arrow on pushbutton face, housing, or mounting \& pushbutton with parallel orientation to crosswalk direction $=$ No | 2 | 2 |
|  | Level Clear Space | Level clear space provided at pushbutton (min. 30 " $\times$ 48") landing area provided with less than a $2 \%$ cross slope in any direction $=$ No | 2 | 2 |
|  | Both Audible Tone during "Walk" Cycle and Audible Speech during "Walk" Cycle | Audible indication of WALK interval in tone = No and Audible indication of WALK interval in speech $=$ No | 2 | 2 |
|  | Locator Tone during "Don't Walk" Cycle | Locator tone operates during DON'T WALK and flashing DON'T WALK intervals $=$ No | 2 | 2 |


| ACCESSIBILITY <br> INDEX SCORE | CRITERIA | THRESHOLD | SCORE | MAX. POSSIBLE SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Braille Street Name | Braille correctly showing street name $=$ No and audible indication of street name at any time $=$ No | 2 | 2 |
|  | APS Style Housing | Housing is APS Style $=$ No | 2 | 2 |
|  | Maximum Signal Pushbutton (AIS) Score |  |  | 30 |
| Crosswalks | Width | $<6$ feet | 6 | 6 |
|  | Run Slope | $>5 \%$ | 12 | 12 |
|  | Cross Slope | $>5 \%$ at Non-Stop/Yield Controlled Intersections or $>2 \%$ at any other type except for mid-block crossings | 12 | 12 |
|  | Maximum Crosswalk (AIS) Score |  |  | 30 |
| Bus Stops | Boarding Area Dimensions | < 5'x8' or no boarding area | 8 | 8 |
|  | Condition | Poor | 5 | 5 |
|  | Boarding Area Cross Slope | > 2\% | 5 | 5 |
|  | Boarding Area Run Slope | $>5 \%$ and not similar to roadway grade | 4 | 4 |
|  | Accessible Route Slope | $>5 \%$ and not similar to roadway grade (if separation between boarding area and shelter) | 4 | 4 |
|  | Shelter Cross Slope | > $2 \%$ (If there is a shelter) | 4 | 4 |
|  | Maximum Bus Stop (AIS) Score |  |  | 30 |
| Parking Stalls | Stall Width | If regular stall, < 96 inches. If van accessible stall, < 132 inches and adjacent aisle is < 96 inches. | 4 | 4 |
|  | Stall Turning Slope | > 2\% | 4 | 4 |
|  | Stall Pavement Marking | No Marking | 3 | 3 |
|  | Sign Present | No Sign | 2 | 2 |
|  | Sign Height | < 60 inches | I | I |
|  | Wheelstop or Curb Present | No Wheelstop/Curb (and not a parallel stall) | 2 | 2 |
|  | Vertical Clearance | $<98$ inches and a van accessible parking stall | 2 | 2 |
|  | Adjacent Walkway Width | For parallel on-street parking with a sidewalk <= 14 feet wide nearby, stall is not at end of block. If sidewalk is > 14 feet wide, no access aisle provided in | 2 | 2 |


| ACCESSIBILITY <br> INDEX SCORE | CRITERIA | THRESHOLD | SCORE | MAX. POSSIBLE SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | road parallel to stall or access aisle is $<5$ feet wide. |  |  |
|  | Connected to Access Aisle (Max. Score) | No Access Aisle | 10 | 10 |
|  | Connected to Accessible Path | Not Connected | 2 |  |
|  | Access Aisle Width | < 60 inches | 3 |  |
|  | Access Aisle Turning Slope | > $2 \%$ | 3 |  |
|  | Pavement Marking | No Hatching | 2 |  |
|  | Maximum Parking Stall (AIS) Score |  |  | 30 |
| Pedestrian Railroad Crossings | Flange Gap | > 3 inches wide | 10 | 10 |
|  | DWS | No DWS | 10 | 10 |
|  | DWS Placement | < 6 feet or > 15 feet from edge of nearest rail, or No DWS | 10 | 10 |
|  | Maximum Railroad Crossing (AIS) Score |  |  | 30 |


| ACCESSIBILITY INDEX SCORE | CRITERIA | THRESHOLD | SCORE | MAX. POSSIBLE SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADA Parking Stalls | Stall Width | If regular stall, < 96 inches. If van accessible stall, < 132 inches and adjacent aisle is < 96 inches. | 4 | 4 |
|  | Stall Turning Slope | > $2 \%$ | 4 | 4 |
|  | Stall Pavement Marking | No Marking | 3 | 3 |
|  | Sign Present | No Sign | 2 | 2 |
|  | Sign Height | < 60 inches | 1 | 1 |
|  | Wheelstop or Curb Present | No Wheelstop/Curb (and not a parallel stall) | 2 | 2 |
|  | Vertical Clearance | $<98$ inches and a van accessible parking stall | 2 | 2 |
|  | Adjacent Walkway Width | For parallel on-street parking with a sidewalk <= 14 feet wide nearby, stall is not at end of block. If sidewalk is > 14 feet wide, no access aisle provided in road parallel to stall or access aisle is $<5$ feet wide. | 2 | 2 |


| ACCESSIBILITY <br> INDEX SCORE | CRITERIA | THRESHOLD | SCORE | MAX. POSSIBLE SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Connected to Access Aisle (Max. Score) | No Access Aisle | 10 | 10 |
|  | Connected to Accessible Path | Not Connected | 2 |  |
|  | Access Aisle Width | < 60 inches | 3 |  |
|  | Access Aisle Turning Slope | > 2\% | 3 |  |
|  | Pavement Marking | No Hatching | 2 |  |
|  | Maximum Parking Stall (AIS) Score |  |  | 30 |
| Wheelchair Ramps | Rise | $>30$ inches | 3 | 3 |
|  | Run Slope | > 8.3\% | 3 | 3 |
|  | Cross Slope | > $2 \%$ | 3 | 3 |
|  | Width | $\begin{aligned} & <4 \text { feet if in ROW, }<3 \\ & \text { feet if on-site } \end{aligned}$ | 3 | 3 |
|  | Top Landing Length | $<5$ feet or no top landing | I | I |
|  | Bottom Landing Length | < 5 feet or no bottom landing | I | I |
|  | Top Landing Width | < Ramp width or < 5 ft if ramp requires change in direction at landing or no top landing | I | I |
|  | Bottom Landing Width | < Ramp width or < 5 ft if ramp requires change in direction at landing or no bottom landing | I | I |
|  | Top Landing Cross Slope | > $2 \%$ or no top landing | I | I |
|  | Bottom Landing Cross Slope | > $2 \%$ or no bottom landing | I | I |
|  | Extended Ramp <br> Surface/Edge Barrier | No extended ramp surface or < 12 inches and no barrier or barrier opening $>=4$ inches | I | I |
|  | Grade Breaks | One or both ends not concurrent | I | I |
|  | Handrail <br> Placement (Max. <br> Score) | No handrails present and rise > 6 inches | 10 | 10 |
|  | Handrail Placement | Handrail on one side only and rise > 6 inches | 2 |  |
|  | Handrail Height | $<34$ inches or > 38 inches | I |  |
|  | Handrail Clearance | < 1.5 inches | I |  |
|  | Handrail Grip Surface Obstructed | > 20\% obstructed | I |  |
|  | Handrail Cross Section | If circular, diameter < 1.25 inches or $>2$ inches If non-circular, perimeter < 4 inches or $>6$ inches | I |  |
|  | Handrail Top Extension Slope | Not horizontal and/or doesn't begin at first | I |  |


| ACCESSIBILITY <br> INDEX SCORE | CRITERIA | THRESHOLD | SCORE | MAX. <br> POSSIBLE <br> SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | nosing, or no top extension |  |  |
|  | Handrail Top Extension Length | < 12 inches | I |  |
|  | Handrail Bottom Extension Slope | Not horizontal and/or doesn't begin at bottom of ramp, or no bottom extension | I |  |
|  | Handrail Bottom Extension Length | $<12$ inches | I |  |
|  | Maximum Wheelchair Ramp (AIS) Score |  |  | 30 |
| Staircases | Riser | $<4$ inches or > 7 inches | 4 | 4 |
|  | Tread | < 11 inches | 4 | 4 |
|  | Tread Cross Slope | $>2 \%$ | 3 | 3 |
|  | Contrasting Strip | If no contrasting strips and staircase within ROW | 2 | 2 |
|  | Contrasting Strip Placement/ Width/ Length | If there are strips and they're placed elsewhere than front of steps AND/OR <br> If there are strips and they're < 2 inches AND/OR <br> If there are strips and they're less than the full width of each step | 1 | 1 |
|  | Nosing Radius | $>0.5$ inches | 2 | 2 |
|  | Riser Slope | > 30 degrees | 2 | 2 |
|  | Tread Projection | $>1.5$ inches | 2 | 2 |
|  | Handrail <br> Placement (Max. <br> Score) | No handrails present | 10 |  |
|  | Handrail Placement | Handrail on one side only | 2 |  |
|  | Handrail Height | < 34 inches or > 38 inches | 1 |  |
|  | Handrail Clearance | < 1.5 inches | 1 |  |
|  | Handrail Grip Surface Obstructed | > 20\% obstructed | I |  |
|  | Handrail Cross Section | If circular, diameter < 1.25 inches or > 2 inches If non-circular, perimeter < 4 inches or $>6$ inches | 1 | 10 |
|  | Handrail Top Extension Slope | Not horizontal and/or doesn't begin at first nosing, or no top extension | I |  |
|  | Handrail Top Extension Length | < 12 inches | I |  |
|  | Handrail Bottom Extension Slope | Not same slope as stairway or no bottom extension | I |  |


| ACCESSIBILITY <br> INDEX SCORE | CRITERIA | THRESHOLD | SCORE | MAX. POSSIBLE SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Handrail Bottom Extension Length | < Tread width | 1 |  |
|  | Maximum Staircase (AIS) Score |  |  | 30 |

## Location Prioritization (aka Location Index Score)

A number of destinations are used to identify high priority pedestrian facilities within the City. This is done by identifying public destinations such as public buildings, transit and parks and identifying pedestrian facilities within close proximity of one or more of these destinations.
Pedestrian facilities within the identified proximity were assigned points based on each destination they were close to, as shown in Table. This measure is called the Location Index Score (LIS), which identifies high pedestrian generating overlapping areas. Ultimately the more pedestrian generating areas an asset is within, the higher number. Community Defined Destinations criteria is added to the Location Index Score (LIS) following comments and results received from open house attendees, City staff, other stakeholders during engagement and public outreach. This assists in factoring in what's important to the citizens and community to help with the overall prioritization.
Below is an example of typical weighted values to equal a total possible score of 45

| LOCATION CRITERIA | RATING CRITERIA | $\begin{aligned} & \text { POSSIBLE } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schools |  |  |
| Proximity to Schools | Within $1 / 8$-mile radius of school | 5 |
| Walk-To-School Route Proximity | Within $1 / 2$-mile radius of school | 5 |
| Parks | Within $1 / 8$-mile radius of park | 5 |
| Transit |  |  |
| High-Capacity Transit / Park and Ride | Within $1 / 8$-mile of park and ride or highcapacity transit | 5 |
| Bus Stops | Within $1 / 8$-mile of transit stop | 5 |
| Traffic Signal/Roundabout | Within $1 / 8$-mile of signal or roundabout | 5 |
| Public Buildings | Within $1 / 8$-mile of location | 5 |
| Downtown / Urban / Commercial Business Centers | Within $1 / 4$-mile radius of Downtown, Urban and Commercial Business Center Zoning | 5 |
| Community Defined Destinations (defined by Stakeholder/Public Engagement*) | Within $1 / 8$-mile of location | 5 |
| TOTAL LOCATION INDEX SCORE (LIS) |  | 45 |

## Barrier Removal Priorities (Combined Composite Index Score)

By combining the Accessibility Index Score and Location Index Score, a Combined Composite Index Score was developed. Together, these measures prioritize barrier removal at locations where pedestrian facilities present a barrier and where pedestrians would be expected.

Facilities with the highest score should be addressed first (46+ points) and represent facilities that present a clear physical barrier and are in high-demand areas. Facilities with lower scores should be address last ( 0 to 15 points), have minor barriers, and are in locations where pedestrian demand would be expected to be lower. These scores are relative, comparing one facility to the other. The ranges for medium and high priority were defined based on review of the identified barriers and assessment of the relative barrier they present. It should be noted that while some barriers have a lower priority, they still should be removed.

## Public Parks \& Buildings

## Parks \& Building Accessibility Index Score

The Department of Justice (CFR Title 28) provides criteria to be used to establish the priority of each type of barrier. As barriers are identified during the self-assessment, priority levels are assigned and recorded for each barrier. Once the self-assessment is complete, a Park \& Building Accessibility Index Score (PBAIS) is calculated for each barrier based on its assigned priority level. Facilities with a higher PBAIS score represent higher priority barriers while facilities assigned lower priority levels have a lower score. Table 3 shows the priority levels and the number of possible points assigned to barriers for each priority level.

| PUBLIC PARKS \& BUILDING ACCESSIBILITY INDEX SCORE | RATING CRITERIA | $\begin{aligned} & \text { POSSIBLE } \\ & \text { SCORE } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Priority I | Provision of access to a place of public accommodation from public sidewalks, parking or public transportation. (entrance ramps, widening entrances, accessible parking etc.) | 30 |
| Priority 2 | Provision of access to those places where goods and services are made available. (revising interior routes, adjusting layout of tables, signage, doorways and ramps) | 20 |
| Priority 3 | Provisions of accessible restrooms. (Widening doorways, widening restroom stalls, | 10 |
| Priority 4 | Modifications to provide access to the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations. (public phones, water fountains etc.) | 0 |
| TOTAL PUBLIC PARKS \& BUILDING ACCESSIBILITY INDEX SCORE (PBAIS) |  | 30 |

## Parks \& Building Location Index Score

Similar to the Location Index Score for Public ROW, each barrier for parks and buildings are assigned a LIS based on the relative importance of the facility in which the barrier is located. Several criteria are used to identify high priority facilities within the City with points awarded for each criterion. Values can be revised per comments received from open house attendees, City staff, other stakeholders during engagement and public outreach. Below is an example of typical weighted values to equal a total possible score of 45 .

| PUBLIC PARKS \& BUILDING CRITERIA | RATING CRITERIA | POSSIBLE SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level of Public Use | Low(2) Medium(5) High(8) | 8 |
| Unique Public Programs | Facility with unique public programs (Y/N) | 7 |
| Critical Public Programs | Low(2) Medium(5) High(8) | 8 |
| Public Input / Identified Complaints | Facility has been identified to be an issue by public complaints (Y/N) | 7 |
| Social Equality | Facility serves historically underserved populations (Y/N) | 7 |
| Level of Investment | <\$500(8) < \$5,000(5) > \$5,000(2) | 8 |
| TOTAL PARKS \& BUILDING LOCATION INDEX SCORE (PBLIS) |  | 45 |

## Barrier Removal Priorities (Combined Composite Index Score)

By combining the Accessibility Index Score and Location Index Score, a Composite Index Score is calculated. Together, these measures prioritize barrier removal at locations where pedestrian facilities present a barrier and where pedestrians would be expected.
Facilities with the highest score should be addressed first ( $46+$ points) and represent facilities that present a clear physical barrier and are in high-demand/high-importance locations. Facilities with lower scores should be address last ( 0 to 15 points), have minor barriers, and are in locations where pedestrian demand would be expected to be lower. These scores are relative, comparing one facility to the other. The ranges for medium and high priority were defined based on review of the identified barriers and assessment of the relative barrier they present.

## School Buildings \& Common Areas

## School Buildings \& Common Areas Accessibility Index Score

A number of criteria are used to identify high priority facilities on the UW Bothell/Cascadia Community College campus. This was done by identifying buildings, and common areas and how much the facility is utilized by the public.
Facilities identified were assigned points based on each several criteria, as shown in Table 5. This measure was called the Building and Common Area Accessibility Index Score (BCAIS). Intermediate scores may be used for buildings that may lay between the designated priority levels, if a building falls between two designated levels, use the value midway between the designated possible scores. For example, a score of 25 would be given to a building that is between Priority 1 and 2. Facilities with a higher BCAIS values presented a large accessibility barrier, facilities with fewer or no barriers have a lower scores.

| BUILDINGS \& COMMON AREA |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| ACCESSIBILITY INDEX SCORE |\(\left.\quad \begin{array}{c}POSSIBLE <br>


SCORE\end{array}\right]\)| RATING CRITERIA |
| :--- |

## School Buildings \& Common Areas Location Index Score

Facilities identified were assigned points based on each several criteria, as shown in Table 6. Buildings and common areas are assigned scores based on the presence of different facilities, as shown in Table 6 , regardless of the accessibility of the facility in question. For example, a building that contains admin facilities, classrooms, and study rooms would receive a score of 23 even if the admin facility is the only inaccessible area. Very few buildings are expected to receive maximum scores, as such higher values were assigned to higher priority facility types. Facilities may be reordered based on student or institution comments.

| BUILDINGS \& COMMON AREA |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| LOCATION INDEX SCORE |  | POSSIBLE |
| SOATING CRITERIA | SCORE |  |
| Admin Facilities |  | 10 |
| Faculty Offices |  | 8 |
| Classrooms |  | 7 |
| Library/Study Rooms/Computer Lab |  | 6 |
| Student Gathering Areas |  | 4 |
| Dining/Food Service Facilities |  | 3 |
| Housing |  | 2 |
| Maintenance Facilities |  | 45 |
| TOTAL BUILDINGS \& COMMON AREA LOCATION INDEX SCORE (BCLIS) | 4 |  |

## Barrier Removal Priorities (Combined Composite Index Score)

By combining the BCAIS and the BCLIS together, a Composite Index Score (CCIS) was developed. Together, these measures prioritize barrier removal at locations where pedestrian facilities present a barrier and where pedestrians would be expected.

Facilities with the highest score should be addressed first ( $46+$ points) and represent facilities that present a clear physical barrier and are in high-demand areas. Facilities with lower scores should be address last ( 0 to 15 points), have minor barriers, and are in locations where pedestrian demand would be expected to be lower. These scores are relative, comparing one facility to the other. The ranges for medium and high priority were defined based on review of the identified barriers and assessment of the relative barrier they present. It should be noted that while some barriers have a lower priority, they still should be removed.

## Appendix D - Facilities \& Parks Survey Report

## City of Mercer Island, WA

## ADA Accessibility Survey Report
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Transpo Group
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Attn: Mr. Ryan Peterson
Submitted on December 1, 2021


Accessibility Consulting | ADA-FHA Compliance

December 1, 2021

Attn: Mr. Ryan Peterson<br>Via Email: Ryan.Peterson@transpogroup.com<br>Transpo Group<br>12131 113th Ave. NE<br>Kirkland, WA 98034

## Re: Proj07-ADA Facility Survey Report City of Mercer Island, Mercer Island, WA <br> E\&A Project \#20.1036.6

## Dear Ryan:

Endelman \& Associates PLLC (E\&A) is pleased to present this ADA Facility Survey Report in PDF format. This report is an assessment of compliance of the vertical elements only of select City of Mercer Island facilities with the Americans with Disabilities Act using the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design, as discussed more fully in the Overview / Executive Summary section. We trust you will find the report thorough and useful.

The Overview / Executive Summary explains the survey context. This leads to an important recommendation: E\&A recommends that anyone receiving a copy of any portion of the report data be provided the Overview / Executive Summary section. This section answers many questions and helps ensure that the data is used properly.

It has been our pleasure working with you, and we will be glad to provide you with any clarifications you require regarding the contents in our report.

Sincerely,


Jody L. Meldrum
Consultant


David Machemer Senior Consultant


Bart Sanderson, CASp
Associate, Technical Director Transpo-Proj07-CityofMercerIsland-ADASurvey-CvrLtrFINAL
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## Section 3 - ADA SURVEY RESULTS

Matrix followed by Captioned Photo Pages for each location

For each of the following facilities, sorted by location \#, a detailed Matrix of observed issues and captioned photo pages have been provided, in the following order.

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 77th Avenue SE Landing |
| 2 | Aubrey Davis Park |
| 3 | Bicentennial Park |
| 4 | Boat Launch |
| 5 | Calkins Landing |
| 6 | Clarke Beach |
| 7 | Clise Park |
| 8 | Community and Events Center |
| 9 | Deane's Children's Park |
| 10 | Ellis Pond |
| 11 | First Hill Park |
| 12 | Forest Landing |
| 13 | Franklin Landing |
| 14 | Fruitland Landing |
| 15 | Garfield Landing |
| 16 | Groveland Beach |
| 17 | Homestead Park |
| 18 | Island Crest Park |
| 19 | Lincoln Landing |
| 20 | Luther Burbank Park |
| 21 | Luther Burbank Park Administration Building \& Caretaking Facility |
| 22 | Main Fire Station \#91 |
| 23 | Maintenance Hall |
| 24 | Mercer Island City Hall |
| 25 | Mercerdale Park |
| 26 | Miller Landing |
| 27 | Pioneer Park |


| 28 | Proctor Landing |
| :---: | :--- |
| 29 | Roanoke Landing |
| 30 | Roanoke Park |
| 31 | Rotary Park |
| 32 | Secret Park |
| 33 | Slater Park |
| 34 | South Fire Station \#92 |
| 35 | South Mercer Playfields |
| 36 | Wildwood Park |
| 37 | Youth and Family Services Thrift Shop \& Recycling Center |

# Transpo Group City of Mercer Island, WA ADA FACILITY SURVEY REPORT 

Prepared by: Endelman \& Associates PLLC - December 1, 2021

## I. OVERVIEW / SCOPE OF SERVICES

Transpo Group contracted with Endelman \& Associates PLLC (E\&A) to perform an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Survey of vertical elements for public areas of 37 facilities owned by the City of Mercer Island, WA. This ADA Facility Survey Report is an effort to identify observed barriers to program accessibility in the public areas of existing City facilities for compliance with the "program accessibility" requirements of Title II of the ADA.

As per our specific scope of work, E\&A did not cite "horizontal elements" such as number of and requirements for parking spaces, access aisles, curb ramp and accessible routes, including stability of surface, level changes, slopes, stairs, ramps, and handrails.

E\&A is responsible for citing "vertical elements" (excluding handrails at stairs) including buildings, toilet rooms, benches, drinking fountains, trash, recycling and dog waste receptacles, play areas, bleachers, dugouts, picnic shelters and tables, boardwalks, raised patios, and signage. Accordingly, when an element is located along an unpaved path, E\&A cites the element and any clearances required, but not the path itself, which is beyond our scope of work. However, when an element is not located adjacent an accessible pathway, E\&A cites clearances and the accessible route from the nearest path (regardless of whether that path is currently paved) up to elements in a given area.

When vertical elements are adjacent to an unpaved path that would be difficult to make readily accessible (such as a grade that is too steep or uneven from roots or large stones), E\&A assumes these elements will not be made accessible and does not cite elements on such an inaccessible pathway.

It is important to understand the facilities are one component of City program accessibility, and E\&A's scope of work is limited to facility access only. Additionally, there may be many available programmatic solutions for facility access, such as relocating programs to alternate accessible locations. However, the focus of this report is on removing physical barriers at each facility in order to provide enduring program access.

This ADA Facility Survey was performed to assess observed barriers under the ADA located in areas and facilities accessible to the public. Employee-only (or staff areas) were not assessed or part of E\&A's scope of work. Specifically excluded are assessments of staff-only (employee) areas where the public is not given self-directed access. Under Title I of the ADA, the City must make "reasonable accommodation" to employees with disabilities. However, staff-only areas are beyond E\&A's scope of work. In facilities subject to the ADA the common areas of the employee areas fall under Title II. Corridors, toilet rooms, kitchenettes, and break rooms are considered "common areas" for which Title II is applicable).

E\&A is also providing preliminary "Recommended Solutions" to remove each barrier, along with itemized budget costs. Title II of the ADA requires Owners to remove barriers to programs over time to the extent that it is "does not cause an undue burden." In this report, the "Owner" refers to the City of Mercer Island.

This report does not evaluate whether the facility was constructed in full compliance with the applicable building code accessibility provisions in force at the time of the original permit, or during any subsequent renovations. Note building code accessibility compliance is not enforced retroactively. However, ADA compliance is retroactive and is a civil rights law that presents the biggest exposure from a risk management perspective. It is important to note that in obtaining a building permit for any areas to be renovated for ADA compliance, there may be some more stringent dimensional aspects under the current building Code that would also apply.

This survey does not address "auxiliary aids" or operational issues ensuring that people with disabilities are not denied equivalent services, such as provision of interpreters or braille printed material.

The field ADA Facility Surveys for the properties were conducted using proven ADA Survey instruments and calibrated measurement tools. Collected data was reviewed and analyzed, and recommended preliminary solutions were developed and are presented in this ADA Facility Survey Report. We used E\&A's custom Survey Solutions ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ software database to generate the ADA Survey Results section. The field ADA Surveys were performed during June, July, and August 2021.

Please see Section III, ADA Survey Report, for details and format. Each item in the ADA Survey Results for each facility that follows this Overview \& Executive Summary includes the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design Citation (ADAS), the Observed Barrier, Location, General Priority (PR), a "Sufficiency" Code, and a Comments field per item. (Please see "Survey Legend" in Appendix B for definitions.)

The Report includes captioned photographs of typical or unique conditions.

## ADA Survey Standard

This survey is an assessment to determine compliance with ADA using the 2010 ADA Standards. The 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design (ADAS), and Regulations under 28 CFR Part 36, were adopted 09/15/10 to replace the original 1991 ADA (with its ADA Accessibility Guidelines [ADAAG] Appendix section revision dated July 1, 1994). Under Title II, there was an 18 month "grace period" which has expired, during which the 1991 Standards or the 2010 ADA Standards (ADAS) may be used. A single standard must be selected in its entirety for ADA compliance of all elements of a facility, and "cherry picking" portions of each is not permitted. The project was surveyed using the new 2010 ADAS in full force effective March 15, 2012.

All facilities built after January 23, 1993 should have been constructed in full compliance with the ADA per the 1991 Standards. Per Title II of the ADA, existing public sector facilities are subject to the continuing obligation to make facilities readily accessible to the extent that is not structurally impracticable.

The new regulations offer "safe harbor" for "elements" that were built or altered between 1992 and 2012 and that conform to the original 1991 ADA Standards. Any such elements that meet the 1991 Standards can remain in place indefinitely until such time as they are physically altered. As an example, light switches installed at 54 inches above the floor in conformance with the old ADAAG may remain in place until they are altered in future remodeling projects, even though the 2010 ADAS require light switches to be installed no higher than 48 inches above the floor.

In some instances, the 2010 ADAS is more stringent, but in other instances, the 2010 ADAS is less stringent than the original ADAAG, and in these cases accessibility can be reduced to the level of the 2010 ADAS. As an example, the location of an accessible toilet centerline in the original ADAAG must be 18 " exactly to a side wall. In the 2010 ADAS, the toilet may be between 16 " and 18 " to the side wall.

There are also 14 new scoping elements that must comply now with the 2010 ADAS that did not appear at all in the original ADAAG. The 14 new scoping areas include some items that apply to these facilities:
(A) Residential facilities and dwelling units (B) Amusement rides, (C) Recreational boating facilities, (D) Exercise machines and equipment, (E) Fishing piers and platforms, (F) Golf facilities, (G) Miniature golf facilities, (H) Play areas, (I) Saunas and Steam rooms, (J) Swimming pools, wading pools, and spas, (K) Shooting facilities with firing positions (L) Miscellaneous - (1) Team or player seating, (2) Accessible route to bowling lanes, (3) Accessible route in court sports facilities.

## II. OVERVIEW OF ADA REQUIREMENTS

## A. BACKGROUND

The ADA is civil rights legislation designed to extend civil rights protection to persons with disabilities. It is not a building code, although many of the technical requirements in the ADAAG and 2010 ADAS resemble technical standards of a building code. It is primarily administered by the US Department of Justice (USDOJ). A complaint can be filed by any person, and fines and other penalties may be assessed as determined by the USDOJ. In addition, the ADA includes a mechanism for the USDOJ's approval of local codes to be consistent with the requirements of the ADA.

There are four Titles to the ADA:
Title I Employment - Prohibits discrimination in hiring and requires employers to provide "reasonable accommodation" to disabled individuals with respect to job description and the workplace. Employment accessibility is/was not included in the E\&A scope of work and is not part of this report.

Title II Public Services and Transportation - Prohibits state and local governments from discrimination by requiring "program accessibility." Program accessibility can be attained by rescheduling and/or relocating programs to accessible locations or by making physical facility changes, called "structural changes" in the ADA. Program accessibility must be achieved to the extent that it does not cause "an undue burden," a significantly higher
standard than "readily achievable," applicable under Title III, which applies to privately owned "public accommodations." The City Owned Facilities surveyed for this report fall under Title II.

Title III Public Accommodations - Places of public accommodations are required to be made accessible where "it is readily achievable," with a deadline for existing facilities as of January 26, 1992. Title III is applicable to the private sector.

Title IV Telecommunications - Applies to companies providing telephone service to the public. They must offer telecommunications devices for the deaf (TDD'S), or other equipment.

## Title II applies to the ADA Surveys of Public Spaces as part of the City's "program."

Under Title II, the ADA requires public entities to remove barriers in their existing programs to the extent that it is does not cause an "undue burden." In preparing this report, E\&A was not provided confidential information on the details of the City's finances and/or annual budgeting. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the City to make the final determination of what constitutes an "undue burden" for the entity of a given year. In addition, the ADA is designed so that accessibility can be achieved over the long term. This means what is not achievable in year one (based on what constitutes an "undue burden") may be achievable at a future point in time.

Because E\&A did not survey areas within staff spaces, E\&A is not addressing any potential Title I Employee issues that may be required as "reasonable accommodation" to any disabled employees.

## B. TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS / STANDARDS

The ADAS is the current technical accessibility standard applicable when constructing new public accommodation facilities or altering existing facilities. These standards apply retroactively in requiring owners to remove barriers to existing facilities.

When implementing solutions to barrier removal, as an alternative to literally complying with a technical standard cited in 2010 ADAS, the ADA allows for an "equivalent facilitation" to accomplish barrier removal. This is acceptable to the extent that such action provides greater or equal access. For example, a pharmacy may provide a free prescription drug delivery service in lieu of renovating the entry to the pharmacy. However, the Owner should be aware that providing "operational solutions," rather than physical facility solutions, is a less enduring approach to barrier removal and may require continued training, monitoring and enforcement of staff operations.

State and local code requirements apply to buildings constructed or renovated under a building permit. These may also apply if, and when renovations are made to remove barriers. As previously stated, E\&A assessed for compliance with the currently enforceable 2010 ADA Standards only. Building code compliance is not applied retroactively, unlike the ADA. Fortunately, ADAS requirements and the current building code are an estimated $95 \%$ identical.

In addition, ADA Title II requires that the program of the trail system must be accessible. However, the 2010 ADA Standards do not yet address Developed Outdoor Recreation Areas, such as trail systems, and only detail more typical building and site standards, within property lines. Thus, Title II puts public entities in a difficult position - to make entity programs accessible without standards yet detailing what is compliant. Developed Outdoor Recreation Area standards have been under development for over 20 years with participation from a wide range of stakeholders and are proposed at some future date to be adopted by the Department of Justice as law, thus providing the necessary technical standards.

As of this date, these standards have been adopted by DOJ only for federal lands, and not for other public entities. In absence of any other adopted reasonable standard for trails, E\&A recommends the City of Mercer Island use these same standards for technical compliance of the trail and link. No one can then argue whether the most carefully developed and reasonable standards have been applied, despite not being formally adopted for use by the City.

## C. GENERAL PRIORITIES UNDER THE ADA

The ADA provides general priorities in 28 CFR Part 36.304(c) as guidance only for barrier removal in public accommodations (Title III). These would also be reasonable to apply to public entity facilities as well to help prioritize program access per Title II. These are not mandatory priorities, but rather, general guidance as to relative importance. As the Owner makes a determination of phasing and implementation priorities for barrier removal, E\&A recommends taking the ADA general priorities into account, along with other factors including budget, operational issues, and public usage data. In this report E\&A has assigned these ADA general priorities (PR) to each noted barrier for guidance only. As part of a transition plan, it is the City's responsibility to further prioritize removal of barriers to program based upon finances and program priorities to the extent that it does not cause an "undue financial burden."

## ADA Priorities per 28 CFR Part 36.304(c)

1 Provision of access to a place of public accommodation from public sidewalks, parking, or public transportation. These measures include installing entrance ramps, widening entrances, and providing accessible parking spaces/signage.
2 Provision of access to those places where goods and services are made available. These measures include revising interior routes, adjusting the layout of tables, providing Braille and raised character building signage, widening interior doors, and installing ramps.
3 Provision of accessible restrooms, such as removal of obstructing items on the route to the restroom, widening of restroom doors, widening of toilet stalls, provision of accessible plumbing fixtures, and installation of grab bars.

4 Making other modifications to provide access to the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations, such as accessible public phones and water fountains.

## III. ADA FACILITY SURVEY REPORT OVERVIEW

## A. REPORT CONTENTS AND FORMAT

This report is based upon field observations of barriers, as defined by the currently enforceable 2010 ADA Standards ( 28 CFR Part 35). The complete report for each facility includes the following:

1. The Overview/ Executive Summary includes the essential Assumptions sections
2. The Appendix includes an ADA Survey Results Legend and Abbreviation List
3. The ADA Survey Results is the detailed report of the barriers observed at each facility, with citations, and comments on ADA compliance. Please reference the ADA Survey Results Legend for more information on reading the report.
4. The Captioned Photo Pages is provided for each facility for illustrative purposes. Photos are not intended as comprehensive documentation.

All Report data is being provided in electronic format, either on our customer accessed web-based version of the Survey Solutions database or exportable to MS Excel, for the Owner to use in managing a barrier removal program.

## B. ASSUMPTIONS \& CONSIDERATIONS

This report divides Assumptions and Considerations into three categories: Facility, General, and Technical.

## Facility Assumptions

These assumptions are specific to this Transpo Group / City of Mercer Island project.

1. Public Use - E\&A treated the term "public" to mean facilities used by "other than City employees only." This may include City residents, school groups, vendors, and other similar outside users.
2. Operations and Program Information - E\&A was provided with limited program information concerning facility operations. Solutions for barrier removal were developed based upon our observations of existing conditions and the program information provided.
3. Department Office Spaces - This ADA Facility Survey Report addresses public program areas of facilities. In a typical administrative office, this might include a public information counter and/or a conference room (spaces where the public may be directed unescorted). E\&A did not survey staff areas unless noted herein. If the public is allowed into these areas, the assumption is that the public would only do so in an escorted manner, where any assistance (such as an inaccessible door knob) could be provided by the person escorting. Title I of the ADA covers employee issues, and the city needs to make reasonable accommodations to employees with disabilities, on a personal basis, not a prescriptive standard.
4. Properties Surveyed - The list of properties surveyed was selected by the City.
5. Public Rights-of-Way - The surveys by E\&A did not include the public right-of-way sidewalks and curb ramps. Public right-of-way sidewalks and curb ramps are part of the City's program but are beyond the scope of this survey and report. Refer to the Transpo report for these areas. Note that final technical standards for public rights-of-way have not been issued by the Access Board or adopted by DOJ at this time. The Proposed standards (commonly called PROWAG) are in draft form only and should be used only for guidance. ADAS is recommended for use as a reasonable standard to the extent technically feasible, and E\&A used this standard in our survey.
6. Park Facilities - Note that technical standards for outdoor developed public recreation areas have not been issued by the Access Board or adopted by DOJ at this time. Specifically excluded from this survey are outdoor trails. Vertical elements that are provided within these areas were only assessed if applicable for height and clear floor space. ADAS is recommended as a reasonable standard to the extent technically feasible, and E\&A used this standard in our survey for accessible routes in developed areas of the park. For undeveloped areas of the park where trails exist, we recommend using the outdoor recreation standard as described above.
7. City Policies for Equivalent Facilitation - E\&A is not aware of any formal or informal policies currently used in facilities to provide an equivalent facilitation. E\&A recommends all such operational policies be formally adopted in writing, and signage be posted in a conspicuous location to allow customers to note such available equivalent services
8. E\&A Recommended Solutions - The solutions proposed in our survey are recommendations based upon survey observations and our experience, and do not reflect any design study. There may be alternative compliant solutions. For some items, E\&A indicated "further design study required" where the solution requires detailed study, or where there is no obvious solution. In retrofits, accessibility must be provided to the maximum extent technically feasible. Proposed solutions also may not take into account notable aesthetic considerations which could modify or increase the cost of implementing the solution in an acceptable way.
9. Door Maneuvering Space - E\&A's report uses the term "level" for door maneuvering space, clear floor space, and landings at ramps. In this context "level" means having a slope in all directions no more than $2 \%(1: 48)$ per ADAS requirements, which is a slope of $1 / 4$ " per foot. This is considered level per ADAS.
10. Plumbing Fixture Counts - E\&A did not perform an analysis of plumbing code requirements to determine if the minimum number of plumbing fixtures is provided in each room or space.
11. Owner Items - Some recommendations indicate "Owner Items" and carry no cost for removal. Since the City maintains in-house forces that may be responsible for general building maintenance and small projects, it will be more cost efficient to have City staff address these relatively minor issues.
12. Public Areas versus Staff Areas - Only public areas were surveyed for purposes of identifying and correcting barriers as part of this survey. Staff work areas would be included as part of a reasonable accommodation per Title I of the ADA.
13. Vehicle Charging Stations - There are currently no enforceable standards for charging stations. E\&A recommends that where provided, an accessible route from the building entry be provided to the charging stations. This is to include a 60 " access aisle on one side that will give access to the charger. E\&A also recommends having the operable control within the required reach range.
14. Specific Facility Assumptions - Refer to below for specific assumptions and for specific horizontal elements not surveyed as part of E\&A's scope of work.

Although E\&A did not cite existing routes, E\&A did cite required accessible routes where no route currently exists, such as routes to picnic tables, benches, trash receptacles, dog waste stations, beaches or play areas located in lawns or other areas with no discernable pathways leading to the elements.

E\&A did not cite vertical elements for accessible parking along the street if street parking was not clearly indicated at the property.

At Luther Burbank Park, the Pea Patch did not appear to be clearly divided between individual users by easily discernable modules or areas. Accordingly, E\&A only cited required accessible route the full length of the Pea Patch from south to north in the center (where clearance between patches appears widest).

At Luther Burbank Administration Building, a new elevator shaft is cited as required to provide an accessible route between floors. This requirement could potentially be satisfied (for program access) by reallocation of all programs onto the ground floor connected by accessible routes from accessible entrances.

## General Assumptions

1. Operations and Program Information - E\&A was provided limited general information concerning facility operations. The report was developed based upon E\&A's observations of existing conditions and programmatic information provided. The facilities were surveyed, and solutions derived based upon the current use as observed.
2. ADAS Amendments - The 2010 ADA Standards may be periodically amended by The Access Board and adopted by DOJ. The ADA Facility Survey Report and citations applied were based upon the ADAS currently enforceable by USDOJ at the time of conducting the field survey. Amendments issued in the Federal Register as adopted by the Department of Justice subsequent to the issuance of the report may affect future barrier removal plans.
3. "Undue Burden" and Barrier Removal - The Public Entity is solely responsible for determining when program accessibility does not cause an undue burden based upon the Owner's current finances. Generally, where the Consultant has made a recommendation to not remove a barrier at the present time, it is only if the cost appeared extremely high and only if minor increased accessibility would be achieved as a result of this removal. Such recommendations should be reviewed by the Owner at intervals over time, as finances may change.
4. Reasonable Accommodation to Employees - Under the ADA Title I, staff areas of existing facilities need not be changed unless an employee (or potential employee) with a disability requests a reasonable accommodation be provided. Note that actual accommodations required by an individual with a disability will depend upon their specific needs. Also note that if currently designated "staff" areas were changed into designated "public" areas in the future, it may require removing additional barriers to satisfy ADA requirements for public use.
5. Building Code - The 2018 IBC / ICC A117.1-2009 with local amendments may be applicable when securing a building permit for renovations requiring such a permit. There may be some deviations from ADAS in dimensional requirements for accessibility, which should be verified prior to construction. E\&A has attempted to take these into account in our recommended solutions.
6. Code Required Accessibility Expenditures - Alteration projects completely distinct from an ADA project may trigger the building code "percentage of cost for path of travel compliance" rules. These regulations require that a portion of the total money spent on renovation be spent to improve the accessibility of the building. Therefore, it would be prudent to evaluate the long-term facility uses and renovation plans prior to implementing ADA barrier removal, to perform work most cost effectively.
7. No Testing of Hidden Conditions or Alarms - Barrier removal solutions were based upon field observations of existing conditions. No testing, review of construction documents, or review of building codes was undertaken as part of this ADA Facility Survey Report. For example, grab bar reinforcing within walls was not verified by E\&A to be present or tested by E\&A to assure the reinforcing meets the required loads for safety. E\&A did no testing of alarm systems for compliance with technical standards in ADAAG.
8. Risk Management - The ADA is a complex law. It contains many concepts and terms which have not been tested by actual experience or defined in the courts with respect to particular factual situations. Accordingly, E\&A makes no claim, expressed or implied, that, in preparing this limited verification ADA Facility Survey Report, all barriers (to all individuals with disabilities) have been identified whose removal might be required by the ADA.
9. Fixtures, Furniture and Equipment - Estimated costs are budgetary only and do not include moveable fixtures, furniture, and equipment (FF\&E), unless specifically noted in the Matrix.
10. Preliminary Solutions - Some recommended solutions are very preliminary in nature and require more detailed design study and code verification to confirm feasibility and costs. The solutions are intended to provide scoping for a designer to provide construction documents for implementation. These are generally noted in the Facility Survey data as "further design study required."
11. Owner Items - Some recommendations indicate "Owner Items" and carry no cost for removal. Since the Owner maintains in-house forces that may be responsible for general building maintenance and small projects, it will be more cost efficient to have the Owner's staff address these relatively minor issues.
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The Owner is solely responsible for non-discrimination under the ADA and other applicable laws, and civil lawsuits under the ADA (frivolous or otherwise) remain possible regardless of the number or types of barriers, if any, that are removed.

E\&A's recommendations should be reviewed by the Owner's legal counsel and risk management and compliance personnel. The modification work required to comply with the ADA varies according to many factors among which are the financial resources of the Owner and significance and/or severity of the barriers. The Owner's decisions regarding the scope of work to perform should be based upon the professional advice of the noted parties, along with input from the disabled community or representatives, whenever possible.

## Technical Assumptions

1. Slip Resistance - ADAS Section 302 requires that both floors on accessible routes and floors within accessible room areas are to be slip resistant. While OSHA has considered a static coefficient of friction of 0.5 to be slip resistant, the Access Board recommends a coefficient of 0.6. Ramps require a higher slip resistance of 0.8.

There is more than one testing methodology, and the results of the different tests are not interchangeable. Tests are for dry surfaces, and do not take wet surfaces into account.

The Owner should be aware that some VCT (vinyl composition tile) and sheet vinyl floors commonly used may not have 0.6 coefficients of friction; therefore, would not be considered slip resistant under the new standard. Generally, stone, tile, wood, and vinyl floors with specified "polished" finishes are likely to not meet the slip resistant coefficient. Polishes and contaminants further exacerbate the situation, suggesting a maintenance program. Floors in wet areas, such as restrooms, are made more slippery by water and soaps. E\&A recommends that detailed product information for new installations be carefully reviewed to ensure compliance. More discussion is available from the Access Board in "Technical Bulletin: Ground and Floor Surfaces" (available online at www.access-board.gov).

The Owner's cleaning and maintenance program should be reviewed in the context of slip resistance.

For the playground areas and other park features that use Engineered Wood Fiber (EWF), verify if EWF meets ASTM F 1951. Ground surfaces must be inspected and maintained regularly and frequently to ensure continued compliance with the ASTM F 1951-99 standard.

Floors and surfaces were neither tested nor specifically cited in the ADA Facility Survey Report as this testing is not included in E\&A's scope of work, nor is it our technical expertise.
2. Dimensional Tolerances - Section 104.1 .1 of the ADAS states all dimensions are subject to conventional building industry tolerances for field conditions, "except where the requirement is stated as a range with specific minimum and maximum end points."


#### Abstract

Although many studies have been performed to determine what acceptable dimensional tolerances are, there are relatively few widely accepted tolerances. It should be noted that in the case of new construction, design documents can often lead to dimensions that exceed ADAS maximums and minimums, such as a ramp that is designed with a $1: 12$ slope. The contractor may construct the ramp with a slight field tolerance which results in a ramp that slightly exceeds the $1: 12$ slope, which is actually the maximum slope allowed by ADAS, not a desired slope. Therefore, design documents should specify maximums and minimums where applicable and also allow for field tolerances.


USDOJ's position and as specified in Section 104.1.1 of the 2010 ADAS states where a range of dimensions is cited as allowable, there is no tolerance above or below that range, because the range is the tolerance. As an example, for a ramp with a slope range greater than $5 \%$ and less than $8.33 \%, 8.5 \%$ would not be considered an allowable construction tolerance.
3. Door Closers - ADAS does not have a requirement for opening pressure for exterior hinged doors. It has been E\&A's experience that existing door closers can only be adjusted to within approximately $3-5 \mathrm{lbs}$. of their current operating force. Accordingly, E\&A may recommend replacement of door closers, as opposed to simple adjustment, where the opening pressure exceeds 8 lbs . Although the ADA does not contain a requirement for exterior doors, it has been E\&A's experience that building code requirements for exterior doors is extremely necessary for many individuals to enter a building.
4. Level Door Maneuvering Clearances / Landing - E\&A may use the term "level" for door maneuvering clearances, ramps, and landings. In this context "level" means having a slope in all directions no more than $2 \%(1: 48)$ per ADAS requirements, which is a slope of $1 / 4$ " per foot.

## C. BUDGET COST ASSUMPTIONS

The budget costs included in the ADA Facility Survey Report are concept level costs that are provided only to assist the Owner with establishing budgets to remove physical barriers in public accommodation areas, subject to the assumptions in this Executive Summary.

The costs in the Survey Report are budget costs, not an estimate of probable cost, subject to the following conditions:

## Budget costs INCLUDE:

- Costs for direct material, labor, and equipment; without general contractor mark-ups for overhead and profit, general conditions, or sales tax
- Costs are based upon costs typical for the region of the facilities at the time of survey. Please refer to indexes such as the Means Construction Index to reflect changing costs over time
- Costs based upon typical costs for labor and materials for each item, given moderate quantities for typical construction types

The following are some specific budget items not included in the budget costs which the Owner should consider in project budgeting, in addition to the costs summarized in this report.
Budget costs DO NOT INCLUDE:

- General Contractor overhead, profit, and general conditions
- Construction Management, if used
- Design and project management fees
- Inflation factors when phasing construction over time
- Contingency for unforeseen existing conditions
- Premiums due to construction in occupied and heavily used spaces
- Premium for any potential overactive bid climate and potential high volatility and unpredictability reported for certain materials such as lumber and steel
- Potential asbestos abatement, lead paint abatement, or other environmental impact costs that may arise during accessibility renovation work
- Alternate costs that may be included in comment field, not in budget cost field
- High levels of fit, finish and detail that may be desired on an aesthetic basis
- Contingency due to future changes in the accessibility laws and codes
- Permit fees
- Sales tax
- Any in-house costs allocated to projects


## D. REMOVING BARRIERS TO FACILITIES - Using This ADA Survey Report

It is important to understand that the ADA Facility Survey Report represents preliminary solutions and costs for physical facility modifications to remove barriers, as if the building were to be constructed to new compliant standards, and that it is NOT automatically necessary to remove barriers to facilities by making all these expenditures. There are also some limitations due to structural or technical infeasibility (as specifically defined in the law).

As outlined above in the requirements for Public Sector entities under Title II of the ADA, there are many ways to remove barriers to the City's programs, and program accessibility includes far more than the facility survey that is E\&A scope of work under our contract.

To implement the survey information in this report, there are some important concepts to consider.

- The ADA requires that public entities perform a "Self-Assessment" and a "Transition Plan" (implementation plan). The Self-Assessment is the list of barriers. Because this ADA Facility Survey Report includes recommended solutions and itemized costs, the detailed portion of a Transition Plan is completed. The missing piece is the overview planning and prioritization and matching the needs to annual budgets. It is the City's responsibility to perform this part of the Transition Plan.
- This report provides physical facility solution to remove barriers, and such solutions are enduring solutions.
- There may be other methods to remove barriers in a compliant fashion which may be found as a result of further design study. E\&A's recommendations are preliminary, based upon observed conditions and our experience, and are NOT based upon any design work.
- Equivalent facilitation, such as providing the service in a different way, is permitted under the ADA. However, operationally dependent solutions require clear written policies, ongoing monitoring, enforcement, and training of staff, and usually cannot be depended upon to work on a long-term basis.


## Alterations

Per Section 202.3 and 202.4 in the ADAS, there are some aspects worth highlighting.

- 202.3.1 Prohibited Reduction in Access - An alteration that decreases or has the effect of decreasing accessibility of a building or facility below the requirements for new construction at the time of alteration is prohibited.
- 202.3.2 Extent of Application - An alteration of an existing element, space, or area of a building or facility shall not impose a requirement for accessibility greater than required for new construction.
- 202.4 Alterations Affecting Primary Function Areas - In addition to the requirements of 202.3, an alteration that affects or could affect the usability of or access to an area containing a primary function shall be made so as to ensure that, to the maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area, including the rest rooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, unless such alterations are disproportionate to the overall alterations in terms of cost and scope as determined under criteria established by the Attorney General. In existing transportation facilities, an area of primary function shall be as defined under regulations published by the Secretary of the Department of Transportation or the Attorney General.


## IV. EXECUTIVE ACCESSIBILITY SUMMARY

## ADA Surveys - Public Spaces

E\&A contracted with Transpo Group to perform an ADA Facility Survey of vertical elements in public areas of 37 facilities owned by the City of Mercer Island to assess observed barriers under Title II of the ADA using the 2010 ADA Standards (ADAS) currently enforceable by the US Dept. of Justice as a technical standard. A review of accessibility issues per applicable building code was NOT part of E\&A's scope of work. Review of accessibility within staff only areas was NOT part of E\&A's scope of work. However, E\&A's proposed preliminary solutions do attempt to consider some more stringent building code dimensional requirements, where clearly applicable.

Under the ADA, the public entities need to remove barriers to programs to the extent that it "does not cause an undue burden" over time. All new construction after January 26, 1993 should have been constructed in compliance with 1991 Standards (1994 ADAAG). Please reference essential Assumptions in Section III - B above.

Transpo Group - City of Mercer Island - ADA Facility Survey Report
Page 16

As previously stated, the ADA Facility Survey Report represents preliminary solutions and costs for physical facility modifications to remove barriers, as if the building were to be constructed to new compliant standards, and it is NOT automatically necessary to remove barriers to programs by making all these expenditures.

The total cost to remove all barriers to the facilities using facility modifications per the detailed reports is: $\$ 1,303,577$ subject to all the budget assumptions above. Again, this is not what it is likely to cost for full barrier removal if other operational solutions are applied where possible.

Some items that have the "general appearance or symbols of accessibility" are not compliant with the ADA standards.

Administrative spaces were viewed from the perspective of the limited areas that the public can use unaccompanied by staff. These areas are often essential interface points for public service.

Where appropriate, the City may relocate and reschedule programs to alternate accessible locations, or rethink how some services are provided. A transition plan, matching the findings to annual budgets, and an overall strategy for removal of barriers to programs must be completed.

E\&A based recommendations on somewhat limited input from representatives on the sites and the City's published information, which may not be a complete understanding of the operation. Again, the City's judgment needs to be applied during implementation. It should be noted that there is virtually no such thing as a perfectly compliant new facility, and E\&A did find some issues in the newest City facilities.

Finally, E\&A recommends that the appropriate people from City departments take some time to digest the wealth of detail to understand the large picture of their operations and facility issues. The standards are not simple and implementing barrier removal should be a considered action.

E\&A is providing the survey data in electronic format, with client access to our web based custom ADA Survey Solutions ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ software, for Transpo Group to use in managing the process.

Endelman \& Associates PLLC has been pleased to work with Transpo Group and will remain available to work with you as your future needs may require.

## Overview of Findings

The following are "snapshots" of the significant issues and extent of non-compliance in the surveyed facilities. These are not intended to be complete summaries. Please see the ADA Facility Survey Report for detailed information on each facility.

## 77th Avenue SE Landing

An accessible route from the park entry to amenities is not provided.

## Aubrey Davis Park

Bleachers at baseball diamonds require some location adjustment to provide wheelchair spaces together with companion seats (aligned with the front row) at the ends of the bleachers. Bleacher locations shall ensure accessible routes are provided in front and along sides. Signage is required for wheelchair seat areas.

Baseball team dugouts require gate openings of $32 "$ min. width, with an 18 " min. width at the gate maneuvering space on the pull side.

The play area adjacent to Feroglia Fields requires a compliant ramp.
Restrooms require some adjustment of fixture locations as well as replacement of grab bars (which are too short), and relocation of dispensers encroaching on grab bar clearances and mirrors mounted at non-compliant heights.

## Bicentennial Park

Restrooms require compliant signage, including Braille. Restroom door closers require adjustment to minimize force required to open.

Restrooms require some adjustment of fixture locations and heights, and stall partition sizes. New grab bars are required. Dispensers require relocation within accessible reach ranges. The mirror in the Men's restroom is mounted at a non-compliant height. Men's restroom floor has an excessive slope.

## Boat Launch

The slope of the existing gangway to the floating boat launch pier is too steep.
Revise life jacket hook heights to provide one of each type at an accessible height.

## Calkins Landing

An accessible route is required from the end of the sidewalk (at the picnic table) to the beach area.

The beach is accessed by stairs only. A ramp may be required.

## Clarke Beach

Restrooms and changing rooms are substantially non-accessible.

## Clise Park

No vertical elements were observed requiring attention.

## Community and Events Center

The Game Room and Landing Room have multiple tables and seating areas, none of which provide accessible work surfaces with compliant knee and toe space below.

The meeting rooms on the entry level have countertops with sinks exceeding the 34 " max. accessible height and no knee and toe space below for a forward approach.

The Slater Room is used for public functions and has a unisex restroom with 2 toilet compartments with solid walls extending to the floor. The depth of the accessible toilet compartment is too small unless toe clearance 9 " high is provided.

## Deane's Children's Park

Play areas require ramps at the entries.
The restroom entry requires new exterior surface to provide a compliant door maneuvering clearance. Restroom signage is non-compliant. The restroom requires revised rear wall behind the toilet and replacement of grab bars. The toilet and lavatory are not accessible. The mirror and baby changing station are mounted too high.

## Ellis Pond

The park has no paved accessible route to amenities.
The edge of the boardwalk has an excessive vertical rise (1-1/2" high).

## First Hill Park

The play area is surrounded by a raised wooden border, which must be altered to provide an accessible route.

## Forest Landing

No accessible route is provided to the water's edge.

## Franklin Landing

The park has no paved accessible route (but a flagstone path) to the water's edge.

## Fruitland Landing

A gravel path is provided thru the park toward the water's edge.

## Garfield Landing

The park has no paved accessible route to the water's edge.

## Groveland Beach

An accessible route is lacking to restrooms, the beach, volleyball court, and the pier. Restrooms and changing rooms are substantially non-accessible.

## Homestead Park

Bleachers at baseball diamonds require some location adjustment to provide wheelchair spaces together with companion seats (aligned with the front row) at the ends of the bleachers, and to ensure accessible routes are provided in front and along the side. Signage is also required for wheelchair seat areas. Dugouts lack an accessible route and a clear floor space on one side of bench for a wheelchair space.

An accessible route is lacking to tennis courts and ballfields.
Restroom signage is non-compliant. Grab bars are too short and mounted at the wrong height. Toilet paper dispensers are mounted too close to the grab bars. Accessible toilets in restrooms are too far from the side wall. Seat cover dispensers require relocation to an accessible location.

## Island Crest Park

Bleachers at baseball diamonds require some location adjustment to provide wheelchair spaces together with companion seats (aligned with the front row) at the ends of the bleachers, and to ensure accessible routes are provided in front and along the side. Signage is also required for wheelchair seat areas.

Baseball team dugouts require a wheelchair space at the end of the team bench.
An accessible route to the tennis court would require a ramp.
Signage at restroom entries is non-compliant in location, lettering, and braille. Restroom entry doors lack the required door maneuvering clearances on the push side. The accessible stall in each restroom is too narrow and the toilet seat heights are too low. Men's accessible toilet requires flush control relocation to the open side of the toilet. Accessible lavatories do not have compliant knee spaces. Toilet paper dispensers encroach on grab bar clearances. Seat cover dispensers, mirrors, coat hooks, and soap dispensers require relocation due to non-compliant heights and locations. Restrooms also serve as dressing rooms, and the provided benches are non-compliant.

## Lincoln Landing

The landing has a paved walk that terminates in the lawn area without extending to the water's edge.

## Luther Burbank Park

The amphitheater requires wheelchair accessible seating areas (together with companion seating) on an accessible route from adjacent paths. Signs are required at each space. An accessible route is also required to the stage area.

Service counter at guard station (at swimming area near Picnic Area C) is too high. A portion of the counter shall be lowered for accessibility.

Gates at the dog parks require a level paved maneuvering space on each side of the gate. Paved door maneuvering space outside the Women's restroom door (near tennis courts) has an excessive slope.

Restrooms require some adjustment of fixture locations as well as replacement of grab bars (which are too short), relocation of dispensers encroaching on grab bar clearances, mirrors mounted too high, and pipes below lavatories lacking insulation. Restrooms by the old boiler room and near Picnic Area C are substantially non-accessible and require renovation.

Tennis courts lack an accessible route to the courts. A ramp could be provided from the north seating area.

The roof above the restrooms (by the tennis courts) is not accessible. A wheelchair lift is required, or access to this roof top could be eliminated as a public amenity.

The designated accessible dock for boat slips has an excessive slope.

## Luther Burbank Park Administration Building \& Caretaking Facility

The north entry door is recessed deeper than 8 " permitted for door maneuvering clearance. A power operator with backup power is required to preserve historic door frame.

The south entry door is designated as an accessible entry, but the door is recessed 34 ", while a max. 8 " recess is permitted into the door maneuvering space. A min. 18 " clearance beyond the door latch is required on the pull side (only 6 " is provided). The external slab has an excessive slope, and the vision panel is too high. Consider designating this door as exit only.

The building has 3 stories, with only an interior stairway. An elevator is required to provide an accessible route connecting all levels.

The second floor restroom is too small to provide turning space and fixture clearances.
Door maneuvering space at the first floor restroom door is encroached on by significant protrusion of grab bar due to non-compliant configuration of toilet side wall. Side wall and door frame should be reconfigured, and grab bars installed with compliant lengths and clearances. Flush control shall be on the open side of the toilet. Shelf / mirror combination and coat hook are not at compliant heights.

## Main Fire Station \#91

The service counter has a clear floor space, but the curved configuration prevents a strictly parallel approach.

The high level drinking fountain is on the open side, protruding into the path of travel.
Public meeting room has a dividing partition, separating it into two rooms. Each room's wet bar has a sink that is approximately 2 " too high.

Both public restrooms are substantially non-compliant and require renovation.

## Maintenance Hall

Door hardware at the upper level administration entry is above accessible reach range.
The kitchen countertop is too high for public use. The range has non-accessible controls on the rear panel. The sink and a work surface (directly adjacent the oven) must have knee and toe space below for a forward approach when a range is provided.

The accessible entry is on the upper level, leading to the administrative areas. An accessible route is required to the restrooms and locker rooms downstairs.

## Mercer Island City Hall

Exterior slab in front of the main entry doors to City Hall has an excessive slope.
Restrooms near the Licensing Department are substantially non-compliant. Accessible signage is not provided. No wheelchair accessible toilet stalls are provided. Knee and toe space are not provided at the lavatory in the Women's restroom. Multiple urinals are provided at Men's restrooms, but none are designated as accessible.

Entry doors for all restrooms swing in, and do not provide the min. 18 " wide door maneuvering space on the pull side.

Courtroom has raised area for jurors and witnesses that are accessed by stairs only. Ramps cannot be installed due to insufficient space. Wheelchair lifts may be required.

The Council Room has raised seating areas for the public, with no wheelchair space adjacent to a companion seat. The speaker podium requires an accessible forward approach.

The police lobby has call buttons, telephone, and countertops higher than accessible reach.

## Mercerdale Park

Ramps in play areas have excessive slopes and lack compliant handrails on both sides.
Accessible routes are required through the wooden borders to some exercise stations and to the information plaque at the sculpture.

## Miller Landing

The change in level from the roadway down to the water's edge is very steep, and the property is narrow. Providing an accessible route may cause an "undue burden."

Signage should be provided, indicating that the landing is not accessible.

## Pioneer Park

No specific items. See Typical for Multiple Properties below.

## Proctor Landing

There is a 9" step down to the pier. An accessible ramp with handrails is required.

## Roanoke Landing

No specific items. See Typical for Multiple Properties below.

## Roanoke Park

No specific items. See Typical for Multiple Properties below.

## Rotary Park

No specific items. See Typical for Multiple Properties below.

## Secret Park

The entry to the play area requires a ramp.

## Slater Park

No specific items. See Typical for Multiple Properties below.

## South Fire Station \#92

AED cabinet by the front entry door is mounted too high. Controls should be 48 " max. and bottom edge of cabinet (protruding more than 4 " from wall) should be 27 " max. above the paving.

The lavatory in the restroom is mounted too high and encroaches on both the door maneuvering space and toilet clearance. The toilet is installed at a skewed angle and too far from the wall. Grab bars are mounted too high.

## South Mercer Playfields

Bleachers at baseball diamonds require some location adjustment to provide wheelchair spaces together with companion seats (aligned with the front row) at the ends of the bleachers. Bleacher locations shall ensure accessible routes are provided in front and along sides. Signage is required for wheelchair seat areas.

A hose bib is located in the knee space of the low level drinking fountain.
The play area requires a compliant ramp at the entry.
Men's and Women's restroom floors have an excessive slope.
Accessible toilet stalls are too small, and stall entry doors are required to be self-closing. Toilets in these stalls require excessive force to flush. Some dispensers encroach on grab bar clearances. others are mounted too high or beyond accessible reach ranges. Sink faucets require excessive force to operate.

Restroom doors require compliant signage. Restroom doors require removal of hold open devices to provide a clear 10 " bottom surface on the push side.

## Wildwood Park

No specific items. See Typical for Multiple Properties below.

## Youth and Family Services Thrift Shop \& Recycling Center

The exit door on the south side of the building has an exterior column blocking the door maneuvering clearance. The exit door on the east side of the building lacks a paved exterior surface for the door maneuvering clearance.

The check-out counter lacks an accessible version.
The work table encroaches on the door maneuvering clearance for the door exiting the Workroom.

The sink in the Workroom is too high and requires knee and toe space below for a forward approach.

The dining table in the second floor kitchen lacks an accessible seat with knee and toe clearance. The countertop is too high for an accessible reach to outlets on the back wall. The kitchen lacks $50 \%$ accessible storage. $5 \%$ of the provided lockers are required to be accessible.

At least one dressing room is required to provide a turning space and a bench.
Grab bars in the ground floor restroom are too short on the side wall. The seat cover dispenser is not accessible above the toilet. The lavatory does not provide the required knee space.

Provide directional signage to the accessible restroom on the second floor. The accessible restroom signage is too high. Grab bars are mounted too high. The toilet flush control is on the wrong side. The mirror is too high.

## Typical for Multiple Properties

At properties with accessible parking stalls, some accessible stalls have signage that is too low and needs to be raised to compliant heights.

Where picnic tables are provided in parks, $5 \%$ of total seating at picnic tables is required to be accessible seating (with forward approach clear floor space below) and dispersed between each picnic area.

Where benches are provided, recommendation is that some benches have an adjacent clear floor space at one end of the bench. (Although dispersed seating is not clearly scoped in ADAS, this recommendation complies with the principle of equal access to all features and elements.)

Drinking fountains in various areas of multiple parks tend to be singular and/or mounted at non-compliant heights. Drinking fountains where provided should have a minimum of two, serving both wheelchair users and standing persons.

All play areas require compliant ground surfaces, which must be periodically inspected and maintained. (No cost was included pending testing of surface materials.)

Accessible routes are required to accessible versions of all elements, including picnic tables, bike racks, benches, BBQ grills, and trash receptacles.

Please see the ADA Facility Survey Report results for details of these and other items not discussed above. Total budget cost to address all the issues as defined, subject to assumptions herein, is included at the end of the ADA Facility Survey Report.

Please call E\&A if you require any clarifications on this report.
Respectfully Submitted,


Jody L. Meldrum Consultant


David Machemer
Senior Consultant


Bart Sanderson, CASp Associate, Technical Director

## APPENDIX

Included in the Appendix are the following items:

## A. Abbreviations

B. Legend for the ADA Survey Results Report

## Appendix A- Abbreviations

General: These are common abbreviations that may be used in the ADA Facility Survey Report.

| @ | At | LL | Lower Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AC | Asphalt Paving | LBS | Pounds Force |
| ACCESS | Accessible | LS (or LSum) | Lump Sum |
| ADA | Americans with | MAX | Maximum |
| ADAAG | Disabilities Act ADA Accessibility | MIN | Minimum |
|  | Guidelines | MEZZ | Mezzanine |
| ADAS | The ADA Standards for Accessible Design - 2010 | N | North |
| AFF | Above Finished Floor | PH | Phone |
| AHJ | Authority Having Jurisdiction | P | Public |
| AMBU | Ambulatory Stall | POS | Point of Sale |
| ANSI | American National | PR | Priority |
|  | Standards Institute, Inc. | PUB | Public |
| APPROX | Approximately | RM | Room |
| BBQ | Barbecue | RR | Restroom |
| BLDG | Building | S | South |
| BSMT | Basement | S | Staff |
| CBC | 2013 California Building Code | SF | Square Feet |
| COMM'L | Commercial | SAN NAPKIN | Sanitary Napkin |
| CONC | Concrete | STR | Stair |
| CONF | Conference | T | Toilet |
| CORR | Corridor | TYP | Typical |
| CT | Court (Tennis, etc.) | W | West |
| E | East | WF | Water Fountain |
| EA | Each |  |  |
| ELEV | Elevator |  |  |
| EXT | Exterior |  |  |
| EWF | Engineered Wood Fiber |  |  |
| FLR or FL | Floor |  |  |
| INT | Interior |  |  |
| LEV | Level |  |  |
| LF | Lineal Feet |  |  |

## Appendix B - Legend for the ADA Facility Survey Report

This Legend is essential to assist in properly interpreting the recommendations for facility accessibility solutions to program barriers in the report.

Building ID (Client): The facility location may be followed by an ID\# using any Client provided numbers or abbreviations.

Barrier (\#xxx): This item describes the observed barrier (or potential barrier) to the disabled. (Numbers are used for report cross referencing use only)

ADA Citation: This item identifies the section of the 2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design (ADAS) referenced for each barrier.

Location: This is the area where the barrier was observed. Where appropriate, items may be grouped and shown with multiple quantities.

Recommendation (Proposed Solution): This column describes the solution proposed to remove or reduce the potential barrier identified, compliant with the ADA standards current at the time of survey. Sometimes there may be alternate solutions. Some solutions may require further design study.

Comments: This column is used to clarify the existing condition and the ADA requirement or further clarify the Recommendation shown.

Type (S/P): This column provides an indication of the area in which the barrier was observed. E\&A's scope of work is solely public accommodation areas (excluding tenant spaces), and excludes Staff areas, $\mathbf{S}$ indicates that it is in a Staff area; $\mathbf{P}$ indicates a Public Accommodation area, and therefore subject to Title II. Under Title I, work in a staff area would not technically be required to be performed until a person with a disability employed in this area requires reasonable accommodation, except for provision of an accessible route to staff areas.

Responsibility (Resp.): This column indicates whether the issue is the responsibility of the Owner ("O"). "P" indicates it is for a public entity, such as for public sidewalks. "T" indicates it is a tenant responsibility.

Code: Each recommended solution is given a compliance sufficiency code, numbered from 1 to 8 . The sufficiency code further qualifies the level of compliance achieved by, or other major aspect of, the recommended solution. The meanings are as follows:

1 When the proposed solution is implemented this barrier will be removed and will be, in our opinion, in compliance with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act's current ADA Standards.

2 Complete compliance with the requirements of the ADA will not be provided. It is either "technically infeasible," or (for the public sector), the solution would appear to be an "undue burden" per ADA Standards for public entities. Therefore, the Consultants have recommended that no changes be made at this time. Strict adherence with the ADA would in E\&A's opinion carry an unreasonable cost (to be solely determined by the Owner) or be technically infeasible. In enforcement, the USDOJ would consider the Owner's financial capability, among other ADA criteria.

3 The solution appears to be the responsibility of another entity such as a tenant or other entity, who we recommend be notified of the barrier.

4 The condition identified technically does not meet the requirements of the ADA. However, in our professional opinion, the deviation is minor enough or within construction tolerances that correction of it would not likely significantly increase the degree of accessibility of the condition. For that reason, no modification beyond what is described in the Recommendation column is proposed, but sufficiency is not indicated as fully compliant.

5 Because complete compliance appears to be technically infeasible or extremely difficult due to the existing building configuration, the proposed alternative means (or policy implementation) has been proposed. While this recommended solution provides less than complete physical compliance, it may constitute a reasonable course of action for this situation that improves the condition.

6 Delay implementation of solution pending final approval by law.
7 The subject item is not accessible, but it is not required to be, based upon an exemption in the law. It may, however, be a program issue that requires some action.

8 The subject item meets the 1991 ADA guidelines, so is therefore "grandfathered" and need not meet the 2010 ADAS until it is physically altered.

PRI (ADA Guidance Priority): For general guidance only, the recommended solution is given an ADA general priority coding of $1,2,3$, or 4 . These codes correspond to the barrier removal categories provided for general guidance for public accommodations in the Regulation on Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability by Public Accommodations and in Commercial Facilities (reference 28 CFR Part 36.304(c)). Upon completion of the Survey, the Owner may establish implementation priorities in detail based upon criteria such as the law, operational needs, funding, and long-range planning.

1 Provision of access to a place of public accommodation from public sidewalks, parking, or public transportation. These measures include installing entrance ramps, widening entrances, and providing accessible parking spaces / signage.

2 Provision of access to those places where goods and services are made available. These measures include revising interior routes, adjusting the layout of tables, providing Braille and raised character building signage, widening interior doors, and installing ramps.

3 Provision of accessible restrooms, such as removal of obstructing items on the route to the restroom, widening of restroom doors, widening of toilet stalls, provision of accessible plumbing fixtures, and installation of grab bars.

4 Making other modifications to provide access to the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations, such as accessible public phones and water fountains.

Qty / Units: The quantity includes the unit of measure applicable to the Recommended Solution, and to the Budget Cost immediately following.

Budget (Budget Cost): This column provides a budgetary opinion of approximate construction cost per item, based only upon descriptive scope, not a completed design. This is not a cost estimate. Design fees, management costs, sales tax, internal costs, General Contractor overhead and profit, escalation, and other items are not included in these figures. Allowances are shown when further design study is required. All costs for implementation are not included in these costs. Therefore, please see Budget Cost Assumptions section and Facility Assumptions sub-section in the Overview for details.
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| Community and Events Center |  |  | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 5 |
| location | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | budget |
| Doors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 14: GAME ROOM ENTRY OFF LOBBY | Recommend no change. | If altered, per 2010 Standards, existing doors would be required to have a kickplate the full width of the door and up to 10 " AFF. | P | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 STY | \$0 |
| ITEM 15: LOWER LEVEL GYMNASIUM | Recommend no change. | If altered, per 2010 Standards, existing doors would be required to have a kickplate the full width of the door and up to 10 " AFF. | P | O | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 STY | \$0 |
| ITEM 16: LOWER LEVEL GYMNASIUM, DOORS TO THE EXTERIOR | Recommend no change. | If altered, per 2010 Standards, existing doors would be required to have a kickplate the full width of the door and up to $10^{\prime \prime}$ AFF. | P | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 STY | \$0 |
| ITEM 17: MERCER ROOM 107-ALUM./GLASS ENTRY DOORS | Recommend no change. | If altered, per 2010 Standards, existing doors would be required to have a kickplate the full width of the door and up to 10 " AFF. | P | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 STY | \$0 |
| ITEM 18: SLATER ROOM EXTERIOR ENTRY | Recommend no change. | If altered, per 2010 Standards, existing doors would be required to have a kickplate the full width of the door and up to 10 " AFF. | P | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 STY | \$0 |
| ITEM 19: SLATER ROOM RESTROOM DOORS | Recommend no change. | If altered, per 2010 Standards, existing doors would be required to have a kickplate the full width of the door and up to 10 " AFF. | P | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 STY | \$0 |
| ITEM 20: SLATER ROOM RESTROOM ENTRY | Recommend no change. | If altered, per 2010 Standards, existing doors would be required to have a kickplate the full width of the door and up to 10 " AFF. | P | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 STY | \$0 |
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For City of Mercer Island for Transpo
Community and Events Center

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | RECOMMENDATION | COMmENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | budget |
| Drinking Fountains |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 27: MAIN LOBBY ADJACENT TO VENDING MACHINES | The fountain is a protruding object. Lower the fountain (or provide a skirt) to 27" exactly where it will not be a protruding object and meet knee space requirements. Another option is to provide a non-movable object adjacent to this fountain, while maintaining a min. of 30 " wide forward approach, centered on the fountain. | Existing drinking fountain is a hi-low model. However, the lower fountain is in the path of travel and has a bottom surface at 28" AFF. | P | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | EA | \$2,440 |
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 ENTRY PLAZA paving to the indicated amenities.
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RESTROOM, ACCESSIBLE using an offset flange.
TOILET STALL
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## Survey Results - by Building / Element

For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

| Community and Events Center |  | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 22 |
| LOCATION RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | BUDGET |
| Restrooms / Bathrooms |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 71: ENTRY LOBBY Replace with new grab bars. LEVEL - WOMEN'S RESTROOM, ACCESSIBLE TOILET STALL | Grab bars should be 1-1/4" - $2^{\prime \prime}$ in diameter, $33^{\prime \prime}-36^{\prime \prime}$ AFF, with $1-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. between the wall and the grab bar. Circular cross section - outside diameter 1-1/4" min. - 2" max. Non-circular cross section - perimeter of $4^{\prime \prime}$ min. $-4.8^{\prime \prime}$ max. Horizontal projections shall be 1-1/2" min. below bottom of rail. [2010 Standards: Rear grab bar min. 24" long from centerline of toilet at transfer side; allows 1-1/4"-2" cross section and non-circular shapes; allows alternate children's use height.] Existing L-shaped grab bar extends 18 " from toilet center to the transfer side. | P | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | EA | \$1,300 |
| ITEM 72: LOWER LEVEL - Replace with new grab bars. MEN'S RESTROOM, ACCESSIBLE TOILET STALL | Grab bars should be 1-1/4"- $2^{\prime \prime}$ in diameter, $33^{\prime \prime}-36$ " AFF, with $1-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. between the wall and the grab bar. Circular cross section - outside diameter 1-1/4" min. - 2" max. Non-circular cross section - perimeter of $4^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min} .-4.8^{\prime \prime}$ max. Horizontal projections shall be 1-1/2" min. below bottom of rail. [2010 Standards: Rear grab bar min. 24" long from centerline of toilet at transfer side; allows 1-1/4"-2" cross section and non-circular shapes; allows alternate children's use height.] Existing L-shaped grab bar extends $18^{\prime \prime}$ from toilet center to the transfer side. Also, top of grab bars are 36-3/4" AFF. 33" - 36" AFF required. | P | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | EA | \$1,300 |
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| Community and Events Center |  | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 23 |
| LOCATION RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | BUDGET |
| Restrooms / Bathrooms |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 73: LOWER LEVEL - Replace with new grab bars. WOMEN'S RESTROOM, ACCESSIBLE TOILET STALL | Grab bars should be $1-1 / 4^{\prime \prime}-2^{\prime \prime}$ in diameter, $33^{\prime \prime}$ to 36 " AFF, with $1-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. between the wall and the grab bar. Circular cross section - outside diameter 1-1/4" min. - 2" max. Non-circular cross section - perimeter of 4" min. - 4.8" max. Horizontal projections shall be 1-1/2" min. below bottom of rail. [2010 Standards: Rear grab bar min. 24 " long from centerline of toilet at transfer side; allows 1-1/4"-2" cross section and non-circular shapes; allows alternate children's use height.] <br> Existing L-shaped grab bar extends 18 " from toilet center to the transfer side. Also, top of grab bars are 37" AFF. 33" - 36" AFF required. | P | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | EA | \$1,300 |
| ITEM 74: SLATER ROOM - Replace with new grab bars. ACCESSIBLE TOILET COMPARTMENT | Grab bars should be 1-1/4"- $2^{\prime \prime}$ in diameter, $33^{\prime \prime}-36^{\prime \prime}$ AFF, with $1-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. between the wall and the grab bar. Circular cross section - outside diameter 1-1/4" min. $-2^{\prime \prime}$ max. Non-circular cross section - perimeter of 4" min. - 4.8" max. Horizontal projections shall be $1-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. below bottom of rail. [2010 Standards: Rear grab bar min. 24" long from centerline of toilet at transfer side; allows 1-1/4" - 2" cross section and non-circular shapes; allows alternate children's use height.] Existing L-shaped grab bar extends 18 " from toilet center to the transfer side. | P | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | EA | \$1,300 |
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## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

Community and Events Center $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021

|  |  | Page: 27 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LOCATION | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | BUDGET |

Shower Stalls / Bathtubs

| Barrier | 711 | The shower lacks required clear floor space adjacent to the shower stall (36"x48" <br> aligned with control wall for transfer shower or 30"x60" parallel to roll in) OR | Citation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

aligned with control wall for transfer shower or 30"x60" parallel to roll in) OR exceeds $2 \%$ slope.

| ITEM 88: LOWER LEVEL MEN'S RESTROOM, ACCESSIBLE SHOWER STALL | Replace with a $36 " x 36$ " accessible transfer shower. Revise length of the wall between the 2 showers to align with the face of the transfer shower, and revise location of the controls (to the opposite wall) to provide the 48 " long clear floor space, starting at the control wall, and running parallel and immediately adjacent to the shower opening. | Shower stalls must have a 36 " $\times 48^{\text {" }}$ clear floor space in front aligned with the control wall for 36 " $\times 36$ " transfer showers; rectangular roll in showers must have a 30 "x60" clear floor space in front. <br> Existing condition: Shower enclosure size is $36^{\prime \prime}$ wide $\times 37^{\prime \prime}$. Also, the control wall is located where the required $48^{\prime \prime}$ deep clear floor space, aligning with the control wall, is only $36-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$. | P | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | EA | \$18,440 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITEM 89: LOWER LEVEL WOMEN'S RESTROOM, ACCESSIBLE SHOWER STALL | Replace with a 36 " $x 36$ " accessible transfer shower. Revise length of the wall between the 2 showers to align with the face of the transfer shower, and revise location of the controls (to the opposite wall) to provide the 48 " long clear floor space, starting at the control wall, and running parallel and immediately adjacent to the shower opening. | Shower stalls must have a 36 " $\times 48$ " clear floor space in front aligned with the control wall for 36 " $\times 36$ " transfer showers; rectangular roll in showers must have a $30 " \times 60$ " clear floor space in front. <br> Existing condition: Shower enclosure size is $36-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 36-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$. Also, the control wall is located where the required $48^{\prime \prime}$ deep clear floor space, aligning with the control wall is only $36-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$. | P | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | EA | \$18,440 |
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Community and Events Center

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | QTY |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Page: } 29 \\ \hline \text { BUDGET } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI |  | UnITS |  |
| Signage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 94: MAIN LOBBY WOMEN'S RESTROOM | Provide a sign with the International Symbol of Accessibility. | Sign to be mounted 48" high min. measured from finished floor to bottom of the visual characters to 60" max. to the bottom of the visual characters. <br> Existing sign does not have the International Symbol of Accessibility. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$180 |
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ITEM 102: MERCER ROOM Lower the mounting height of the sink to $\quad$ Existing countertop is 36 " high, with sink rim at $36-1 / 4$ " AFF and $\quad$ P 1 107
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## Community and Events Center

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 1


> Community and Events Center
> Upper Left: Terrace does not provide edge protection \&/or a guardrail between terrace and seating steps.

> Upper Right: Door between Mercer Rm. \& Landing Rm. is recessed 11 ", and does not provide the required clearance on the push side.

> Lower Left:
> Fire alarm pull stations are mounted too high. 48" max. AFF required.

## Community and Events Center

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 2


Community and Events Center
Upper Left: Landing Rm. \& Game Rm. require tables with accessible seating.

Upper Right: $\quad$ Numerous door have 7-1/2" high bottom rail with hold open devices. Bottom surface of door on push side is required to be a smooth surface to 10 " AFF.

Lower Left: Surface mounted latching mechanisms obstruct the required 10" bottom smooth surface required on the push side.

## Community and Events Center

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 3


| Community and Events Center |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Entry level meeting rooms have countertops with <br> sinks above the required 34" max. AFF height, and do <br> not provide the forward approach knee space below <br> sink. |
| Upper Right: | Slater Rm. public restroom does not provide an <br> accessible stall of the min. required size. |
| Lower Left: | Mercer Rm. above countertop outlets and switches <br> are not accessible for a side reach. |

## Community and Events Center

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 4


Community and Events Center
Upper Left: Stair handrail protrudes into the accessible route.
Upper Right: Gymnasium does not provide an accessible drinking fountain at required height, and with a forward approach knee space.

Lower Left:
Fitness Rm. drinking fountain is mounted at standing person height. An accessible drinking fountain at required height, and with a forward approach knee space is required.

## Community and Events Center

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 5


| Community and Events Center |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Restroom signage does not provide the International <br> Symbol of Accessibility. |
| Lower Left: | Toilet in the accessible stall is required to be 16" min. <br> Locker room benches do not provide the required <br> back support, and are not of the required size for <br> accessibility. Each locker room requires an accessible <br> are mounted too far from wall. |

## Community and Events Center

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 6


Community and Events Center
Upper Left: The length of the L-shaped grab bar section behind toilet is too short. Many grab bars are mounted too high. 1-1/2" between the grab bar and adjacent surface is required. Dispenser encroaches on clearance.

Upper Right: Height of the sink rim exceeds the max. 34" AFF.
Lower Left: At least one of the large lockers must be accessible.

## Community and Events Center
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## Community and Events Center

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 8
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## UPPER LEVEL

 mounted controls.
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## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

| Maintenance Hall |  | COMMENTS | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | $\begin{gathered} \text { Page: } 39 \\ \hline \text { BUDGET } \end{gathered}$ |
| LOCATION | RECOMMENDATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kitchens - Lounges |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 12: KITCHEN UPPER LEVEL | Provide compliant 30 " wide x 34 " high work surface on the latch side of the door for side hinge or either side for bottom hinge. Work surface requires a forward approach with knee \& toe space. | Existing kitchen has no work surface adjacent to the oven. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$1,830 |



| Maintenance Building |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Accessible parking sign is required to be remounted to <br> $60 "$ min. above pavement to bottom surface. |
| Upper Right: | Entry door lacks the required maneuvering clearance <br> space. |
| Lower Left: | Entry door hardware is mounted above accessible <br> reach. |

## Maintenance Building

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 1


## Maintenance Building

Upper Left: Kitchen range has controls that require a reach over the burners. Kitchens with cooktops require an adjacent work surface with knee \& toe space.
Upper Right:
Sink is 36 " AFF ( 34 " max. required). Outlets and switches mounted above countertop are not accessible for a side reach due to countertop height \& depth.

Lower Left: Metal cabinets and water bottles block the required turnaround space. Paper towel dispenser and fire extinguisher are mounted too high.

## Maintenance Building

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 2
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| Mercer Island City Hall |  |  | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 45 |
| LOCAtion | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | BUDGET |
| Doors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 12: MEN'S RESTROOM - ADJACENT TO LICENSING AREA | Reverse the swing direction of the door to swing out from restroom. | Ensure door maneuvering spaces are min. 18" at pull side and min .12 l at push side (if equipped with latch \& closer). Provide clear floor space min. 60" perpendicular to door for front / pull side approach and 48 " perpendicular to door for front or side / push side approach (latch \& closer). Doors are allowed to be recessed 8 " max. from the face of door to face of wall surface. See additional Dimensions for other approaches in 404.2.4.1 Existing entry door lacks the 18 " width on the pull side, and is recessed $18^{\prime \prime}$ on the bathroom side of the door. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$810 |
| ITEM 13: POLICE ENTRY SOUTH ENTRY DOORS | Secure movable area rug or mat with double stick tape at all edges. | Owner / Maintenance item. | P | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | EA | \$0 |
| ITEM 14: WOMEN'S RESTROOM - ADJACENT TO COURTROOM AREA | Reverse the swing direction of the door to swing out from restroom. | Ensure door maneuvering spaces are min. 18" at pull side and $\mathrm{min} .12^{\prime \prime}$ at push side (if equipped with latch \& closer). Provide clear floor space min. 60" perpendicular to door for front / pull side approach and 48" perpendicular to door for front or side / push side approach (latch \& closer). Doors are allowed to be recessed $8^{\prime \prime}$ max. from the face of door to face of wall surface. See additional Dimensions for other approaches in 404.2.4.1 Existing entry door lacks the 18 " width on the pull side, and is recessed $25^{\prime \prime}$ on the bathroom side of the door. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$810 |
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Mercer Island City Hall $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 46 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| location | RECOMMENDATION | COMmENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | BUDGET |
| Doors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 15: WOMEN'S RESTROOM - ADJACENT TO LICENSING AREA | Reverse the swing direction of the door to swing out from restroom. | Ensure door maneuvering spaces are min. 18" at pull side and min .12 l at push side (if equipped with latch \& closer). Provide clear floor space min. 60" perpendicular to door for front / pull side approach and 48 " perpendicular to door for front or side / push side approach (latch \& closer). Doors are allowed to be recessed $8^{\prime \prime}$ max. from the face of door to face of wall surface. See additional Dimensions for other approaches in 404.2.4.1 Existing entry door lacks the 18 " width on the pull side, and is recessed 18" on the bathroom side of the door. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$810 |
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## City Hall

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 3


| City Hall |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Restroom entry doors require min. 18" maneuvering <br> clearance on pull side (or a power door operator). |
| Upper Right: | Restroom entry doors require min. 18" maneuvering <br> clearance on pull side (or a power door operator). |
| Lower Left: | Women's restroom near Licensing shall have at least <br> one lavatory with accessible controls on faucets, and <br> exposed pipes isolated from contact. |

## City Hall

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 4


| City Hall |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Dispensers present protruding object hazard, <br> requiring relocation or permanent barrier located <br> below. |
| Upper Right: | Baby changing tables require relocation due to height. |
| Lower Left: | Wheelchair accessible toilets are required to be 16" <br> min. $-18 "$ max. from side wall. Relocation required at <br> some toilets. |

## City Hall

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 5


| City Hall |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Women's restroom near Courtroom: door to <br> accessible compartment located on wrong side of <br> compartment and swings in. |
| Upper Right: | Women's restroom near Courtroom: toilet location <br> should be adjusted. Flush control should be on open <br> side. |
| Lower Left: | Men's restroom near Courtroom: one urinal should be <br> accessible. |

## City Hall
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## City Hall
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| City Hall |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Courtroom: witness box and judge's platform have <br> stairs (no accessible route). |
| Upper Right: | Courtroom: juror's area has stairs (no accessible <br> route). |
| Lower Left: | Courtroom: court clerk counter required to be lowered <br> to 36" AFF max. |
| City Hall |  |
| ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P.8 |  |



| City Hall |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Exterior sidewalk approaching main entry has an <br> excessive slope. |
| Upper Right: | Picnic table requires an accessible seat. |
|  | Lower Left: <br> accessible height. Countertop shall be lowered to $36 "$ <br> max. AFF. |
| City Hall | ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P.9 |



| City Hall |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Police Lobby: telephone and counter should be lowed <br> to accessible height. |
| Upper Right: |  |
| Lower Left: |  |

## City Hall

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 10
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## Survey Results - by Building / Element

For City of Mercer Island for Transpo



| 77th Ave. SE Street End |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Park entry lacks an accessible route. No parking is <br> provided. |
| Upper Right: | No accessible route to park amenities. |
| Lower Left: | Bench requires an adjacent clear floor space at one <br> end. |

77th Ave. SE Street End
ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 1
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# ADA SURVEY RESULTS 

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

| Aubrey Davis Park |  | COMMENTS | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | $\begin{gathered} \text { Page: } 65 \\ \hline \text { BUDGET } \end{gathered}$ |
| Location | RECOMMENDATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assembly Areas - Indoor / Outdoor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 5: WEST BALLFIELD - SOUTH BLEACHERS, FEROGLIA FIELDS | Designate min. 66"x48" space between bleachers and dugout for 1 wheelchair space and 1 companion seat (aligned with front edge of bleachers). Move bleachers as required away from dugout and ballfield fencing to maintain $36^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. wide accessible route ( $44^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. per Code). Relocate trash and recycling receptacles as required (ensuring $30 " x 48$ " level clear floor space adjacent opening). Costs are for 2 signs, not for moving the bleachers. | Existing bleachers provide seating for approximately 18 people 1 wheelchair space and 1 companion space required. Quantity required: For ( 4 to 25 ) fixed seats= 1 space; $(26$ to 50$)=2$ spaces; $(51$ to 150$)=4$ spaces; ( 151 to 300 ) $=5$ spaces; ( 301 to 500$)=6$ spaces; $(501$ to 5000$)=6$ plus 1 for each 150 of fraction thereof between 501 through 5000 spaces; ( 5001 and over) $=36$ plus 1 for each 200 or fraction thereof over 5000 spaces. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | EA | \$102 |
| ITEM 6: WEST BALLFIELD - WEST BLEACHERS, FEROGLIA FIELDS | Designate min. 66"x48" space between bleachers and dugout for 1 wheelchair space and 1 companion seat (aligned with front edge of bleachers). Move bleachers as required away from dugout and ballfield fencing to maintain $36^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. wide accessible route ( $44^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. per Code). Relocate trash and recycling receptacles as required (ensuring 30 " $\times 48$ " level clear floor space adjacent opening). Costs are for 2 signs, not for moving the bleachers. | Existing bleachers provide seating for approximately 18 people 1 wheelchair space and 1 companion space required. Quantity required: For ( 4 to 25 ) fixed seats= 1 space; $(26$ to 50$)=2$ spaces; $(51$ to 150$)=4$ spaces; ( 151 to 300 ) $=5$ spaces; ( 301 to 500$)=6$ spaces; $(501$ to 5000$)=6$ plus 1 for each 150 of fraction thereof between 501 through 5000 spaces; (5001 and over) $=36$ plus 1 for each 200 or fraction thereof over 5000 spaces. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | EA | \$102 |
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## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

| Aubrey Davis Park |  | COMMENTS | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | $\frac{\text { Page: } 70}{\frac{\text { BUDGET }}{}}$ |
| location | RECOMMENDATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drinking Fountains |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 20: PICNIC SHELTER | Replace the fountain with a hi-low model. | Where provided, min. 2 water fountains are required. 1 is required to meet 602.1-602.6 for clear floor space, height, operable parts, and water flow, and 1 is required to meet 602.7 which is height for standing persons. If a water fountain is provided that meets both requirements, it may be substituted for 2 fountains. Spout outlets shall be 36 " max. AFF or ground. Drinking fountains for standing persons: Spout outlets of drinking fountains for standing persons shall be $38^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. and $43^{\prime \prime}$ max. AFF. <br> Existing condition: Only low level drinking fountain is provided. | P | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | EA | \$4,400 |
| ITEM 21: RESTROOMS AT FEROGLIA FIELDS | Replace the fountain with a hi-low model. | Where provided, min. 2 water fountains are required. 1 is required to meet 602.1-602.6 for clear floor space, height, operable parts, and water flow, and 1 is required to meet 602.7 which is height for standing persons. If a water fountain is provided that meets both requirements, it may be substituted for 2 fountains. Spout outlets shall be 36" max. AFF or ground. Drinking fountains for standing persons: Spout outlets of drinking fountains for standing persons shall be 38 " min. and 43 " max. AFF. <br> Existing condition: Only low level drinking fountain with rim at 35 " AFF and spout at $37^{\prime \prime}$ AFF is provided. Dog fountain is acceptable, but not required. | P | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | EA | \$4,400 |

## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

| Aubrey Davis Park |  | COMMENTS | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | $\frac{\text { Page: } 71}{\text { BUDGET }}$ |
| Location | RECOMMENDATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Drinking Fountains |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 22: SOUTH OF TENNIS COURTS | Replace the fountain with a hi-low model. | Where provided, min. 2 water fountains are required. 1 is required to meet 602.1-602.6 for clear floor space, height, operable parts, and water flow, and 1 is required to meet 602.7 which is height for standing persons. If a water fountain is provided that meets both requirements, it may be substituted for 2 fountains. Spout outlets shall be 36" max. AFF or ground. Drinking fountains for standing persons: Spout outlets of drinking fountains for standing persons shall be $38^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. and $43^{\prime \prime}$ max. AFF. <br> Existing condition: Only low level drinking fountain is provided. | P | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | EA | \$4,400 |
| ITEM 23: WEST BALLFIELD - SOUTH DUGOUT, FEROGLIA FIELDS | Replace the fountain with a hi-low model. | Where provided, min. 2 water fountains are required. 1 is required to meet 602.1-602.6 for clear floor space, height, operable parts, and water flow, and 1 is required to meet 602.7 which is height for standing persons. If a water fountain is provided that meets both requirements, it may be substituted for 2 fountains. Spout outlets shall be 36" max. AFF or ground. Drinking fountains for standing persons: Spout outlets of drinking fountains for standing persons shall be 38 " min. and $43^{\prime \prime}$ max. AFF. <br> Existing condition: Only low level drinking fountain is provided. | P | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | EA | \$4,400 |
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## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

## Aubrey Davis Park

LOCATION RECOMMENDATION COMMENTS

## Restrooms / Bathrooms

| Barrier | 675 | The stall door swing encroaches on clear floor space within stall, or the door is not <br> located on the wide side of the stall, or the door is more than 4" from side panel. | Citation |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | 20

ITEM 36: RESTROOMS AT Revise the front stall partitions to relocate FEROGLIA FIELDS - doors to the wide side of the stalls with 4" ACCESSIBLE STALL max. hinge side panels.

Doors to accessible stalls are required to be on the open side of the stall to provide door maneuvering space on the inside of the stall.
Existing condition: Doors open on toilet side of accessible stalls in both restrooms.


ITEM 37: MEN'S
RESTROOM AT FEROGLIA
FIELDS

Relocate the wall-hung toilet to be 16" - 18"
from centerline to side wall by revising
plumbing. Repair wall finish.

| Barrier | 681 | The existing grab bars are non-compliant in size, configuration, or mounting height. $\quad$ Citation $\mid 20$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

ITEM 38: RESTROOMS AT Replace with new grab bars. FEROGLIA FIELDS ACCESSIBLE STALLS

Grab bars should be 1-1/4" - 2" in diameter, 33" - 36" AFF, with $1-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ min. between the wall and the grab bar. Horizontally, grab bar on rear wall shall extend from toilet centerline 12" min. toward side wall and 24" min. away from side wall. Side wall grab bar shall begin 12" max. from rear wall and extend 54 " min. from rear wall.
Existing condition: Side wall grab bar extends 52" from rear wall in Women's Restroom \& 52-1/2" from rear wall in Men's Restroom.

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

## Aubrey Davis Park Date: 12/01/2021

Page: 77
TYPE RESEACKIE PRI QTY UNITS RECBMUGEDATION COMMENTS

## Restrooms / Bathrooms

10 ADA Bansief04|8.1.2 682 The flush controls are not located at open side of toilet, or controls require gripping, twisting, or pinching to operate.
 RESTROOM AT FEROGLIA as required.
FIELDS - ACCESSIBLE STALL

Flush controls shall comply with Section 309.4 in regards to 5 lbs . max. force required to operate.
Existing condition: Flush control is difficult to operate.

Barrior__684_The_hathronm_contains more than one urinal and the rim exceeds 17 " high or is not 10 ADA Stds. 604.2 13-1/2" deep.


10 ADA Stds. Fig. 604.5.2, 609.2, 604.9

Cost includes lowering flush valve at the same time. Urinal shall be mounted with the rim no higher than 17" AFF and the urinal should extend 13-1/2" min.
Existing condition: Two urinals are both installed with rim at 24-1/2" AFF.

| Barrier | 692 | The mirror exceeds max. 40" high measured from the bottom of the reflecting | Citation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20 |  |  |  | P $\quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 3 \quad 2$ s世rface OR mir, ૬̧ff not located above countertops exceed 35 " high.

Mirrors above countertops are required to be 40" max. to the reflective surface. Wall mounted mirrors are required to be 35" max. and $74^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. to the reflected surface (tall mirrors). Existing condition: Mirrors are size for installation above lavatory but installed on side wall with bottom edge at 44" AFF in Women's Restroom and 44-1/2" AFF in Men's Restroom.

## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

For City of Mercer Island for Transpo


Total for Building: Aubrey Davis Park


Aubrey Davis Park
ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 1


| Aubrey Davis Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: $\quad$ Bleachers require wheelchair seating (with signage). |  |
| Upper Right: | Only low level drinking fountain is provided. Hi-low <br> drinking fountain required. |
|  | Team dugout gates require 32" min. wide openings <br> with maneuvering space on pull side. |

## Aubrey Davis Park

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 2


| Aubrey Davis Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Ground surfaces of all play areas must be compliant <br> and require periodic inspections \& maintenance. |
| Upper Right: | A compliant ramp is required for the play area east of <br> Feroglia Fields. |
| Lower Left: | $5 \%$ of picnic table seating should be accessible. |

## Aubrey Davis Park
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## Aubrey Davis Park
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Aubrey Davis Park
Upper Left: Mirrors in both restrooms by Feroglia Fields should be relocated to above sinks at 40" max. AFF.

Upper Right: Doors are located on wrong side of accessible stalls at restrooms by Feroglia Fields and should be relocated.

Lower Left:
Flush control in Women's restroom by Feroglia Fields should be repaired or replaced due to operation difficulty.

## Aubrey Davis Park
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For City of Mercer Island for Transpo


## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

Bicentennial Park
LOCATION RECOMMENDATION COMMENTS

## Interior Accessible Routes

| Barrier | 646 | The accessible route has cross slopes that exceed max. 2\% (1:48). Citation $\mid 20$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| ITEM 5: MEN'S | Apply a topping coat on the concrete slab <br> to level it. Slope must be no more that 1:48 |
| :--- | :--- |
| RESTROOM | (2\%). |

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

## Bicentennial Park

Date: 12/01/2021
Page: 82
TYPE RRSEAGODE PRI QTY UNITS RECGMUGEDATION COMMENTS

## Restrooms / Bathrooms

10 ADA Badsieł03|3 $671 |$| The accessible toilet stall lacks the $\min$. required dimensions, or the accessible |
| :--- |
| water closet lacks the min. required 60 wide clear floor space. |

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } 112250 \text { SF } \\ & \text { ITEM 6: MEN'S } \\ & \text { RESTROOM - } \\ & \text { ACCESSIBLE TOILET } \\ & \text { STALL } \end{aligned}$ | \$263 <br> Relocate side toilet partition to provide one compliant accessible stall that meets standard stall size requirements. Budget cost includes removing metal partition with accessories, and replacing with new portion of partition. | 2010 Standards requirements for standard stalls: Min. 60" wide x 56 " long (at wall mounted toilet), or min. 60 " wide $\times 59$ " long (at floor mounted toilet). Also, min. $9^{\prime \prime}$ high toe clearance is required at all accessible stalls, unless stall depth exceeds 62 for wall hung and 65 " for floor mounted toilets is provided. ADA requirements for clear floor space at water closets: Min. 60" wide x min. 56" long (both approaches). <br> Existing condition: Toilet stall is 58 " wide -60 " min. is required. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

## ITEM 7: WOMEN'S RESTROOM ACCESSIBLE TOILET STALL

Relocate front toilet partition to provide one compliant accessible stall that meets standard stall size requirements. Budget cost includes removing metal partition with accessories, and replacing with new portion of partition.

2010 Standards requirements for standard stalls: Min. 60" wide x 56 " long (at wall mounted toilet), or min. 60" wide $\times 59$ " long (at floor mounted toilet). Also, min. $9^{\prime \prime}$ high toe clearance is required at all accessible stalls, unless stall depth exceeds 62" for wall hung and 65 " for floor mounted toilets is provided. ADA requirements for clear floor space at water closets: Min. 60" wide x min. 56" long (both approaches).
Existing condition: Toilet is floor mounted, requiring a min. 59" deep toilet stall - 56 " provided. operate, which is not accessible, or the door is not self closing.

ITEM 8: WOMEN'S RESTROOM ACCESSIBLE TOILET STALL

Adjust stall door closer.
Existing stall door is not fully self-closing.
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Total for Building: Bicentennial Park


## Bicentennial Park

Upper Left: Only low level drinking fountain is provided. Hi-low drinking fountain is required for both wheelchair users and standing persons.
Upper Right: Restroom signage lacks Braille.
Lower Left:
Women's restroom: toilet location should be adjusted, rear wall grab bar is required, and dispensers should be relocated within accessible reach ranges.

## Bicentennial Park
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## Bicentennial Park
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## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

Boat Launch $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021


| Barrier $522 \|$W <br> de | Where an accessible bench is to be provided, the deep, with a 17" - 19" high seat an 18" high back bench lacks a 30"x48" clear floor adjacent to one | bench is not 42" long, 20"-24" unless affixed to a wall) OR the nd of the bench. | 2010 AD | Std |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITEM 2: BENCH NEAR SCULPTURE | Recommendation: Provide level clear floor space (concrete pad) adjacent to one end of the bench and 44 " wide (per Code) paved walkway from existing sidewalk at an angle to ensure compliant running slope of $5 \%$ or $1: 20 \mathrm{max}$. (If running slope is greater than 1:20, provide compliant ramp with running slope of $1: 12 \mathrm{max} .60^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. long landings top and bottom and continuous handrails both sides with 12" min . extensions beyond top and bottom of ramp.) Assumed length of path (without a ramp) is $30^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$. | Although not required under 2010 ADA scoping, E\&A recommends providing a compliant 30 " $\times 48$ " clear floor space to one side of the bench. Existing condition: bench is located in lawn, and no clear floor space is provided. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 34 | LF | \$1,201 |

## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo




| Mercer Island Boat Launch |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Gangway to boat launch pier requires an accessible <br> route. |
| Upper Right: | $30 " x 48 "$ clear floor space is required on one side of <br> bench, and an accessible route shall be provided. |
| Lower Left: | Life jacket hooks are mounted too high. Lower one of <br> each type to 48" max. AFF. |

## Mercer Island Boat Launch
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## Calkins Landing
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## Calkins Landing
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Clarke Beach Park

| Upper Left: | Hi-low drinking fountain required adjacent to <br> restrooms. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Right: | Hi-low drinking fountain required adjacent to upper <br> picnic area. |
| Lower Left: | An accessible route is lacking to picnic table in upper <br> picnic area. |

## Clarke Beach Park
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Clarke Beach Park
ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 3


Clarke Beach Park
Upper Left: Restrooms are substantially non-accessible. Accessible stall in each restroom is non-compliant in size, grab bars are not compliant, flush control in Women's is incorrectly located, turn-around not provided in Men's restroom. Other issues were recorded.

Upper Right: Changing rooms are substantially non-accessible. Women's changing room: no turn-around space is provided, and changing cubicles are not compliant in size. Men's changing room: non-compliant bench.

## Clarke Beach Park
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Deane's Children's Park $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021



## Deane's Children's Park

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 1


| Deane's Children's Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Play area requires compliant ground surfaces, which <br> must be periodically inspected and maintained. |
| Upper Right: | Wood border at play areas block accessible route. <br> Removal of wood border and installation of ramp to <br> play areas required. |
| Lower Left: | Bike rack lacks an adjacent (paved) clear floor space <br> along one side. |

Deane's Children's Park
ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 2


| Deane's Children's Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Restroom signage lacks raised lettering, and is non- <br> compliant in mounting height. |
| Upper Right: | Entry door into restroom lacks sufficient area for door <br> maneuvering clearance. Concrete walk to be enlarged, <br> and garbage can relocated. |
| Lower Left: |  <br> height. Wall surface behind toilet to be revised for <br> grab bar. Seat cover dispenser lacks a forward <br> approach. Toilet non-compliant for children's use. |

## Deane's Children's Park
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Deane's Children's Park
Upper Left: Lavatory does not provide knee \& toe clearance and is mounted too high for children's use. Mirror is mounted too high.

Upper Right: Baby changing station is mounted too high.

## Deane's Children's Park
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## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Elemen

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

| Ellis Pond |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| DOCATION | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | Page: 108 |
| BUDGET |  |  |  |



| Barrier | $\begin{array}{l\|l} \hline 510 & \text { The }: \\ & \text { acce } \end{array}$ | The site amenity (ball field, playground, bench, picnic table, BBQ, etc.) lacks an accessible route to it. |  | 2010 ADA Stds. 206.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITEM 2: ROUTE WATER | SSIBLE <br> NCH AND <br> T | Provide 44" min. wide (per Code) asphalt paving to the indicated amenities. At any slopes exceeding $5 \%$, provide a compliant ramp with complying handrails and landings. Further design study and civil engineering required. | Existing site has a lawn area (only) between entry area and bench at waterfront. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | LF | \$353 |
| Barrier | $\begin{array}{l\|l} \hline 522 & \begin{array}{l} \text { Whe } \\ \text { deep } \\ \text { benc } \end{array} \end{array}$ | Where an accessible bench is to be provided, the bench is not 42" long, 20"-24" Citation deep, with a 17" - 19" high seat an 18" high back (unless affixed to a wall) OR the bench lacks a $30 " x 48$ " clear floor adjacent to one end of the bench. |  | 2010 ADA Stds. 903 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 3: BENCH | SSIBLE | Recommendation: Provide level clear floor space (concrete pad) adjacent to one end of the bench. | Although not required under 2010 ADA scoping, E\&A recommends for at least $5 \%$ of benches provide compliant $30 " \times 48$ " clear floor space to one side of the bench. Existing condition: Adjacent to each side of the bench is a dirt path, and no clear floor space is provided. | P | 0 | 7 | 2 | 5 | SF | \$125 |
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Total for Building: First Hill Park $\$ 4,35$
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Forest Landing $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021

| LOCATION | RECOMMENDATION | COMmENTS | TYPE RESP CODE PRI |  |  |  | QTY | UNITS | BUDGET |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Exterior Accessible Routes / Entries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Barrier \| $510 \left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { T }\end{aligned}\right.$ | The site amenity (ball field, playground, bench, picnic table, BBQ, etc.) lacks an accessible route to it. | nic table, BBQ, etc.) lacks an | Citation 2010 ADA Stds. 206.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 1: ACCESSIBLE ROUTE TO BENCH | E Provide 44" min. wide (per Code) asphalt paving to the indicated amenities. At any slopes exceeding $5 \%$, provide a compliant ramp with complying handrails and landings. | Existing site has a path consisting of pavers and stepping stones. | P | O | 1 | 2 | 25 | LF | \$883 |
| Barrier \| 522| | Where an accessible bench is to be provided, the bench is not 42" long, 20" - 24" deep, with a 17" - 19" high seat an 18" high back (unless affixed to a wall) OR the bench lacks a 30"x48" clear floor adjacent to one end of the bench. |  | 2010 ADA Stds. 903 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 2: ACCESSIBLE BENCH | E Recommendation: Provide level clear floor space (concrete pad) adjacent to one end of the bench. | Although not required under 2010 ADA scoping, E\&A recommends for at least $5 \%$ of benches provide compliant $30 " \times 48$ " clear floor space to one side of the bench. Existing condition: Bench is provided, however no adjacent clear floor space is provided. | P | O | 7 | 2 | 10 | SF | \$250 |

Total for Building: Forest Landing


## Forest Landing
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Total for Building: Franklin Landing


## Franklin Landing
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Fruitland Landing
Page: 115



| Fruitland Landing |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: $\quad$A paved accessible route is lacking to the picnic table, <br> bench, and waterfront. Picnic table does not provide <br> an accessible seat area with a paved clear floor space <br> below. |  |
| Upper Right: | A paved accessible route is lacking to the waterfront. |
| Lower Left: | Bench requires an adjacent clear floor space at one <br> end. |

## Fruitland Landing
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Total for Building: Garfield Landing
\$8,727


## Garfield Landing
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| Groveland Beach |  |  | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 122 |
| Location | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | budget |
| Exterior Accessible Routes / Entries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 14: BENCH IN PLAY AREA | Recommendation: Provide level clear floor space (concrete pad) adjacent to one end of the bench and 44 " wide (per Code) paved walkway from play area entrance (extending by, and providing clear floor space for, trash receptacle). | Although not required under 2010 ADA scoping, E\&A recommends for at least $5 \%$ of benches - provide a compliant $30 " \times 48$ " clear floor space to one side of the bench. Existing condition: bench is located in wood chips at play area, and no clear floor space is provided. | P | 0 | 7 | 2 | 20 | LF | \$706 |
| ITEM 15: BENCH NEAR RESTROOMS | Recommendation: Provide level clear floor space (concrete pad) adjacent to one end of one bench adjacent new paved walkway to restrooms. | Although not required under 2010 ADA scoping, E\&A recommends for at least $5 \%$ of benches - provide a compliant $30 " \times 48$ " clear floor space to one side of the bench. Existing condition: two benches are surrounded by lawn, and no clear floor space is provided. | P | 0 | 7 | 2 | 10 | SF | \$250 |
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Groveland Beach $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021



| Groveland Beach Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Accessible parking stall lacks signage. |
| Upper Right: | Curb obstructs toe space and a clear floor space is <br> lacking at the lower fountain. |
| Lower Left: | Drinking fountain by restrooms lacks a clear floor <br> space and an accessible route. |

## Groveland Beach Park
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| Groveland Beach Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Paved road ends. No accessible route is provided to <br> beach, restrooms, volleyball court, or pier. |
| Upper Right: | No accessible route is provided through the lawn to <br> the restrooms. |
| Lower Left: | No accessible route is provided to the beach or pier. |

## Groveland Beach Park
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| Groveland Beach Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Play area requires compliant ground surfaces, which <br> must be periodically inspected and maintained. |
| Upper Right: | Restroom signage lacks an adjacent clear floor space <br> below. |
| Lower Left: | The picnic table lacks an accessible seat, clear floor <br> space, and accessible route. |

## Groveland Beach Park
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Groveland Beach Park
Upper Left: Restrooms are substantially non-compliant. Accessible stall in the Women's restroom is too small, grab bars are missing, flush control is incorrectly located. The Men's restroom lacks a turn-around.

Upper Right: Changing rooms are affected by adjacent restrooms which are substantially non-compliant. No turning space is provided, changing cubicles are too small, and benches in Men's changing room are noncompliant.

## Groveland Beach Park
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## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

Homestead Park $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021

| LOCATION | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | budget |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assembly Areas - Indoor / Outdoor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Barrier \| 563| | The assembly area lacks the minimum quantity of wheelchair seating areas with adjoining companion seats. |  | \|2010 ADA Stds. 221.2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 2: NORTH <br> BALLFIELD - EAST <br> BLEACHERS | Move bleachers away from the fencing to provide min. $5^{\prime}-8$ " clearance. Add a $36 " \times 48 "$ min . concrete pad adjacent to the south end of the bleachers for one of the wheelchair spaces (the other one will be located between the bleachers and the dugout). | Existing bleachers provide seating for approximately 33 people 2 wheelchair spaces are required. Due to the proximity of the bleachers to the ballfield fencing, bleachers need to move back, away from the ballfield fencing, to provide an accessible route. Quantity required: For (4 to 25) fixed seats = 1 space; ( 26 to 50 ) $=2$ spaces; $(51$ to 150$)=4$ spaces; $(151$ to 300$)=5$ spaces; $(301$ to 500$)=6$ spaces; $(501$ to 5000$)=6$ plus 1 for each 150 of fraction thereof between 501 through 5000 spaces; (5001 and over) $=36$ plus 1 for each 200 or fraction thereof over 5000 spaces. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | EA | \$3,622 |
| ITEM 3: NORTH BALLFIELD - NORTH BLEACHERS | Move bleachers away from the fencing to provide a min. of $5^{\prime}-8$ " clearance. Add a 36 " $\times 48$ " min. concrete pad adjacent to the west end of the bleachers for one of the wheelchair spaces (the other one will be located between the bleachers and the dugout). | Existing bleachers provide seating for approximately 33 people 2 wheelchair spaces are required. Due to the proximity of the bleachers to the ballfield fencing ( $44^{\prime \prime}$ exists, 68 " min. required), bleachers need to move back, away from the ballfield fencing, to provide an accessible route. <br> Quantity required: For (4 to 25 ) fixed seats= 1 space; ( 26 to 50 ) $=2$ spaces; $(51$ to 150$)=4$ spaces; $(151$ to 300$)=5$ spaces; ( 301 to 500 ) $=6$ spaces; $(501$ to 5000$)=6$ plus 1 for each 150 of fraction thereof between 501 through 5000 spaces; ( 5001 and over) $=36$ plus 1 for each 200 or fraction thereof over 5000 spaces. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | EA | \$3,622 |

## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

Homestead Park $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 127 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOCATION | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | BUDGET |
| Assembly Areas - Indoor / Outdoor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 4: SOUTH BALLFIELD | Move bleachers away from the fencing to provide min. $5^{\prime}-8$ " clearance. Relocate wood border on the east side of the bleachers to provide 110" clearance for 2 wheelchairs plus 44 " accessible route. | Existing bleachers provide seating for approximately 33 people 2 wheelchair spaces are required. Space for 2 wheelchairs should be provided along the east end of the bleachers ( $66^{\prime \prime}+$ $44^{\prime \prime}$ accessible route $=110^{\prime \prime}$ required; $65^{\prime \prime}$ is provided). Due to the proximity of the bleachers to the ballfield fencing ( 37 " exists; 68 " min. required), bleachers need to move back, away from the ballfield fencing, to provide an accessible route. <br> Quantity required: For (4 to 25) fixed seats = 1 space; (26 to 50 ) $=2$ spaces; $(51$ to 150$)=4$ spaces; $(151$ to 300$)=5$ spaces; $(301$ to 500$)=6$ spaces; $(501$ to 5000$)=6$ plus 1 for each 150 of fraction thereof between 501 through 5000 spaces; ( 5001 and over) $=36$ plus 1 for each 200 or fraction thereof over 5000 spaces. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | EA | \$3,622 |
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## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo


Total for Building: Homestead Park $\$ 25,397$


| Homestead Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Parking signs are mounted too low. Bottom to be 60" <br> min. above paving. |
| Upper Right: Bleachers require wheelchair seating (with signage). <br> Lower Left: Tennis courts lack an accessible route. |  |

## Homestead Park
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## Homestead Park

Upper Left:
Upper Right: Restroom signage is mounted too low.
Lower Left:
Accessible toilet stall doors are required to be selfclosing, have a pull on the inside surface, and have coat hooks at 48" max. AFF.


## Homestead Park
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## Homestead Park

Upper Left: Grab bars in accessible toilet stalls are not compliant in length and mounting height. Seat cover dispensers mounted behind toilet are not accessible. Toilets are too far from wall (should be located $16^{\prime \prime}$ min. - 18" max. from side wall).

Upper Right: Toilet paper dispensers are mounted within the required 12 " clearance space above the grab bar.

Lower Left:
Men's lavatory does not provide compliant knee clearance. Soap dispenser is mounted too high.

## Homestead Park
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Total for Building: Island Crest Park


Island Crest Park

| Upper Left: | Van accessible parking space is insufficient in width. <br> Relocation of signage is required due to restriping. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Right: | Ballfield \#1 Home Team bleachers - companion <br> seats do not provide the required width for adjacent <br> wheelchair seating. |
| Lower Left: | Ballfield \#1 Visitor Team bleachers - space is not <br> sufficient for wheelchair seating, including accessible <br> route. |

Island Crest Park
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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Island Crest Park } \\
& \text { Upper Left: } \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text { Ballfield \#2 Home Team bleachers are too close to } \\
\text { fencing to provide an accessible route in front of the } \\
\text { required wheelchair spaces. }
\end{array} \\
& \text { Upper Right: } \begin{array}{l}
\text { Ballfield \#2 Visitor Team bleachers are too close to } \\
\text { fencing to provide an accessible route in front of the } \\
\text { required wheelchair spaces. }
\end{array} \\
& \text { Lower Left: } \begin{array}{l}
\text { Dugouts require a wheelchair space adjacent to the } \\
\text { end of the bench. Some benches must be adjusted in } \\
\text { length to provide wheelchair space. }
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Island Crest Park
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> Island Crest Park Upper Left: $\begin{array}{ll}1 \text { picnic table is required to provide an accessible } \\ \text { seat. An accessible route is required to table. }\end{array}$ Upper Right: $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { picnic table is required to provide an accessible } \\ & \text { seat. An accessible route is required to table. A ramp } \\ & \text { is required to tennis courts. }\end{aligned}$ Lower Left: $\begin{aligned} & \text { A single low drinking fountain is provided outside of } \\ & \text { each restroom, with insufficient knee space. Hi-low } \\ & \text { drinking fountains are required. }\end{aligned}$

## Island Crest Park
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## Island Crest Park

| Upper Left: | Restroom doors have a latch and a closer, requiring 12" <br> min. width on the push side. |
| :---: | :--- |
| Upper Right: $\quad$Dressing room benches are non-compliant, an additional <br> bench is required in each dressing room. Clothes hooks are <br> mounted too high, one in each room must be lowered or <br> provide a new hook at 48" max. AFF. |  |
| Lower Left: | Each restroom has 2 lavatories. Neither has an accessible <br> knee space clearance. 1 in each restroom must be <br> compliant. Soap dispenser mounted too high. |

## Island Crest Park
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## Island Crest Park

| Upper Left: | Accessible toilet stall in each restroom is insufficient <br> in width. Seat heights are too low. Grab bars require <br> relocation. Flush control in Men's accessible stall is <br> incorrectly located. Photo is Men's restroom. |
| :---: | :--- |
| Upper Right: | The accessible toilet stall in each restroom requires <br> toilet paper \& seat cover dispensers to be relocated. <br> Photo is Women's restroom. |
| Lower Left: | Restroom signage is non-compliant (requires raised <br> lettering and braille), and is non-compliant in location. |

## Island Crest Park
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Lincoln Landing
Upper Left: No accessible route is provided to picnic tables.
Upper Right: $\quad$ Neither of the 2 picnic tables provides an accessible seat with the required knee and toe clearance. 1 accessible picnic table must be provided.

Lower Left:
The accessible picnic table requires a paved clear floor space at the accessible seat, and an accessible route to it.

## Lincoln Landing
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| Luther Burbank Park |  |  | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Page: 156 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOCAtion | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE | RESP | ODE | PRI | QTY | UNITS | BUDGET |
| Built In Elements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 8: ACCESSIBLE PICNIC TABLE IN SMALL DOG PARK | Provide additional accessible picnic table near gate with surface 34" max. above grade and knee space $30^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. wide, $27^{\prime \prime}$ min . high and $17^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. deep on one end of table. | Existing picnic table is a stand alone located in the middle of dog park with no clear floor space. Table surface measures 28-1/2" from grade with knee space measures $27^{\prime \prime}$ high and 9 " deep. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$2,500 |
| ITEM 9: ACCESSIBLE PICNIC TABLE NEAR PLAY AREA - NEAR PICNIC AREA C | Raise tables (or alter accessible end of tables) by $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ min. to provide knee height of 27 ". | Existing picnic tables are have table surface measuring 30 " from grade with knee space measuring $30-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ wide and $26-1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ high (with unlimited depth). <br> Owner/maintenance item. | P | O | 1 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$350 |
| ITEM 10: ACCESSIBLE PICNIC TABLE ON BOARDWALK - WETLAND TRAIL | Add accessible picnic table with surface $34 "$ max. AFF and knee space 30 " min. wide, $27^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. high and $17{ }^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. deep on one end of table. | Existing picnic table is stand alone located on boardwalk platform with table surface measuring $28^{\prime \prime}$ from grade with knee space measures $26-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ high and $9^{\prime \prime}$ deep. | P | O | 1 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$2,500 |
| ITEM 11: ACCESSIBLE PICNIC TABLES CALKINS POINT | Replace accessible picnic tables with top of tables at 28 " to $34^{\prime \prime}$ above slab, and with $27^{\prime \prime}$ min. high, 30 " min. wide, $17^{\prime \prime}$ deep knee and toe space. If table is pedestal type (similar to existing), ensure central post is embedded or recessed in concrete. Pedestal base with change in level at steel plate and protruding bolts is not permitted to encroach into toe space within 30 " $\times 48$ " clear floor space. | Accessible picnic tables are provided on paving on both sides of Calkins Point beach, with surface at 32" AFF, but knee space below measured $25-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ from slab to bottom edge of steel angles spaced 26 " apart. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | EA | \$5,000 |

## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

| Luther Burbank Park |  |  | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | Page: 157 |
| location | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  |  |  |  | BUDGET |
| Built In Elements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 12: ACCESSIBLE PICNIC TABLES - PICNIC AREA A | Assuming 8 people per picnic table (and 3 existing tables), add 2 new accessible tables with surface 34" max. above grade and knee space 30 " min. wide, 27 " min. high and $17^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. deep on one end of table. Locate new accessible tables along new accessible route to BBQ grille and trash receptacles. | 3 existing stand alone picnic tables were observed in lawn with no clear floor space. Knee space at end of all of them was too low and/or too shallow. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | EA | \$5,000 |
| ITEM 13: ACCESSIBLE PICNIC TABLES - PICNIC AREA B | Assuming 8 people per picnic table, replace accessible table (which is not compliant) with 2 compliant accessible tables, each with surface 34" max. above grade and knee space 30 " min. wide, $27{ }^{\prime \prime}$ min . high and $17^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. deep on one end of table. Locate new accessible tables along new accessible route to BBQ grille and hot coal receptacle. | 3 existing picnic tables were observed in lawn, including 1 designated as accessible table. Knee space at accessible table measured $27^{\prime \prime}$ high to bottom surface of table, but only $24-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ to bottom edge of steel supports spaced 21-1/2" apart and encroaching on knee space, making it non-compliant. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | EA | \$5,000 |
| ITEM 14: ACCESSIBLE PICNIC TABLES - PICNIC AREA C | Assuming 8 people per picnic table (and 8 picnic tables dispersed across Picnic Area C), replace 4 existing tables with accessible picnic tables with knee space 30 " min. wide, $27^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. high and $17^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. deep on one end of table. Locate accessible tables so that slab for 30 " $\times 48^{\prime \prime}$ clear floor space at accessible end of table has slope of $2 \%(1: 48)$ at concrete slabs closest to paved walkway. | Existing picnic tables have knee space measuring too low and/or too shallow. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | EA | \$10,000 |

## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

| Luther Burbank Park |  | COMMENTS | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | Page: 158 BUDGET |
| Location | RECOMMENDATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Built In Elements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 15: ACCESSIBLE PICNIC TABLES EAST OF AMPITHEATER | Assuming 8 people per picnic table, replace 2 existing tables with accessible picnic tables with surface 34" max. above grade and knee space $30^{\prime \prime}$ min. wide, $27{ }^{\prime \prime}$ min . high and $17^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. deep on one end of table. | Existing picnic tables are stand alone located in lawn with no clear floor space. Table surface measures 28 " from grade with knee space measures $26-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ high and $12^{\prime \prime}$ deep. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | EA | \$5,000 |
| ITEM 16: ACCESSIBLE PICNIC TABLES NEAR PLAY AREAS - NEAR TENNIS COURTS | Raise tables (or alter accessible end of tables) by $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ min. to provide knee height of $27^{\prime \prime}$. | Existing picnic tables are have table surface measuring 30 " from grade with knee space measuring $30-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ wide and $26-1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ high (with unlimited depth). <br> Owner/maintenance item. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | EA | \$700 |
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| Luther Burbank Park |  |  | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 164 |
| location | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | budget |
| Exterior Accessible Routes / Entries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 36: ACCESSIBLE ROUTE TO BENCH NEAR PATH - CALKINS POINT | Provide new accessible route 44 " wide (per Code) asphalt paving from north gate to existing bench along north fence. | No accessible route is provided to bench. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | LF | \$283 |
| ITEM 37: ACCESSIBLE ROUTE TO BENCH NEAR PATH - EAST OF AMPITHEATER | Provide new accessible route 44 " wide (per Code) asphalt paving from existing paved path to accessible bench near path facing shore. | No accessible route is provided to benches. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | LF | \$424 |
| ITEM 38: ACCESSIBLE ROUTE TO BENCH NEAR PICNIC AREA B | Provide new accessible route $44^{\prime \prime}$ wide (per Code) asphalt paving from new accessible route along Picnic Area $B$ to nearest bench. | 2 benches are provided near Picnic Area B and no accessible route is provided to either bench. <br> Running slope of accessible route shall be 1:20 (5\%) max. (otherwise a compliant ramp would be required). | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 30 | LF | \$1,060 |
| ITEM 39: ACCESSIBLE ROUTE TO BENCH NEAR WALLACE POND | Provide new accessible route $44^{\prime \prime}$ wide (per Code) asphalt paving from existing paved path to bench nearest North Lot. | 2 benches are provided near Wallace Pond and no accessible route is provided to either bench. Running slope of accessible route shall be 1:20 (5\%) max. (otherwise a compliant ramp would be required). | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 25 | LF | \$883 |
| ITEM 40: ACCESSIBLE ROUTE TO BENCH UNDER TREE - EAST OF AMPITHEATER | Provide new accessible route 44 " wide (per Code) asphalt paving from nearest existing paved path to accessible bench under tree. | No accessible route is provided to benches. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 35 | LF | \$1,236 |
| ITEM 41: ACCESSIBLE ROUTE TO DOG BEACH BIG DOG PARK | Provide 44" min. wide (per Code) asphalt paving to dog beach. At any slopes exceeding $5 \%$, provide a compliant ramp with complying handrails and landings. | No accessible route is provided to dog beach. Slope of decline toward water measured as steep as $18 \%$. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 190 | LF | \$12,540 |
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$\begin{array}{ll}\text { RECEPTACLE ACROSS } & \text { floor space } \\ \text { FROM PLAY AREA - NEAR } & \text { receptacle. }\end{array}$
FROM PLAY
SOUTH LOT
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| Luther Burbank Park |  |  | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 169 |
| Location | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | budget |
| Exterior Accessible Routes / Entries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 61: BENCH ACROSS FROM PLAY AREA - NEAR SOUTH LOT | Recommendation: Add 30"x48" min. clear floor space at one end of bench. | Although not required under 2010 ADA scoping, E\&A recommends for at least $5 \%$ of benches, provide compliant 30 " $\times 48$ " clear floor space to one side of the bench with slope in any direction not to exceed 1:48. <br> Existing condition: Slab at bench is too small to accommodate clear floor space on either end. | P | 0 | 7 | 2 | 10 | SF | \$250 |
| ITEM 62: BENCH NEAR DOG WASH | Recommendation: Add 30 " $\times 48^{\prime \prime}$ min. clear floor space at one end of bench. | Although not required under 2010 ADA scoping, E\&A recommends for at least $5 \%$ of benches, provide compliant $30 " \times 48$ " clear floor space to one side of the bench with slope in any direction not to exceed 1:48. <br> Existing condition: Slab at bench is too small to accommodate clear floor space on one end. | P | 0 | 7 | 2 | 10 | SF | \$250 |
| ITEM 63: BENCHES EAST OF AMPITHEATER | Recommendation: Add 30 " $\times 48^{\prime \prime}$ min. clear floor space at one end of 2 benches (one under tree and one near path facing shore). | Although not required under 2010 ADA scoping, E\&A recommends for at least $5 \%$ of benches, provide compliant 30 " $\times 48$ " clear floor space to one side of the bench with slope in any direction not to exceed 1:48. <br> Existing condition: Slab at benches (if any) is too small to accommodate clear floor space on one end. | P | 0 | 7 | 2 | 20 | SF | \$500 |
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| Luther Burbank Park |  |  | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 171 |
| Location | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | budget |
| Play Areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 66: SMALL CHILDREN AREA - PLAY AREA NEAR TENNIS COURTS | Adopt a policy to maintain and inspect the ground surfaces to ensure compliance with ASTM F 1951 and ASTM F 1292 for Use Zones. <br> Also, confirm that interface with rubberized surface at adjacent play area is accessible. | 1008.2.6.1 Accessibility. Ground surfaces shall comply with ASTM F 1951 (incorporated by reference, see "Referenced Standards" in Chapter 1). Ground surfaces shall be inspected and maintained regularly and frequently to ensure continued compliance with ASTM F 1951. <br> 1008.2.6.2 Use Zones. Ground surfaces located within use zones shall comply with ASTM F 1292 (1999 edition or 2004 edition) (incorporated by reference, see "Referenced Standards" in Chapter 1). <br> Existing condition: Ground level is loose wood chips and interface with rubberized surface at adjacent play area has narrow transition that measures up to $45 \%$ in places, which would be a compliant slope for change in level of $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ max. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$0 |
| ITEM 67: SMALL CHILDREN AREA - PLAY AREA NEAR TENNIS COURTS | Adopt a policy to maintain and inspect the ground surfaces to ensure compliance with ASTM F 1951 and ASTM F 1292 for Use Zones. | 1008.2.6.1 Accessibility. Ground surfaces shall comply with ASTM F 1951 (incorporated by reference, see "Referenced Standards" in Chapter 1). Ground surfaces shall be inspected and maintained regularly and frequently to ensure continued compliance with ASTM F 1951. <br> 1008.2.6.2 Use Zones. Ground surfaces located within use zones shall comply with ASTM F 1292 (1999 edition or 2004 edition) (incorporated by reference, see "Referenced Standards" in Chapter 1). <br> Existing condition: Ground level is loose wood chips. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$0 |
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Luther Burbank Park $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021

| Location | RECOMMENDATION | COMmENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | budget |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Play Areas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 68: ZIP LINE - PLAY AREA NEAR TENNIS COURTS | Adopt a policy to maintain and inspect the ground surfaces to ensure compliance with ASTM F 1951 and ASTM F 1292 for Use Zones. <br> Also, confirm that interface with rubberized surface at adjacent play area is accessible. | 1008.2.6.1 Accessibility. Ground surfaces shall comply with ASTM F 1951 (incorporated by reference, see "Referenced Standards" in Chapter 1). Ground surfaces shall be inspected and maintained regularly and frequently to ensure continued compliance with ASTM F 1951. <br> 1008.2.6.2 Use Zones. Ground surfaces located within use zones shall comply with ASTM F 1292 (1999 edition or 2004 edition) (incorporated by reference, see "Referenced Standards" in Chapter 1). <br> Existing condition: Ground level is loose wood chips and interface with rubberized surface at adjacent play area has narrow transition that measures up to $45 \%$ in places, which would be a compliant slope for change in level of $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ max. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$0 |
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TOILET STALL
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Luther Burbank Park

| Upper Left: | Accessible parking signs are mounted too low (and <br> too far from stall). Provide pole mounted signs at head <br> of stalls. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Right: | Amphitheatre lacks an accessible route to seating <br> area and stage. |
| Lower Left: | There are no accessible seating areas in the <br> Amphitheatre. Wheelchair accessible area next to a <br> companion seat could be accommodated near paths <br> on both sides of stage. |

## Luther Burbank Park

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 1


| Luther Burbank Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Rooftop viewing platform is provided above the <br> restrooms near the tennis courts. |
| Upper Right: | Rooftop platform lacks an accessible route. |
| Lower Left: | Entry into the play area near Picnic Area C includes a <br> step down and no accessible ramp is provided. |

## Luther Burbank Park

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 2


$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Luther Burbank Park } \\
\text { Upper Left: } & \begin{array}{l}
\text { Ground surfaces of all play areas must be compliant } \\
\text { and require periodic inspections \& maintenance. }
\end{array} \\
\text { Upper Right: } & \begin{array}{l}
\text { Service counter at Guard station lacks an accessible } \\
\text { route and is too high. An accessible portion is } \\
\text { required. }
\end{array} \\
\text { Lower Left: } & \begin{array}{l}
\text { Dog wash area lacks an accessible route, and water } \\
\text { control is above accessible reach. }
\end{array}
\end{array}
$$

## Luther Burbank Park
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Luther Burbank Park

| Upper Left: | Only low level drinking fountain is provided near old <br> boiler room. Hi-low drinking fountain required. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Right: | Drinking fountain with foot rinse and shower lacks a <br> high level drinking fountain. |
| Lower Left: | The hi-low fountain near the tennis courts has a clear <br> floor space with excessive slope that affects the <br> height of the fountain, resulting in a protruding object <br> hazard. |

## Luther Burbank Park

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 4


| Luther Burbank Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Restrooms near Picnic Area C are substantially non- <br> accessible. |
| Upper Right: | Designated accessible stalls are significantly too <br> small, toilets are mounted too far from side wall, <br> dispensers require relocation, grab bars are not <br> compliant in location. |

## Luther Burbank Park
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| Luther Burbank Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Restrooms near the old boiler room are substantially <br> non-accessible. |
| Lower Left: | Door maneuvering space is too narrow. <br> lequire relocation, grab bars are not compliant in <br> lengh and location, mirrors are mounted too high. |

## Luther Burbank Park

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 6


| Luther Burbank Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Bike rack lacks a paved clear floor space at one end. |
| Upper Right: | Min. 1 bench in each area should have a clear floor <br> space on one end and be on an accessible route. |
| Lower Left: | BBQ grill and hot coal disposal unit lack an accessible <br> route and paved clear floor space directly adjacent. |

## Luther Burbank Park

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 7


| Luther Burbank Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | An accessible picnic table in each area requires a <br> paved accessible route and an accessible seat. |
| Upper Right: | Picnic Area B provides 1 table designated as <br> accessible, however support angles encroach on the <br> required. knee space clearance and no paved clear <br> floor space is provided. |
| Lower Left: | Door maneuvering space at gates to dog parks are too <br> narrow and lack paving. |

## Luther Burbank Park

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 8


| Luther Burbank Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Grab bars in restrooms near tennis courts are too <br> short. Toilet paper dispenser is too close to grab bar <br> and toilet in Men's restroom is too far from wall. |
| Upper Right: | Both restrooms near tennis courts have lavatories <br> without compliant knee space clearance and pipes <br> are not insulated. |
| Lower Left: | Handrails do not extend low enough to prevent a <br> protruding object of more than 4" into accessible <br> route. |

## Luther Burbank Park

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 9
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For City of Mercer Island for Transpo
Luther Burbank Park Administration Building \& Caretaking Facility Date: 12/01/2021

| LOCAtion | RECOMMENDATION | COMmENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | budget |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Doors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 6: SOUTH ACCESSIBLE ENTRY | Consider abandoning this entry and designate as emergency exit only. | Door maneuvering spaces at latch are required to be min. 18" at pull side and $\mathrm{min} .12^{\prime \prime}$ at push side (if equipped with latch \& closer). <br> Existing condition: On exterior - door is recessed 34" and does not provide the 18 " width on the pull side ( 6 " exists). On the interior - door has both a closer and a latch, therefore 12" width on the latch / push side is required - $2^{\prime \prime}$ exists. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | LEAF | \$0 |
| ITEM 7: SOUTH ACCESSIBLE ENTRY | Add new portion of exterior surface (at door approach). | Ensure door maneuvering spaces are min. 18" at pull side x 60 " min . perpendicular on exterior, and $2.08 \%$ max. slope. <br> Existing area has up to $5 \%$ slope. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 25 | SF | \$1,263 |
| Barrier $\|\quad 615\|$The <br> with <br> of $t$ <br> for | The face of door is recessed more than 8" deep max. or there is an obstruction within 18 " of the latch side of a doorway that projects more than 8 " beyond the face of the door, measured perpendicular to the face of the door and maneuvering space for a forward approach is not provided. |  | 2010 ADA Stds. 404.2.4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 8: NORTH ENTRY DOOR | Install power assisted door operator with push button and backup power. <br> (Alternative is to abandon door as public entry.) | Existing door is recessed 12 " from exterior brick facade; the 18" wide maneuvering space on the (exterior) pull side is not provided due to historic frame profile. Power door requires access to electric power. Without power operator, door maneuvering spaces would be required as follows: min. 18" at the pull side and min. 12 "at the push side (if equipped with latch and closer); min. 60" perpendicular to door for forward approach on pull side and 48 "perpendicular to door for forward approach on push side. | P | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | LEAF | \$6,250 |
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| Barrier $618 \mid$ <br>   <br>   | The existing swing or sliding door threshold exceeds $3 / 4$ " and/or does not have a 1:2 bevel, or threshold measures between $1 / 4$ " and $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ but lacks a $1: 2$ beveled transition. |  | 2010 ADA Stds. 404.2.5, 302, 303 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITEM 10: SOUTH ACCESSIBLE ENTRY | Veplace the threshold. | Threshold height shall not exceed $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$, and have a beveled 1:2 slope. (Exception allows $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ with $1: 2$ bevel at doors in existing buildings or alterations.) E\&A recommends replacing to meet current 1/2" max. standard. <br> Existing condition: Threshold measured over 1" high. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$300 |


| Barrier | 622 | The existing door does not have a smooth surface min. 10" from the floor or exterior <br> surface and / or the kick plate installed is not capped. | Citation 2010 ADA Stds. 404.2.10 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

ITEM 11: NORTH ENTRY Remove the hold open device. DOOR

Existing door has a hold open device located within the required $\quad \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{O} \quad 1 \quad 21 \mathrm{EA}$
10 smooth surface on the push side.
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For City of Mercer Island for Transpo
Luther Burbank Park Administration Building \& Caretaking Facility $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021

|  |  | Page: 184 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LOCATION | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE PRI |

## Interior Accessible Routes

| Barrier | 641 | The multistory private building with 3 or more floors OR more than $\mathbf{3 0 0 0}$ sf per floor <br> OR public building with 2 or more floors lacks an accessible route connecting each | Citation 2010 ADA Stds. 206.2 .3 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |

OR public building with 2 or more floors lacks an accessible route connecting each
floor.
2010 ADA Stds. 206.2.3 floor.

| ITEM 13: GENERAL BUILDING | Explore the possibility of relocating all of the public programs that occur on the lower and second levels to the accessible level of the building. An alternate solution would be to provide a new elevator that will access all three levels of the building. Further design study required (budget $\$ 225,000$ for elevator and shaft accessing three levels). | 2010 Standards does not require the installation of an elevator in an altered private facility that is less than three stories or private building with less than 3,000 sf per story unless the building is a shopping center, a shopping mall, the professional office of a health care provider, a terminal / depot (or other station used for specified public transportation), or any other type of facility as determined by the Attorney General. Public building must comply unless it is one story with occupant load of 5 or fewer that does not contain public use space. <br> Existing condition: Building is three stories, and only the first floor level has an entry (the south entry) that is on the same level as the remainder of that floor level. The north entry enters into a stair structure with no accessible route to the floors above or below. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Barrier \| 652 T | The surface is not firm, stable, and slip resistant access due to high pile / thick pad. | he carpet area prohibits easy | $2010$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 14: SOUTH ACCESSIBLE ENTRY | Secure movable area rug or mat with double stick tape at all edges. | Existing interior space has loose rubber mats at the approach to the exit door. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$150 |
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|  |  | Page: 185 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LOCATION | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE PRI |
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| Luther Burbank Park Administration Building |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | North entry door is recessed 12" from brick façade. To <br> preserve historic doorway, power operator would be <br> required. |
| Upper Right: | Entry door's vision panel is above the max. allowed <br> height of 43" AFF, but permitted for a power door. |
| Lower Left: | Building has 3 stories, with only an interior stairway. <br> An elevator is required to provide an accessible route <br> connecting all levels. |

## Luther Burbank Park Administration Building

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 1


Luther Burbank Park Administration Building

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Upper Left: } & \begin{array}{l}
\text { South entry is designated as accessible entry, but } \\
\text { door is recessed } 34 " \text { " (8" max. allowed) into required } \\
\text { door maneuvering space. Consider abandoning entry. }
\end{array} \\
\text { Upper Right: } & \text { A hi-low drinking fountain is required. } \\
\text { Lower Left: } & \begin{array}{l}
\text { Turning space is not provided, and lavatory } \\
\text { encroaches on door maneuvering space at second } \\
\text { floor restroom. }
\end{array}
\end{array}
$$

## Luther Burbank Park Administration Building
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> Luther Burbank Park Administration Building Upper Left: $\begin{aligned} & \text { First floor reception desk does not provide an } \\ & \text { accessible height counter. }\end{aligned}$ Upper Right: $\begin{aligned} & \text { Office door is too narrow. Remove door and provide } \\ & 32 " \text { min. wide framed opening (otherwise door } \\ & \text { opening needs to be widened). }\end{aligned}$ Lower Left: $\begin{aligned} & \text { Doors have knob type hardware. Lever-type is } \\ & \text { required for accessibility. }\end{aligned}$

## Luther Burbank Park Administration Building

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 3


| Luther Burbank Park Administration Building |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Restroom signage is non-compliant. The International <br> Symbol of Accessibility is required. |
| Lower Right: | Grab bar encroaches on door maneuvering space; <br> should be 1-1/2" from the side wall behind. Revised <br> side wall (and door opening) is required. Toilet <br> requires seat height between 17" - 19" AFF and flush <br> control shall be on open side of toilet. |
| $\quad$Pipes below lavatory are not insulated. |  |

## Luther Burbank Park Administration Building
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Luther Burbank Park Administration Building
Upper Left: Existing shelf/mirror unit is mounted too high. Shelf to be 40" - 48" AFF. An additional tall mirror is required.

Upper Right: Coat hook is mounted above the required 48 " max. height.

## Luther Burbank Park Administration Building
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## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

For City of Mercer Island for Transpo


Total for Building: Main Fire Station \#91 $\$ 39,730$


| Main Fire Station \#91 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Service counter accommodates clear floor space, but <br> curved configuration prevents a parallel approach. |
| Lower Left: | See above. |
| be 34" max. AFF. |  |
| weparating it into 2 rooms. Each of these rooms has a |  |
| seting room has movable partition divider, |  |

## Main Fire Station \#91
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| Main Fire Station \#91 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | The high level drinking fountain protrudes into the <br> path of travel, with the bottom surface at 34-1/2" <br> AFF. |
| Upper Right: | Lavatory is not compliant and encroaches on door <br> maneuvering space. Restrooms require renovation. |
| Lower Left: | Toilets in both restrooms are too far from the side <br> wall. Grab bars are too short. Seat cover dispenser <br> encroaches on 12" clearance above grab bar and is <br> not accessible. |

## Main Fire Station \#91
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## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo



## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

Mercerdale Park $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021


## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

| Mercerdale Park |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| DOAte: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |
| LOCATION | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | BUDGET |



| ITEM 4: PLAY AREA WEST HALF | Remove existing ramp and provide new compliant ramp with level landing and continuous handrails both sides with 12" min. extension at top and bottom of ramp. | Max. running slope is $1: 12(8.33 \%)$. Max. cross slope is $1: 48$ $(2 \%)$. A slope of $1: 20(5 \%)$ is not considered a ramp. Existing condition: Running slope of ramp sections measured 6\% and $11 \%$ and landing slope measured as steep as $3.4 \%$. | P | 0 | 1 | 1 | 20 | LF | \$7,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Barrier 509 | The accessible route has a change in level between $1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ and $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ without a $1: 2$ bevel or more than $1 / \mathbf{2}^{\prime \prime}$ high without a compliant ramp. |  | 2010 ADA Stds. 303.4, 405, 406 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITEM 5: ENTRY TO FITNESS STATIONS | Cut through wooden borders at entry side of fitness stations to provide accessible route 44 " min. wide (per Code). | A $1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ vertical level change is permissible. A $1 / 4^{\prime \prime}-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ change must have a beveled slope. A change greater than $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ requires compliant ramp. <br> Existing condition: Fitness stations (total 5) have wooden borders; although wooden border is lower on entry side, it is still too high for accessible route. | $P$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | EA | \$2,500 |


| Barrier | 510 | The site amenity (ball field, playground, bench, picnic table, BBQ, etc.) lacks an accessible route to it. |  | 2010 ADA Stds. 206.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITEM 6: | PTUR | Provide 44" min. wide (per Code) asphalt paving to the side of sculpture where plaque can be read. Ensure running slope does not exceed $5 \%$ (1:20). | Sculpture named "Duet" has dedication plaque but no accessible route to it. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | LF | \$318 |

## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

For City of Mercer Island for Transpo


## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

| Mercerdale Park |  | COMMENTS | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | Page: 197 |
| location | RECOMMENDATION |  |  |  | BUDGET |  |  |
| Exterior Accessible Routes / Entries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 11: BENCH NEAR STATIC STRETCH FITNESS STATION | Recommendation: Provide level clear floor space (concrete pad) adjacent to one end of one bench. | Although not required under 2010 ADA scoping, E\&A recommends at least $5 \%$ of benches provide a compliant 30 " $\times 48$ " clear floor space to one side of the bench. <br> Existing condition: Bench near static stretch fitness station is on slab too narrow to provide clear floor space. | P | 0 |  | 7 | 2 | 13 | SF | \$325 |

## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo



Total for Building: Mercerdale Park



Mercerdale Park
Upper Left: Accessible parking sign is required to be 60 " min . above paving to bottom of sign.

Upper Right: Ground surfaces of fitness areas must be compliant and require periodic inspections \& maintenance

Ground surfaces of play area must be compliant and require periodic inspections \& maintenance
Lower Left:

## Mercerdale Park
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## Mercerdale Park
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$\left.\begin{array}{|ll|}\hline \text { Mercerdale Park } \\ \text { Upper Left: } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Ramp and top landing have excessive slopes and } \\ \text { lacks compliant handrails on both sides. }\end{array} \\ \text { Upper Right: } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Ramp has excessive slope and lacks handrails on } \\ \text { both sides. }\end{array} \\ \hline\end{array} \begin{array}{l}\text { Fitness stations lack an accessible route thru wooden } \\ \text { borders. }\end{array}\right]$

## Mercerdale Park
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Mercerdale Park
Upper Left:
Sculpture lacks a clear floor space and accessible route to the information plaque.
Upper Right: Adjacent clear floor space at either end of bench has excessive slope.
Lower Left: Bench requires a clear floor space at one end.

## Mercerdale Park
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## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo




## Miller Landing

| Upper Left: | This landing is not accessible, as change in level is <br> substantial and property is narrow. Provide signage <br> indicating that landing is not accessible. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Right: | Top of stair down hill. |
| Lower Left: | Steep, unpaved path from stair down to water's edge. |

## Miller Landing
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## Survey Results - by Building / Element
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## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo




Pioneer Park
Upper Left: Accessible routes are required to accessible picnic tables and benches.

Upper Right: Picnic tables do not provide an accessible seat and clear floor space.

Lower Left: Clear floor space and accessible route is required at $\mathrm{min} .5 \%$ of dog waste and trash receptacles.

## Pioneer Park
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## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

| Proctor Landing |  |  |  | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 204 |
| Location |  | RECOMMENDATION | comments | TYPE RESP CODE PRI |  |  |  |  | QTY | UNITS | budget |
| Exterior Accessible Routes / Entries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Barrier 510 | The site amenity (ball field, playground, bench, picnic table, BBQ, etc.) lacks an accessible route to it. |  |  | Citation 2010 ADA Stds. 206.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 2: ENTRY TO PIER Provide 44" min. wide (per Code) concrete compliant ramp with complying handrails and landings. Further design study and civil engineering required. |  |  | Existing condition: $9^{\prime \prime}$ step down to $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ wide pier. |  | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | LF | \$576 |



| Proctor Landing |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: $\quad 12$ parking spaces; no accessible parking is provided. |  |
| Upper Right: $\quad$ Pier. |  |
| Lower Left: | $9 "$ step down to pier approach. An accessible route is <br> required. |

## Proctor Landing
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## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo




| Roanoke Landing |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: $\quad$Roanoke Landing. <br> Upper Right: | The bench requires an adjacent clear floor space <br> (concrete pad) at one end. Loose gravel is adjacent to <br> each side of the bench. |
|  |  |

## Roanoke Landing
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## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo



Total for Building: Roanoke Park $\$ 13,329$


| Roanoke Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Play area requires compliant ground surfaces, which <br> must be periodically inspected and maintained |
| Upper Right: | Picnic table does not provide an accessible seat and <br> clear floor space. |
|  | Picnic table does not provide an accessible seat and <br> clear floor space. |

## Roanoke Park
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| Roanoke Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Low level only fountain is provided. Drinking fountain <br> requires a hi-low model for both wheelchair users <br> and standing persons. |
| Upper Right: | Clear floor space and accessible route is required to <br> bench and picnic tables. |
| Lower Left: | Clear floor space and accessible route is required to <br> drinking fountain. |

## Roanoke Park
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## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo
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## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo



Total for Building: Rotary Park
\$8,232


## Rotary Park
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| Rotary Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Benches do not have a paved clear floor space on one <br> end. |
| Upper Right: | Play area has a step, and requires an accessible <br> ramp. |

## Rotary Park
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## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo



## Total for Building: Secret Park



| Secret Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Play area requires compliant ground surfaces, which <br> must be periodically inspected and maintained. |
| Upper Right: | Play area requires an accessible route and a ramp <br> down to play area. |
|  | Picnic table does not provide an accessible seat and <br> clear floor space. An accessible route is required to <br> trash can, picnic table, and play area. |

## Secret Park
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| Slater Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Accessible parking sign is too low and should be <br> raised to $60^{\prime \prime}$ min. AFF. |
| Upper Right: | Picnic table does not provide an accessible seat and <br> clear floor space. |
| Lower Left: | Benches in various areas of the park require a clear <br> floor space on one end and be on an accessible route. |

## Slater Park
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## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

South Fire Station \#92
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## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| South Fire Station \#92 |  |  |  |
| LOCATION | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | Page: 223 |



## ADA SURVEY RESULTS
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## South Fire Station \#92

ENDELMAN \& ASSOCIATES PLLC / ADA Survey for City of Mercer Island - Transpo / P. 1


South Fire Station \#92

| Upper Left: | Toilet is installed at a skewed angle, and located too <br> far from side wall. Grab bars are mounted too high. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Right: | Lavatory encroaches on toilet clearance and door <br> maneuvering space. Also, lavatory rim is too high. |

## South Fire Station \#92
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For City of Mercer Island for Transpo
South Mercer Playfields $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021


## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

South Mercer Playfields $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Page: 227 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | RECOMMENDATION | COMmENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | budget |
| Assembly Areas - Indoor / Outdoor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 3: SOUTHWEST BALLFIELD | Move both sets of bleachers away from the fencing to provide min. 5'-8" clearance. Costs are for 4 signs, not for moving the bleachers or wood borders. | Each set of existing bleachers provides seating for approximately 40 people. 2 wheelchair spaces are required per bleacher set, one at each end of the bleachers - next to a companion seated on the lowest bleacher row. Due to the proximity of the bleachers to the ballfield fencing, bleachers need to move back 68" min. away from the ballfield fencing, to provide an accessible route. Quantity required: For (4 to 25) fixed seats $=1$ space; ( 26 to 50 ) $=2$ spaces; $(51$ to 150$)=4$ spaces; $(151$ to 300$)=5$ spaces; (301 to 500) $=6$ spaces; $(501$ to 5000$)=6$ plus 1 for each 150 of fraction thereof between 501 through 5000 spaces; (5001 and over) $=36$ plus 1 for each 200 or fraction thereof over 5000 spaces. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | EA | \$204 |
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For City of Mercer Island for Transpo
South Mercer Playfields $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021
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## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

South Mercer Playfields

| Page: 229 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | RECOMMENDATION | COMments | TYPE RESP CODE | PRI | QTY | UNITS | budget |
| Drinking Fountains |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Barrier 754 | The drinking fountain lacks a 30"x48" clear floor space for a front approach OR the clear floor space slope exceeds $2 \%$ in all directions. |  | Citation 2010 ADA Stds. 602.2 |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 6: DRINKING FOUNTAIN NEAR RESTROOMS | Relocate and/or remove hose bib to provide min. 30 " $\times 48$ " clear floor space at existing fountain. | A hose bib encroaches into knee space under low level drinking fountain. | $\mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{O} \quad 1$ | 4 | 1 | EA | \$3,000 |

## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

South Mercer Playfields $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021

| LOCATION | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE PRI |  |  |  | QTY | UNITS | BUDGET |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Exterior Accessible Routes / Entries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{l\|l\|l} \hline \text { Barrier } & 510 & \begin{array}{l} \text { The si } \\ \text { acces } \end{array} \end{array}$ | The site amenity (ball field, playground, bench, picnic table, BBQ, etc.) lacks an accessible route to it. |  | \|2010 ADA Stds. 206.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 7: ACCESSIBLE ROUTE TO BATTING CAGE | Provide 44" wide (per Code) asphalt paving from roadway to the batting cage. | No paved accessible route is provided to batting cage building and batting practice cages. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 100 | LF | \$3,532 |
| ITEM 8: ACCESSIBLE <br> ROUTE TO PICNIC TABLE <br> - ADJACENT TO THE <br> PLAY AREA | Provide 44" wide (per Code) asphalt paving from roadway to the picnic table. | No paved accessible route is provided to picnic table. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 30 | LF | \$1,060 |
| ITEM 9: ACCESSIBLE ROUTE TO PLAY AREA | Provide 44" wide (per Code) asphalt paving from roadway to the play area. | No paved accessible route is provided to play area. | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 30 | LF | \$1,060 |
| Barrier $\|\quad 518\|$The in <br> lacks | The indicated object exceeds 48" high for a side approach and a front approach OR lacks a level 30 "x48" clear floor space OR requires gripping and twisting. |  | 2010 ADA Stds. 308 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 10: BBQ GRILL ADJACENT TO PLAY AREA | Relocate the grill and provide new concrete paving for clear floor space adjacent to the grill with a $2 \%$ max. cross slope (1:48) and 44 " wide (per Code). | The existing paved area below the picnic table and BBQ grill does not provide a $44^{\prime \prime}$ wide route and clear floor space in front of the grill. | P | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | LF | \$141 |
| ITEM 11: BENCH ADJACENT TO PLAY AREA | Provide new concrete paving for clear floor space adjacent to the bench with a $2 \%$ max. cross slope ( $1: 48$ ) and $44^{\prime \prime}$ wide (per Code) accessible route from asphalt drove to bench. | The existing paved clear floor space adjacent to the bench is not 30 " wide. | P | 0 | 7 | 4 | 16 | LF | \$565 |

## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

South Mercer Playfields $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021

| Location | RECOMMENDATION | comments | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | Budget |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Exterior Accessible Routes / Entries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 12: TRASH RECEPTACLES ADJACENT TO PLAY AREA | Provide new concrete paving for clear floor space adjacent trash receptacle with a $2 \%$ max. cross slope (1:48) and $44^{\prime \prime}$ wide (per Code) accessible route from entry to play area. | Clear floor space adjacent to the opening of trash receptacles is not paved (i.e., not stable, firm, or slip resistant). | P | 0 | 1 | 4 | 16 | LF | \$565 |

## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

South Mercer Playfields $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021


## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

South Mercer Playfields


| Barrier ${ }^{\text {a }}$, 843 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | The ground surface may not meet ASTM F 1951 or ASTM F 1292 for resilience and accessible route. |  | 2010 ADA Stds. 1008.2.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITEM 16: PLAY AREA | A Adopt a policy to maintain and inspect the ground surfaces to ensure compliance with ASTM F 1951 and ASTM F 1292 for Use Zones. | 1008.2.6.1 Accessibility. Ground surfaces shall comply with ASTM F 1951 (incorporated by reference, see "Referenced Standards" in Chapter 1). Ground surfaces shall be inspected and maintained regularly and frequently to ensure continued compliance with ASTM F 1951. <br> 1008.2.6.2 Use Zones. Ground surfaces located within use zones shall comply with ASTM F 1292 (1999 edition or 2004 edition) (incorporated by reference, see "Referenced Standards" in Chapter 1). | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$0 |

## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

For City of Mercer Island for Transpo
South Mercer Playfields $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LOCATION | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | Page: 234 |


| LOCATION RECOMMENDATION |  | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | BUDGET |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Restrooms / Bathrooms |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Barrier \| $671 \left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { T } \\ & \text { w }\end{aligned}\right.$ | The accessible toilet stall lacks the min. required dimensions, or the accessible water closet lacks the min. required 60" wide clear floor space. | dimensions, or the accessible <br> Citation floor space. | 2010 ADA Stds. 604, 213 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 17: MEN'S RESTROOM ACCESSIBLE TOILET STALL | Remove one reinforced masonry toilet stall partition and replace it with a narrower metal toilet partition, providing the extra space in the accessible stall. | 2010 Standards requirements for standard stalls: Min. 60" wide x 56 " long (at wall mounted toilet), or min. 60 " wide $\times 59$ " long (at floor mounted toilet). Also, min. $9^{\prime \prime}$ high toe clearance is required at all accessible stalls, unless stall depth exceeds $62^{\prime \prime}$ for wall hung and 65" for floor mounted toilets is provided. ADA requirements for clear floor space at water closets: Min. 60" wide x min. 56 " long (both approaches). <br> Existing condition: Toilet is wall hung. Stall width is 57 " between solid CMU walls, and $58-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ deep to the entry partition. | P | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | EA | \$5,190 |
| ITEM 18: WOMEN'S RESTROOM ACCESSIBLE TOILET STALL | Remove one reinforced masonry toilet stall partition and replace it with a narrower metal toilet partition, providing the extra space in the accessible stall. | 2010 Standards requirements for standard stalls: Min. 60" wide x 56 " long (at wall mounted toilet), or min. 60 " wide $\times 59$ " long (at floor mounted toilet). Also, min. $9^{\prime \prime}$ high toe clearance is required at all accessible stalls, unless stall depth exceeds 62 " for wall hung and 65 " for floor mounted toilets is provided. ADA requirements for clear floor space at water closets: Min. 60" wide $x$ min. 56" long (both approaches). <br> Existing condition: Toilet is wall hung. Stall width is 57 " between solid CMU walls, and $58^{\prime \prime}$ deep to the entry partition. | $P$ | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | EA | \$5,190 |



## ADA SURVEY RESULTS

## Survey Results - by Building / Element

For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

| South Mercer Playfields |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOCATION RECOMMENDATION |  | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Page: } 235 \\ \hline \text { BUDGET } \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restrooms / Bathrooms |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 20: WOMEN'S RESTROOM ACCESSIBLE TOILET STALL | Adjust self-closing door hardware to close the door completely. | Existing stall door has spring hinges that close the door only part way. <br> Owner/maintenance item. | P | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | EA | \$0 |
| Barrier $682 \mid$ <br> $\mathbf{t}$  | The flush controls are not located at open side of toilet, or controls require gripping, twisting, or pinching to operate. |  | 2010 ADA Stds. 604.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 21: MEN'S RESTROOM ACCESSIBLE TOILET STALL | Adjust flush control to operate with 5 lbs . max. force. | Flush controls shall comply with reach ranges and operation requirements specified in Section 309. <br> Existing push button flush control requires an excess of 8 lbs . force to operate. | P | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | EA | \$500 |
| ITEM 22: WOMEN'S RESTROOM ACCESSIBLE TOILET STALL | Adjust flush control to operate with 5 lbs . max. force. | Flush controls shall comply with reach ranges and operation requirements specified in Section 309. <br> Existing push button flush control requires an excess of 8 lbs . force to operate. | P | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | EA | \$500 |
| $683$ | The toilet paper dispenser is not mounted 7" - 9" in front of the toilet edge measured to the center of the fixture, or $\min .15^{\prime \prime}$ to max. 48 " high OR is located less than $12^{\prime \prime}$ above the grab bar or less than $1-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ below the grab bar. |  | 2010 ADA Stds. 604.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 23: MEN'S RESTROOM ACCESSIBLE TOILET STALL | Relocate the dispenser. | Existing toilet paper dispenser is located above the side wall grab bar, within the required $12^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. clearance above the grab bar. | P | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | EA | \$72 |
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| South Mercer Playfields |  |  | Date: 12/01/2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Page: 237 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOCAtion | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  | PRI | QTY | UNITS | budget |
| Restrooms / Bathrooms |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 28: MEN'S RESTROOM | Recommend no change. The item is not being altered and measures less than 54" AFF for a side approach, which meets the 1991 Standards. | Existing electric hand dryer has operation button at 51" AFF. If altered, per 2010 Standards, the item should be below 48" AFF. (Some building codes such as WAC 51-50/IBC require lower mounting heights according to Table 603.6, which should be applied in these jurisdictions.) | P | 0 | 8 | 3 | 1 | EA | \$0 |
| ITEM 29: MEN'S RESTROOM ACCESSIBLE TOILET STALL | Relocate the seat cover dispenser from behind the toilet / above the grab bar to a location within reach range. | Dispensers are required to be max. 48 " high for a front and parallel approach. <br> Existing condition: seat cover dispenser is located above rear wall grab bar, and within the required 12 " min. clearance. | P | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | EA | \$150 |
| ITEM 30: WOMEN'S RESTROOM | Recommend no change. The item is not being altered and measures less than 54" AFF for a side approach, which meets the 1991 Standards. | Existing electric hand dryer has operation button at 51" AFF. If altered, per 2010 Standards, the item should be below 48" AFF. (Some building codes such as WAC $51-50 /$ IBC require lower mounting heights according to Table 603.6, which should be applied in these jurisdictions.) | P | 0 | 8 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$0 |
| ITEM 31: WOMEN'S RESTROOM | Recommend no change. The item is not being altered and measures less than 54" AFF for a side approach, which meets the 1991 Standards. | Existing soap dispenser is located above the sink and is 51" AFF. (Some building codes such as WAC 51-50/IBC require lower mounting heights according to Table 603.6, which should be applied in these jurisdictions.) | P | 0 | 8 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$0 |
| ITEM 32: WOMEN'S RESTROOM ACCESSIBLE TOILET STALL | Relocate the seat cover dispenser from behind the toilet / above the grab bar to a location within reach range. | Dispensers are required to be max. 48 " high for a front and parallel approach. <br> Existing condition: seat cover dispenser is located above rear wall grab bar, and within the required 12 min . clearance. | P | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | EA | \$150 |
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Total for Building: South Mercer Playfields


| South Mercer Playfields |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Bleachers require wheelchair seating (with signage). |
| Upper Right: | Hose bib under low level drinking fountain requires <br> relocation. |
| Lower Left: | Ground surfaces of all play areas must be compliant <br> and require periodic inspections \& maintenance |

## South Mercer Playfields
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| South Mercer Playfields |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | $30 " \times 48 "$ clear floor space is required on one side of <br> bench, and an accessible route to bench is required. |
| Upper Right: | Picnic table requires an accessible seat \& accessible <br> route. |
| Lower Left: | Accessible route is required to play area. |

## South Mercer Playfields
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| South Mercer Playfields |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Accessible route and door maneuvering space is <br> required at practice area. |
| Upper Right: | Accessible route and door maneuvering space is <br> required at batting cage structure. |
| Lower Left: | Accessible route and door maneuvering space <br> required at practice area. |

## South Mercer Playfields
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| Wildwood Park |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Picnic table does not provide an accessible seat and <br> clear floor space. |
| Upper Right: | No accessible route thru lawn area. |
| Lower Left: | Picnic table, book receptacle, and trash can require <br> an accessible route and clear floor space. |

## Wildwood Park
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## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

Youth and Family Services Thrift Shop \& Recycling Center $\quad$ Date: 12/01/2021


ITEM 12: FRONT ENTRY

## DOORS

Recommend no change, as doors pre-date the 2010 ADAS and the 1994 ADAAG did the 2010 ADAS and the 1994 ADAAG did not include this requirement. When

Door base measure 9" AFF, and door stop / hold open exists in $\quad \begin{array}{llllllll} & & 0 & 8 & 1 & 2 & \text { LEAF }\end{array}$
the kick plate area on the push side.
Existing doors are not required to add a smooth surface, but if
one is installed it is required to be capped. are replaced or otherwise altered however, they will need to be brought into compliance with ADAS
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## For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

Youth and Family Services Thrift Shop \& Recycling Center

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LOCATION | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | Page: 247 |

Kitchens - Lounges

| Barrier | 17850 | The dining surfaces for consuming food and drink lack the min. required 5\% (but not less than one) accessible seating spaces and standing spaces lack accessible seating with knee space. |  |  | Citation 2010 ADA Stds. 226, 902 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITEM } 18 \\ & \text { - KITCH } \end{aligned}$ | COND DINING | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLOOR } \\ & \text { TABLE } \end{aligned}$ | Remove one of the dining tables, and provide one with a dining surface 28 " to 34 " AFF, 30 " wide and with a knee 27 " high, 30 " wide and 19 " deep. | Knee space shall be at least 27 " high Existing table has $13-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ deep knee | deep. | P | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | EA | \$1,840 |


| Barrier | 531 | The kitchen sink exceeds 34 " high, lacks 30 " wide knee space if a range or cooktop is provided, or has inaccessible hardware. |  |  | Citation 2010 ADA Stds. 804.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITEM 19: SECOND FLOOR <br> - KITCHEN |  |  | Lower the sink to be 34" max. | Existing countertop and sink are 3 |  | P | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | EA | \$2,100 |


| Barrier | 532 | The kitchen lacks the 50\% of storage at an accessible level of 15" min. - 48" max. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
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For City of Mercer Island for Transpo
Youth and Family Services Thrift Shop \& Recycling Center
Page: $2481 / 2021$

| location | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | TYPE RESP CODE |  |  |  |  | UNITS | budget |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Restrooms / Bathrooms |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Barrier \| $680 \mid$ The to | The toilet lacks compliant side and/or rear grab bars. $\quad$ Citation |  | 2010 ADA Stds. 604.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 21: SECOND FLOOR - RESTROOM \#206, SOUTH RESTROOM | Recommend no change because this restroom will not be made an accessible restroom. Provide directional signage to accessible restroom. | Grab bars should be $1-1 / 4^{\prime \prime}-2^{\prime \prime}$ in diameter, $33^{\prime \prime}-36^{\prime \prime}$ AFF, with $1-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ min. between the wall and the grab bar. Circular cross section - outside diameter 1-1/4" min. - 2" max.. Non-circular cross section - perimeter of $4^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min} .-4.8^{\prime \prime}$ max. Horizontal projections shall be 1-1/2" min. bellow bottom of rail. (Exception: Grab bars not required to be installed in single occupant accessed through private offices.) [2010 Standards: Rear grab bar min. $24^{\prime \prime}$ long from centerline of toilet at transfer side; allows $1-1 / 4^{\prime \prime}-2^{\prime \prime}$ cross section and non-circular shapes; allows alternate children's use height.] | P | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | EA | \$150 |
|  | The existing grab bars are non-compliant in size, configuration, or mounting height. Citation |  | 2010 ADA Stds. Fig. 604.5.2, 609.2, 604.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ITEM 22: GROUND FLOOR RESTROOM | Replace with new grab bars. | Grab bars should be 1-1/4" - 2" in diameter, $33^{\prime \prime}-36^{\prime \prime}$ AFF, with $1-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{min}$. between the wall and the grab bar. Circular cross section - outside diameter 1-1/4" min. - $2^{\prime \prime}$ max. <br> Existing condition: grab bars are mounted too high at 37-3/4" AFF. Also, side wall grab bar is $36^{\prime \prime}$ in length and is required to be $42^{\prime \prime}$ min., mounted 54 " min. from back corner. Rear wall grab bar is 36 " long, which is compliant, but location is to be $24^{\prime \prime}$ from toilet centerline to the end of the grab bar on the open (toilet) end. | P | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | EA | \$1,300 |
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For City of Mercer Island for Transpo

| Youth and Family Services Thrift Shop \& Recycling Center |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOCATION | RECOMMENDATION | COMMENTS | Page: 250 |
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## Survey Results - by Building / Element

For City of Mercer Island for Transpo


Total for Building: Youth and Family Services Thrift Shop \& Recycling Center $\$ 29,975$


## Youth and Family Services Thrift Shop
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| Youth and Family Services Thrift Shop |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Check-out counter lacks a 36" high max. x 36 " min. in <br> length accessible counterspace. |
| Upper Right: | Lockers do not provide the min. $5 \%$ required to be <br> accessible, due to height of hooks \& bottom shelf. |
| Lower Left: | Sink is 36 " AFF (should be 34" max.) and lacks knee <br> clearance for a forward approach. Above countertop <br> outlets are out of accessible reach. Paper towel <br> dispenser is mounted too high. |

## Youth and Family Services Thrift Shop
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| Youth and Family Services Thrift Shop |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Dining table does not provide the required knee <br> clearance space. |
| Upper Right: | Countertop and sink are too high. Must be 34" AFF <br> max. for sink height and for accessible reach to above <br> countertop mounted outlets. Also, kitchen lacks 50\% <br> of storage at accessible height. |
| Lower Left: | Second level accessible restroom signage is mounted <br> too high. |

## Youth and Family Services Thrift Shop
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| Youth and Family Services Thrift Shop |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Upper Left: | Ground floor restroom grab bars are too short and <br> incorrectly located. Seat cover dispenser is not <br> accessible above the toilet. |
| Upper Right: | Ground floor restroom lavatory does not provide the <br> required knee space clearance. Pipes require <br> insulation. Mirror and towel dispenser are too high. |
| Lower Left: | 2nd floor restroom adjacent the kitchen is <br> inaccessible. Provide directional signage to accessible <br> restroom. |

## Youth and Family Services Thrift Shop
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## Appendix E-Stakeholder Engagement

## CITY OF MERCER ISLAND

## ADA TRANSITION PLAN

ENGAGEMENT \& PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SUMMARY

| PREPARED FOR: | Lia Klein, City of Mercer Island |
| :--- | :--- |
| PREPARED BY: | Jeanne Acutanza, Acutanza STS |
| CC: | Patrick Lynch, Transpo Group |
| DATE: | November 1, 2021 |

## Introduction

This summary provides an overview of engagement and outreach to support the City of Mercer Island ADA Transition Plan development. In developing this ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) Transition Plan, we emphasize outreach and engagement to people with disabilities and those who support people with disabilities. We also reach out to members of the public with no disability. We hope to meet our community where they are; however, most outreach was conducted using virtual and online communications strategies in the interest of community safety. We also want to reflect the communities served and make sure our outreach is accessible to those who are more comfortable communicating in other languages.

We conducted this outreach to gain feedback on current pedestrian facilities within the public right-ofway and access within and to public buildings that provide access to community and government services. This memo outlines the community outreach process used to support the development of this ADA Transition Plan. Our survey and outreach were conducted over the summer and fall of 2021, during the global COVID 19 pandemic. The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and guidance the state a local Departments of Health restricted our ability to conduct in-person outreach for the plan. Outreach was limited to include largely online outreach.
Specific elements of our outreach included:

- an online open house which will remain open through plan development
- an online mapping tool to identify issues that remains open through plan development
- a public survey opened from July into September
- an in-depth focus group and discussions with volunteers from the survey responders

Attachments to this memo include:
A. Survey questions
B. Topline Survey Results
C. Listing of issues from survey and focus group
D. Focus Group Guide

## Promotion and advertising for outreach

The goal of the outreach for the ADA Transition Plan update was to reach out broadly to members of the public that travel on Mercer Island with and without disabilities.

Specific outreach to the public and organizations serving and advocating for individuals with disabilities consisted of:

- Promotion through the City outreach page with current outreach efforts called "Let's Talk" (right) links to a project Online Open House. The City also placed notices in Nextdoor and Facebook.
- Paper flyers and posters placed at public places throughout that are open to the public. These included the library, Mercer Island City Hall and all senior housing facilities on the island.
- Article in the Mercer Island Reporter soliciting community feedback on the survey August 18, 2021 here: www.mi-reporter.com/news/city-offers-resident-survey-while-developing-ada-transition-plan/
- Outreach to the Mercer Island school district to notify families served by the schools
- Launching a landing page within the City website within Public Works dedicated to the development and status of the ADA Transition Plan. It continues to be the landing page to the public for ADA issues.
www.mercerisland.gov/publicworks/page/ada

LET'S TALK


- Promoting an online open house describing Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the ADA process, and the emphasis on facilities for pedestrians in the public right-of-way here: https://www.mercerislandada.com/. The page remains active as an educational resource and links to an online mapping tool to identify locations.
- Creating an online mapping and reporting tool for the public to report barriers to access here: https://www.mercerislandada.com/interactivereporting. This link remains active and allows the public to report obstacles they encounter using a mapping interface.


## Online Survey: July 4 through September 14, 2021

A 17-question survey was open from the online open house launch on July 4 through September 14, 2021. The English language version of the online survey resulted in seventeen complete answers. It asked respondents how they travel, where they live, why they travel in Renton, whether they had a disability or support someone with a disability. It also asks respondents whether an accessibility issue has ever prevented them from participating or obtaining services in the City of Mercer Island. Questions regarding demographics were optional. The survey did not specifically ask where respondents live but did request a ZIP code for each respondent. Most of the respondents indicated they lived within the City and in ZIP code 98004. No Chinese or Spanish language surveys were completed online. No survey respondents indicated they were of Hispanic origin

While the survey was broadly advertised and open for two months, only seventeen people responded fully to the survey. With a small population on Mercer Island, this level of response was not unexpected. The responses themselves were detailed, providing specific examples and perspectives on priorities. Survey respondents were reported to be predominantly residents of Mercer Island. Almost half (47\%) of the respondents said they either had a disability or supported a person with a disability. The summary also included a crosstab comparison of the general responses and responses of those with disabilities.

In addition to feedback through the survey, the City received specific comments from survey respondents and focus group members. Those comments will be incorporated with other comments received during the survey. Focus group members noted that they did see notices on social media.

The survey asked if and where any of the respondents experienced barriers to access. Of the seventeen respondents, four noted they experience barriers to access. Of these four, two noted they had a disability or supported a person with a disability. Sidewalk barriers and gaps in sidewalks were most often shown to be the barrier.
Others noted specific barriers as off-leash dogs within parks, heavy doors in the Mercerdale Park restrooms, and bus stops along West Mercer Way that are not easy to access, or inability to get to the Park-and-Ride by the Congregational Church on Island Crest Way (this requires walking up steep hills which is a challenge on snowy days).

Respondents also noted their top modes of travel were driving and walking. The survey was conducted during the pandemic and may have impacted responses; for example, transit ridership had declined, and some transit routes that were cut or eliminated during the pandemic have yet to return. Few (7\%) indicated they rode transit.

The top response among those with disabilities or supporting a person with disabilities was a lack of ADA parking. The survey welcomed respondents to comment on up to three specific problem locations. A list of twenty-four issues reported in the survey is included in Attachment $C$. The top two issue types were sidewalk barriers/gaps and access within parks. Finally, the respondents were asked about their priorities for addressing ADA gaps and barriers. For the general respondents, the top two priorities identified were transit and retail areas. These were the same two top priorities for those within the crosstab of people with a disability or supporting someone with a disability.

The focus group and individual interviews provide an opportunity to ask for clarifications about barriers and issues noted in the survey.

## Focus Group Meeting September 30, 2021, and Interviews

Using the Zoom virtual platform that included closed captioning, the project team and consultant conducted interviews and a facilitated focus group of Mercer Island residents and survey responders. All the respondents interviewed live on Mercer Island and have a disability or support a person with a disability. The focus group on September 30 was recorded only to confirm documentation. We are grateful to those volunteers that volunteered their time.

In addition to discussing the survey topline results and ADA plan process, the focus group mentioned several issues that are listed in Attachment C. Respondents were invited to describe other barriers observed and experienced on Mercer Island in the public right of way and to provide details on the barriers experienced. It was also asked if there was concurrence with the priorities noted in the survey by the general respondents and the crosstab group of those that either have a disability or support people with disabilities. The top two priorities mentioned were access to transit and access in retail areas. It is also notable that there was significant discussion related to parks, park access, and ADA parking, and ADA restroom access, specifically within or near parks. One of the top issues noted in the survey was missing and poorly maintained sidewalks. This was confirmed in the focus group - that in some areas, broken and uneven sidewalks in retail locations encourage the use of the smoother street. While the City does not maintain or operate traffic signals on Mercer Island, traffic signals were long and not pedestrian-friendly. Pedestrian phasing (either lead pedestrian intervals or pedestrian phase re-call) is desirable, especially near schools with more pedestrians. Many signals do not provide accommodations (buzz or beep) for those with disabilities. This is particularly an issue for pedestrian paths to transit.

## Summary

Topline survey results are provided in Attachment B with a listing of issues at specific locations identified by the public provided in Attachment C. An overview of comments received during this outreach process fall into the following categories:

- Comments on issues within the public right of way
- Issues outside the purview of the ADA Transition Plan
- Priorities


## Comments on issues in the public right of way

The table below notes the number of times different types of issues were mentioned in the online survey. Note that some issues fit more than one category (e.g., maintenance of sidewalks fits in both maintenance and sidewalk categories). Park access and sidewalks were mentioned most, which is consistent with what was noted in the focus group.

People noted broken, uneven sidewalks (like near the post office), missing links (like in neighborhoods), shoulders not clearly marked by use and inappropriately shared by bikes, cars, and pedestrians (like on West/East Mercer Way), and uneven gravel paths that parallel roadways and are intended for pedestrians (like near Luther Burbank Park).

Park access and lack of accessible parking near parks were noted. ADA accessible restrooms, genderneutral restrooms to allow for support people to assist, restrooms that are easily accessible with doors that open easily were also noted. ADA accessible public restrooms near short-term accessible parking were noted as an idea to accommodate those traveling in retail areas. Inaccessible parking for on-street parking was also noted as being awkward for loading and deploying ramps for wheelchairs.

Comments related to access to and within buildings included providing push buttons for doors on the left and near the entrance, making sure public buildings like the police department office within City Hall and virtual public meetings can accommodate all disabilities, including providing closed captioning for all meetings, and not relying on phone technology for access. Information provided via the internet should meet ADA accessibility.

Design standards to meet ADA requirements are provided as minimums and should not restrict the City from considering exceeding minimums where viable, practicable, and beneficial for the public.

TABLE 1 - SUMMARY OF TYPES OF COMMENTS FROM THE SURVEY, MAPPING TOOL, AND FACEBOOK

|  | $n$ $\bar{n}$ 0 0 $i n$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{n}{\pi} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 00 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O으 } \\ & \stackrel{y}{n} \\ & \stackrel{H}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | ¢ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Online Survey Responses | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 7 |

## Issues outside the purview of the ADA Transition Plan

Issues noted in the survey that may be passed on to other agencies included lack of access to programs (football games), recreational programs, or elevators in schools or other recreational facilities. Restrooms in private businesses were noted as substandard, with difficult doors to open, or not genderneutral (to allow for a support person). Again, design standards of width should be considered minimums.

## Priorities

The survey noted top priorities for ADA improvements as Transit and Retail areas and focus group members agreed. Notably, the survey identified numerous issues related to accessing the park. The focus group also discussed parks extensively.

## ATTACHMENT A - SURVEY QUESTIONS

The following survey questions were provided online in English, Chinese, and Spanish.

1. Why do you travel on Mercer Island? (Live, work, school, appointments, etc.)
2. Please tell us about yourself. (Have a disability, support someone with a disability, have no disability, or prefer not to say.
3. If you have a disability or disabilities; or if you support someone with a disability, please check all that apply (lists a range of disabilities)
4. What resources do you use to find information on ADA issues?
5. Please provide your five-digit zip code
6. How often do you travel on Mercer Island?
7. How do you travel within the City of Mercer Island? (Drive, walk, bike, roll, transit, etc.)
8. If you use transit, how often do you use it in a typical week?
9. Are you now, or were you ever unable to participate in an event or obtain services in the City of Mercer Island? (Y/N)
10. Which of the following physical barriers are/were reasons you are not/were not able to participate in events or access services in the City of Mercer Island?
11. What areas would be your priority in improving access to facilities?
12. What areas would be your second priority in improving access to facilities?
13. *Please list up to three locations where you have experienced (or noticed) mobility challenges, accessibility challenges, trip hazards, etc., in the City of Mercer Island. *For these open-ended questions, please provide the location/s where you have experienced challenges with pedestrian facilities as well as a description of the problem/s you encountered. For example, Location: sidewalks on SE 40th St @ Island Crest Way. Description: Sidewalk is raised, creating a trip hazard
14. What is your age? (optional)
15. How do you identify yourself? (optional)
16. Are you of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino origin or descent? (optional)
17. Would you be willing to participate in a focus group or individual interview? (Following all COVID-19 safety protocols)

## ATTACHMENT B - SURVEY TOPLINE RESULTS



# ADA Transition Plan Update Survey Top Line Results 

On-Line Survey
thru September 14, 2021
UPDATED October 14, 2021

Transpo Group/Acutanza STS

## About Transition Plans

- Addresses deficiencies to improve mobility
- public right-of-way including sidewalks, crosswalks, curb ramps, signals, transit stops
- Access and areas within buildings and parks open to the public
- Focused on providing access to resources and services
- Addressing barriers in public right of way \& public buildings
- What is included - sidewalks and roadways especially those that access public services and facilities
- What is not included - facilities managed by others such as schools, churches, private retailers
- Next Steps toward the end


## Outreach

- Survey open July 4 - September 14
- Survey Promotion
- Advertised on Website \& Online Open House
- Promoted through Social Media Channels
- Article in the Mercer Island Reporter
- Translation included Spanish Chinese
- Focus Group Explores
- Where are there barriers
- What types of facilities are priorities (where would you invest)
- Which locations are priorities?


## Survey Summary

1. Respondents and demographics
2. Issue areas
3. Priorities
4. Demographics and Respondents
-17 full responses

- Most live on Mercer Island with one off Island response
- Many also shop, recreate and have medical appointments in Mercer Island
- Highest sources for information was City then State, DSHS and Transit Agencies
-Top two modes are drive and walk, few are regular transit users
- Most respondents in the 45-55 Age


## Demographics / Respondents

- Most white
- No Spanish/Chinese responses
-Respondents (6\% prefer not to say)
-35\% Report they have a disability
-12\% Report they support someone with a disability
- 47\% Report they are not disabled
- Greatest portion had a condition that substantially limits one or more physical activities such as walking, climbing stairs, reaching, lifting, or carrying. Next is those with wheelchairs.


## Please tell us about yourself



Why are you traveling on Mercer Island
(Choose all that apply)


## How do you travel within the Mercer Island?



## 2. Issues identified in the survey

## Issues Identified

- 4 indicated they have experienced barriers to access. Of these, 2 have a disability or support a person with a disability.
- 24 locations were reported by members of the public using the survey. No locations were reported using the on-line mapping tool
- Of the issues reported:
- Sidewalks and ADA parking were identified most
- Lack of facility accommodations were also noted
- Lack of accessible spaces
- 7 People noted they would be willing to support a focus group. Of these, three have a disability or support a person with a disability


## Types of Barriers noted



## Specific other reasons people indicated they could not participate

- Off leash dogs in parks
- Former neighbor unable to open door at Mercerdale Park restroom due to weight of door
- All bus stops on W. Mercer Way removed - can't get to P\&R easily without walking up steep hill (slippery on icy days) to P\&R by Congregational church on Island Crest Way


## Types of Issues Noted

- Most noted sidewalks and issues in parks
- Vehicles in crosswalks/sidewalks/pedestrian shoulders
- Wide streets that impact crossing and encourage speeding
- Lack of ADA parking


## 3. Priorities

# What locations/areas were noted as priority destinations from the general survey 



## What locations/areas were noted as priority destinations for those supporting or with a disability



## Cross-Tab with those with Disabilities or Supporting someone with a Disability

- Lack of ADA parking was identified as the highest barrier to access as compared to a lack of sidewalk in the larger sample
- Access to Retail and Transit were ranked as the highest priorities
- Lack of parking was noted as the top barrier in this cross-tab in comparison to sidewalks noted in the overall
- Parks, parking, and limitations on resources (access to lift/elevator in school), lack of disability areas or resources were also noted as barriers


## ATTACHMENT C - ISSUES IDENTIFIED THROUGH THE SURVEY, MAPPING TOOL, AND FOCUS GROUP/INTERVIEWS

## Survey Comments

| Location | Comment | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{n}{n} \\ & \sum_{0}^{1} \\ & 0 \\ & i n \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \sum_{u}^{n} \\ & 0 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | ¢ ¢ ¢ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| South Mercer Playfields Playground | Barrier to entering the playground. |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Pioneer Park | I like to "walk" in the park, but off-leash dogs jump on my chair and scare me. |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| The sidewalk on 40th in front of Homestead field | Cars park on the sidewalk blocking access in the bus pullout area. Please ticket these vehicles and place no parking on sidewalk signage. | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Mercer Island | Sidewalks are missing or damaged - e.g., cracks, discontinuities, etc. | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lack of crosswalk on 76th Avenue in front of Aljoya | This is a very dangerous situation that should have been remedied shortly after the facility was built. Additionally, there is no wheelchair ramp at the curbside parking in front of the building. |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sidewalks on 77th and 78th in the downtown core. | Uneven or crumbling sidewalks that challenge wheelchair mobility. Ambulatory people can simply step over these obstacles or use the roadway if necessary. A wheelchair cannot avoid these impediments, especially around tree roots affecting sidewalks. | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mary Wayte pool | No changing room and shower for disabled teens/adults. No place to watch swimming other than upstairs bleachers. No water activities for disabled children with mobility issues. |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |


| Location | Comment | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \tilde{n}_{0}^{10} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & i n \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{n}{n} \\ & \stackrel{n}{00} \\ & i n \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | - | ¢ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sidewalks along Island Crest Way North of 40th St | These sidewalks are very narrow, uncomfortably close to the roadway, and have occasional trip hazards | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SE 82nd St to West Mercer Way to Merrimount Dr., to SE 40th St | No bus stops (all removed), No place to park cars along W. Mercer Way when neighborhood roads are too icy and steep, and too many cars (growth of more homes with no improvement to infrastructure to handle the growth on icy, snowy days). Construction trucks blocking roads and workers littering roads. | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Sidewalks in downtown |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 77th Avenue SE in <br> Town Center | Street and street lanes are too wide for safe crossing, especially for older residents and residents with young children. Center lane needs to be removed. As a resident over seventy, Town Center is a very dangerous place to walk. |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| South end | Lack of sidewalks or unleveled or narrow sidewalks | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wheelchair lift at Mercer Island High School | When I was an MIHS student and in a wheelchair, I was not allowed to use the wheelchair lift. It may have been broken, or they might not have wanted to bother helping me. |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Luther Burbank Park | Numerous issues |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Gravel path on 84th from 36th Street to Upper Luther Burbank open space | Please put No parking signs. Cars park on path forcing peds/bikes into middle of road. | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |
| Aljoya and The Mercer Apartment complex | Lack of wheelchair ramp to back parking area behind Aljoya and The Mercer Apartment complex |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |


| Location | Comment |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \sum_{i n}^{10} \\ & \text { un } \\ & \text { od } \end{aligned}$ | n $\cdots$ $\cdots$ 00 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\omega} \\ & \vdots \\ & \stackrel{n}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | - | ¢ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7605 SE 27th St, <br> Mercer Island | My wheelchair van requires I load/unload on the right side. The single disabled parking stall requires my driver to back in, so my ramp opens up on the large cement sidewalk in front of Hair Excel. Parking straight-in does not provide enough space for my ramp to extend and my chair to not contact a car parked adjacent. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| High school sports field/stadium | No disabled family area to watch football game and other sports. |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| W Mercer Way \& 78th Ave SE | Motorcycles and bikers obstruct W Mercer Way. This is a narrow road with many blind curving spots. Bikers ride side-by-side, causing vehicles to bypass into oncoming lane and blind curves. Motorcycle cross into on-coming lane to bypass vehicles, forcing vehicle into narrow pedestrian shoulder. | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| SE 27th Street in Town Center | Street and street lanes are too wide for safe crossing, especially for older residents and residents with young children. This encourages traffic to go too fast on this street, making it very dangerous for residents of all ages. Center lane needs to be removed. |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Town center | Need a few more handicapped spaces on city streets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Deane's Children's Park | Numerous Issues |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Mercerdale Park restrooms | Door is too heavy for a person with disabilities to open. Please lighten the weight of the door. |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Totals | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 7 |

## Focus Group/Interview Questions

## General and Specific Location Comments

While most attendees responded to the survey, they reiterated some of the same comments raised in the survey. Group members suggested that to understand disability issues better, administrators and planners at the City should experience spending time in wheelchairs and attempting to use the transportation system. Comments raised by focus group members are noted below:

GENERAL COMMENTS
Sidewalks and Curb Ramps - When designing sidewalks and curb ramps, consider exceeding the minimum standards. Designers should consider that in many cases, people may be walking with a partner. Design standards are prescribed as "minimums," so consider the benefits of increasing widths when and where it could be beneficial.

ADA Restrooms - Public and private restrooms should be upgraded and modified to meet standards and be made large enough to accommodate a personal assistant. Gender-neutral bathrooms can accommodate people assisting. When bathrooms are updated, they should be upgraded throughout to meet ADA standards. Bathroom doors should be easy (not heavy) to open, and doorknobs should be up to code.

Quality of Sidewalks/Walkways - Small bumps in the sidewalk may meet design tolerances but, if possible, should be reduced or eliminated. Small bumps can be difficult and painful (for example, in a wheelchair) to navigate for some. These bumps may be in doorway frames or part of broken/bumpy sidewalks. Cracks and holes (like holes for utilities) in sidewalks need to be filled. Steep slopes and uneven sidewalks are very difficult to maneuver for people using crutches.

Shared use of spaces for pedestrians - There are "tensions" in pathways where parking occurs in the same space where pedestrians and cyclists are expected to travel. These may appear to be shoulders like on Island Crest Way, where roadway shoulders are expected to be used for parking, biking, and walking. Areas are not well marked to restrict parking, and vehicles use the path/space that pedestrians and cyclists are expected to use. Some gravel paths may provide a walkway near roadways where sidewalks adjacent to streets are not provided. Gravel pathways may be bumpy, uneven, and less desirable, especially for those using wheels and as a result, vulnerable pedestrians may choose the roadway.

Design Standards - While design standards are evolving and are helpful in specifically setting minimum design widths, it should not limit providing greater/wider facilities. For example, if the width of a restroom is prescribed in design standards, it should not restrict providing wider facilities if opportunities present themselves. This may be considered in the future development of the Aubrey Davis Park restrooms. Similarly, the City could exceed recommendations/standards for accessible on street parking.

How is Maximum Extent Feasible applied - How is the City addressing intersections where existing grade makes it challenging to meet full ADAAG for pedestrians (for example SE $40^{\text {th }}$ Street at $86^{\text {th }}$ Ave SE)

ADA Restrooms/Parking - It would be good to publish or make available a map of ADA-accessible restrooms and ADA parking.

ADA Accommodation at Signals - While the City does not own or operate the signals on the Island, they should be upgraded to include accommodations for those with disabilities, including buzzing, beeping when push buttons are used. Signals should be timed to accommodate long pedestrian crossing times specifically adjacent to high pedestrian destinations like transit. Consider downtown intersections, City Hall Area, Island Crest Way and SE $40^{\text {th }}$ Street.

## SPECIFIC ISSUES RELATED TO BUILDINGS \& PARKS/ADA ACCESS

Mercerdale Park. The restroom doors at Mercerdale Park are difficult to open, especially for those with disabilities.

ADA parking related to restrooms, parks, and retail buildings - There is a lack of ADA parking at parks like Pioneer Park and adjacent to retail areas, specifically the recycle center near Mercerdale Park.

City Center ADA Parking - More accessible parking spaces in town city center are needed specifically streets off Island Crest Way in City Center ( $27^{\text {th }}$ and $28^{\text {th }}$ )

Pioneer Park Parking/ADA Restrooms - Time-limited ADA parking adjacent to gender-neutral restrooms that can accommodate wheelchairs and a support person would be welcome. This could serve many with disabilities that may need restroom relief.

Pioneer Park is an especially desirable park for those with disabilities, as it provides smooth and level trails. Parking and access to this park are inconvenient. If people park across the street, there are limited and inconvenient areas to cross the streets to access the park. Protected mid-block (signal-controlled) crossings would be desirable.
$\mathbf{7 6}^{\text {th }}$ Avenue SE at SE 27 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street ADA Parking Challenges - The ADA stall serving this retail area is not wide enough to deploy a wheelchair ramp from the passenger side. From the right passenger side, deploying a ramp could hit cars in the adjacent space. A driver currently needs to back the vehicle into the space so the passenger can deploy the ramp, and it currently loads onto the sidewalk.

Police Department Building Access - Access to buildings and City services should ensure full access for all. In the past, the secured police area of city hall was only accessible by using a phone on the wall, which is not accessible for those with hearing issues. It was also noted that the phone was located at a height that may not have been reachable to all. We will need to confirm if this issue has been resolved.

Access to captioning for City programs - Closed captioning should be provided automatically for all virtual public meetings. To date, captioning has been inconsistent. The pandemic and reliance on virtual meetings exacerbate this issue. Web sites should also be tested for accessibility.

Mercer Island Community Center - The door for access on the central plaza has an inconvenient pushbutton causing users to circulate after pushing the button. The button is on the right but opens into the user. Can it be located left of the door as you enter?

Parks and Leash Laws - Unleashed dogs in parks requiring leashes are not often enforced. Loose dogs can be an impediment or even a threat for all that walk/bike/roll in Mercer Island's parks. There may be opportunities for educational outreach.

## SPECIFIC LOCATIONS RELATED TO PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY

(SIDEWALKS, CROSSWALKS, CURB AND SIGNALS)
Intersection Conflicts Near Schools - Some signal-controlled intersections where there are right-turning vehicles during the green phase have conflicts with pedestrians. Leading pedestrian intervals may help to better accommodate pedestrians. Specifically, SE $\mathbf{4 0}^{\text {th }}$ Street at $\mathbf{8 6}^{\text {th }}$ Avenue SE and SE $\mathbf{4 0}{ }^{\text {th }}$ Street at Island Crest Way have pedestrian conflicts vehicles. Schools have used bus routings to reduce pedestrian/school travel through the intersection of SE 40 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street at Island Crest Way. It might help to provide a gap or return interval for pedestrians. SE 40 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ at Island Crest Way has a long cycle time, increasing wait times for pedestrians if they miss the ped call. More sidewalks are needed to complete all gaps in town center and along Island Crest Way.

Residential Areas without Sidewalks - While many residential areas do not include sidewalks, it is good that sidewalks are provided near and leading to schools.

Bus stop issues - When service returns to normal and as part of ST planning how will the system meet accessibility? There are already access issues for bus stops for the 204 and 630 Metro routes.

Presbyterian Church Park and Ride - There is no accessible path from the parking lot to Island Crest Way boarding area.

North Mercer Way - Consider crossing times and accessible signals surrounding the Park and Ride.
Island Crest Way - Widen Skinny sidewalks along Island Crest Way.
78 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ SW near the Post Office - Tree roots have broken up the sidewalk and make it difficult to walk or roll. Pedestrians may opt to walk in the road to avoid the cracked sidewalks, which is not an option for those in wheelchairs.
$70^{\text {th }}$ Avenue SE at West Mercer Way - Parking impacts pedestrian facilities. It would help to post signs for no parking or note shoulder use for bikes and peds on East Mercer Way and West Mercer Way.

84th Avenue Gravel Shoulder/West Side East Mercer Way - Near Luther Burbank Park, there is a gravel path that is not smooth but is intended for sidewalks for pedestrians. It is often used for vehicle parking. Also, the path should be used instead of the roadway on the curved path parallel to S. 84th Ave SE. Signs should be installed to direct people to the path, which is safer.

68 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave at QFC/Starbucks Entrance - There is no marked crosswalk that connects from the sidewalk to the trail connection into Pioneer Park.

## Comments That May Not Be Addressed by the Plan

Access to schools - While only partially covered by this plan, it was noted that access to schools and around schools seems good. The ADA Plan would include public right-of-way sidewalks and intersections access to the school.

Covenant Church on $\mathbf{7 8}^{\text {th }}$ Ave SE - A tree grate near the church has been removed and should be replaced as it is a tripping hazard.

Consider overlap with other jurisdictions - Share feedback and consider overlap on facilities that are developed by others like Sound Transit, Metro, and other providers.

Private Development - Consider encouraging private retail developers to come up to code to meet accessibility requirements. Like City standards, encourage retailers and developers to "exceed" standards for restroom stall size and ADA parking.

## ATTACHMENT D - FOCUS GROUP GUIDE

## Focus Group Facilitation Guide

## City of Mercer Island ADA Transition Plan Focus Group

Date: September 30, 2021
Location: - Virtual via Zoom

## Purpose and Goals

Gain deeper insight on ADA issues at public facilities and within the Public Right of Way from City of Mercer Island volunteers and expand on priorities and issues identified in the online survey.

The meeting(s) will be held via zoom or conducted as an individual interview by phone.

## Recruiting Members

City will recruit from survey respondents and potential other interested parties. Based on the survey, eight people have volunteered to participate in a focus group. City will provide accommodations requested including alternative formats, sign language interpreters and support notetaking.

## Agenda and Welcome

- Welcome and acknowledge/thank participants and provide brief purpose of meeting- Lia Klein (510 Minutes)
- Introductions - All (5 minutes)
- Ground Rules - Jeanne (5 Minutes)
- Discussion of the outreach results and Description ADA Transition Planning (via PowerPoint) Patrick (10 Minutes)
- Workshop - Jeanne and all (up to 60 minutes)
- In depth discussion and concurrence on top barriers and priorities.
- Next Steps

Lia
Welcome and Purpose
Today we are going to take a deeper dive with all of you on different aspects of accessibility including different locations and types of issues. We want to ask you more about your experiences to explore specific issues and priorities identified in the online survey and open house.

Introductions:
Please take a few minutes to tell us about yourself and why you are here today. What is your interest in this project?

Jeanne
Ground Rules:
We will be using Closed Captioning though zoom. If you need us to slow down, please raise your hand. Also please stop us if there if you need clarifications. As noted, we are recording the meeting to support meeting notes. This recording will not be saved after we summarize the results. We can provide a
summary to you for review if you like. We may also reach out to other stakeholders to support this outreach.

Any questions?
We have planned this focus group to last an hour and a half to two hours. During this time, we have several questions that we would like to cover. We want everyone to take part in the discussion; however, you do not have to respond to every question. Also, feel free to respond to what others are saying-whether you agree or disagree. If you have been speaking a lot, wait a bit before speaking again to allow others a turn. We are genuinely interested in your experiences with barriers to pedestrian access and access to public facilities; therefore, there are no right or wrong answers. If time begins to run short, it may be necessary to interrupt you in order to complete the questions or move to the next discussion.

We will be using some limited graphical materials and a PowerPoint which you have received. We will do our best to describe them, but please feel free to ask questions.

We will treat your answers as confidential. We will not ask for personally identifiable information. While we may use names during this discussion, we will replace names in the transcript after our discussion. We also will not include your names or other personally identifiable information in any reports we write. We ask that each of you respect the privacy of everyone on this call and not share or repeat what is said here in any way that could identify anyone in this room. We would like to see you and have you see us. If you can leave your camera on, that would be helpful.

Please feel free to take a break as you need to. We can take a break if we need to roughly at the $1 / 2$ hour mark.

Patrick
About Transition Plans
The Transition Plan addresses potential deficiencies to improve mobility in the public right of way including access issues along sidewalks, curb ramps, signals, and transit stops within and adjacent to public roadways and access to services at public buildings and parks.

For the Mercer Island, this plan is focused on providing access to resources and services (like Government Buildings or Community Services) and specifically barriers in the public right of way (mostly within pedestrian facilities) that impede access or the features within public buildings like door operations and access or accessibility at parks like water fountains.

Barriers can be temporary like maintenance issues or due to gaps or missing infrastructure.
A transition plan will be developed after completing an inventory of facilities, this public outreach process and a review of the City's current processes for improving facilities. This plan will outline a strategy for making improvements considering several factors such as the extent of deficiencies, identified needs, proximity to certain facilities, requests and complaints by the community, available budget, and a realistic schedule. This focus group will be an in-depth discussion. Please use the raise your hand feature at any time if you would like us to repeat anything or to ask questions. We will also monitor the chat box for your questions and comments.

Outreach Efforts and Summary to Date
Online open house and City "Let's Talk" promoted a survey open from July 4 thru Sept 14. We promoted the survey as follows:

- Advertised on Website \& Online Open House
- Promoted through Social Media Channels
- Article in the Mercer Island Reporter
- Translation included Spanish Chinese

Now we are seeking deeper feedback through this Focus Group which explores

- Where are the barriers?
- What types of facilities are priorities (where would you invest)?
- Which locations are priorities?

Jeanne
Materials
We will use this PowerPoint to help facilitate discussions.

- Power point presentation of the outreach to date (We will read every slide and provide in an accessible PDF format)

We will clarify the types of facilities covered by this plan (for example not schools but sidewalks near schools). We will spend our time considering the types of issues that people have raised and the impact those issues have on accessing facilities that provide public and community services. Specifically, these services include schools and institutions, parks, government buildings that provide access to community service, other government buildings and transit.

We should note that there were a relatively small number of respondents but almost half with disabilities or that support those with disabilities. This is why your responses are also important input. Four noted that barriers impact how they travel or access services and facilities.

## Series 1 -Let's talk about issues and barriers to access - 15-20 minutes

Facilitator Narrative:
First any surprises from the survey?
Let's talk about the issues to barriers that have been raised to date. (Review barrier types people have mentioned - broken sidewalks, maintenance, lack of crosswalks

## Questions:

Concerns we have heard about:

- Most were related to missing, uneven, or unmaintained sidewalks or barriers like parked cars in sidewalks
- Other issues noted were crosswalks and crossing streets that are too wide or encourage speeding.
- Some were related to doors and access to buildings.
- For those with disabilities/supporting a person with disabilities, lack of parking was noted.
- A few were related to the types of programs provided or at facilities the City is not responsible for. We will pass those comments on.
What other issues and concerns do you experience when traveling to public facilities, buildings with community services and within the public right of way? How do these barriers impact your travel?
Additional probing questions for respondents.
- Which of these barriers do you experience?
- How are they problematic? How often do you experience them and how much does it impact your travel?
- Were you surprised at the different perspectives between those with disabilities and those without as far as barriers?
- Do different people experience these barriers differently?
- Is this a priority or severity of one or some of these issues as compared to others?

NOTES:

## Series 2 -Let's talk about locations where access is most important $\mathbf{1 5 - 2 0}$ minutes

## Facilitator Narrative:

Let's talk about locations, and specifically services and resources where there may be barriers to access. Notably from the survey, transit and government buildings that provide public services were most identified as priorities for having good access. For those who indicated they have a disability, access to parking and lack of ADA specific parking where noted.

## Questions:

Were you surprised at the difference between perspectives for those with disabilities as compared to those supporting people or without disabilities?
How many use transit frequently? Where? What kinds of barriers do you observe near transit facilities on Mercer Island?
What other issues and concerns do you experience?

## Additional probing questions.

- Are there barriers or access issues for accessing parks, using docks? Where are they?
- Which parks, schools, community services and institutions are problems to access?
- Which buildings have challenges (e.g., stairways, doorways, fountains etc.)?

NOTES:

## Series 3-Let's talk about priorities 15-20 minutes

Facilitator Narrative:
Part of our task in developing the ADA transition plan will be to identify what to fix first with limited resources? It is likely our needs will outweigh our resources. Where would you invest?

## Questions:

First what types of issues are most important to fix?

- Fixing facilities Completing sidewalks
- Improve Crosswalks
- Enhance Safety
- Curb Ramps
- Pathways serving Transit
- Signal Timings, signal improvements and crosswalks
- Doorway access
- Accommodations at meetings
- Other fixed facilities in buildings missing ramps/stairs/doors/water fountains

Where should we focus our energy?

- Government Buildings that provide community services
- City Parks/docks/trails
- Downtown urban areas
- Residential neighborhoods
- Accessing transit
- Other locations
- All areas equally

Which is your highest priority and why?

NOTES:

## Appendix F - Cost Estimate Backup

## transpogroup

## Planning Level Cost Estimate - Right-of-Way

PROJECT NAME: Mercer Island ADA Transition Plan
TG PROJECT NUMBER: 1.21012 .00
NOTE: This cost estimate is planning level in nature. It should be considered preliminary and for planning purposes only. It specifically excludes structural impacts to buildings and parking structures, inflation, and sales tax. Potential items such as retaining walls, earthwork, etc., are assumed to be included in the planning level estimate contingency unless otherwise indicated.
When features require multiple improvements, the cost of the smaller component is included in the larger task. (i.e. detectable warning surface is included with curb ramp reconstruction.)

| Item No. | ADA Deficiency | Improvement Type | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Total Price |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sidewalk Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Non-compliant sidewalk (width, condition, slope, etc.) | Reconstruct existing sidewalk/paved shoulder walkway | 56,005 | SY | \$ 145 | \$ 8,121,000 |
| 2 | Non-compliant driveway (slope, grade break, etc.) | New driveway with sidewalk | 326 | EA | \$ 2,900 | \$ 946,000 |
|  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  | \$ 9,067,000 |




| Pushbutton Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | Non-APS pushbutton and pushbutton is located incorrectly. | Install new APS pushbutton <br> AND <br> Install new pole. | 72 | EA | \$ | 5,900 | \$ | 425,000 |
| 13 | APS pushbutton that has non-compliant dimensions and/or programming and located incorrectly. | Reprogram pushbutton, reorient pushbutton, and/or install tactile arrow <br> AND <br> Install new pole and relocate pushbutton. | 8 | EA | \$ | 3,700 | \$ | 30,000 |
| 14 | APS pushbutton located incorrectly. | Install new pole and relocate pushbutton. | 3 | EA | \$ | 3,500 | \$ | 11,000 |


| 15 | APS pushbutton that has non-compliant <br> dimensions and/or programming | Reprogram pushbutton, reorient <br> pushbutton, and/or install tactile arrow. | 1 | EA | \$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



| Accessible Parking Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 | Non-compliant parking stall/parking aisle slope. | Grind surface and/or add asphalt lift. | 5 | EA | \$ 2,000 |  | \$10,000 |
| 19 | Non-compliant accessible parking stall/parking aisle width or pavement marking. | Install parking stall accessible symbol/aisle pavement markings or resize and restripe stall/aisle. | 2 | EA | \$ 200 |  | \$1,000 |
| 20 | Non-compliant sign height or no sign indicating accessible stall. | Install new sign or adjust existing sign. | 0 | EA | \$ 100 |  | \$0 |
| Subtotal \$ 11,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total |  | \$ | 16,020,000 |
|  |  |  | Contingency @ 20\% |  |  | \$ | 3,204,000 |
|  |  |  | Design @ 12\% |  |  | \$ | 1,923,000 |
|  |  |  | Mobilization @ 8\% |  |  | \$ | 1,282,000 |
|  |  |  | TESC + Traffic Control @ 12\% |  |  | \$ | 1,923,000 |
|  |  |  | Construction Management @ 20\% |  |  | \$ | 3,204,000 |
|  |  |  | Right-of-Way \& 20\% |  |  | \$ | 3,204,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Grand | al 2021 Dollars | \$ | 30,760,000 |

## transpogroup

## Planning Level Cost Estimate - Parks

PROJECT NAME: Mercer Island ADA Transition Plan
TG PROJECT NUMBER: 1.21012 .00
NOTE: This cost estimate is planning level in nature. It should be considered preliminary and for planning purposes only. It specifically excludes structural impacts to buildings and parking structures, inflation, and sales tax. Potential items such as retaining walls, earthwork, etc., are assumed to be included in the planning level estimate contingency unless otherwise indicated.
When features require multiple improvements, the cost of the smaller component is included in the larger task. (i.e. detectable warning surface is included with curb ramp reconstruction.)

| Item <br> No. | ADA Deficiency | Improvement Type | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price |  | Price |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sidewalk Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Non-compliant sidewalk (width, condition, slope, etc.) | Reconstruct existing sidewalk/paved shoulder walkway | 22,035 | SY | \$ 145 | \$ | 3,196,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal | \$ | 3,196,000 |
| Maintenance/Miscellaneous |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Non-compliant vertical discontinuity (>1/4in - <=1/2in w/out bevel) | Sidewalk grinding (5 LF of sidewalk). | 105 | EA | \$ 250 | \$ | 27,000 |
| 3 | Non-compliant vertical discontinuity (>1/2in) | Replace two adjacent sidewalk panels (5ft x 5ft panels) | 70 | EA | \$ 806 | \$ | 57,000 |
| 4 | Non-compliant horizontal discontinuity | Sidewalk crack sealing/grouting (5LF per occurrence) | 1,605 | LF | \$ 5 | \$ | 9,000 |
| 5 | Fixed Obstacles | Relocation of obstacles including utility pole, mailbox, tree trunk, etc. | 35 | EA | \$ 3,000 | \$ | 105,000 |
| 6 | Moveable Obstacles | Relocation of obstacles including tree/bush (prunable), message boards, parked cars, etc. | 18 | EA | \$ 200 | \$ | 4,000 |
| 7 | Protruding Obstacles | Relocation of obstacles including of bush/tree, signs, awnings etc. | 88 | EA | \$ 500 | \$ | 44,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal | \$ | 246,000 |
| Curb Ramp Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Missing curb ramps | Install new curb ramp. | 12 | EA | \$ 6,000 | \$ | 72,000 |
| 9 | Non-compliant ramp (running slope, cross slope, ramp width, flare slope, lip, grade break, etc.) | Remove and reconstruct existing ramp. | 49 | EA | \$ 6,000 | \$ | 294,000 |
| 10 | Curb ramps without detectable warning surface (DWS), non-compliant DWS placement, non-compliant DWS depth, or non-compliant DWS Width | Install/replace detectable warning surface. | 1 | EA | \$ 1,030 | \$ | 2,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal | \$ | 368,000 |
| Staircase Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Non-compliant staircase (riser, tread, slope, etc.) | Replace concrete staircase (per 1ft width of step). | 366 | LF | \$ 100 |  | \$37,000 |
| 12 | Non-compliant handrail or missing handrail (height, diameter, extensions, etc.) | Replace handrail. | 571 | LF | \$ 150 |  | \$86,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal | \$ | 123,000 |
| Wheelchair Ramp Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Non-compliant ramp (width, slope, landing, etc.) | Replace ramp | 114 | SY | \$ 190 |  | \$22,000 |
| 14 | Non-compliant handrail (height, diameter, extensions, etc.) or missing handrail | Replace handrail | 260 | LF | \$ 150 |  | \$39,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Subtotal | \$ | 61,000 |
| Accessible Parking Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | Non-compliant parking stall/parking aisle slope. | Grind surface and/or add asphalt lift. | 95 | EA | \$ 2,000 |  | \$190,000 |
| 16 | Non-compliant accessible parking stall/parking aisle width or pavement marking. | Install parking stall accessible symbol/aisle pavement markings or resize and restripe stall/aisle. | 23 | EA | \$ 200 |  | \$5,000 |


| 17 | Non-compliant sign height or no sign indicating accessible stall. | Install new sign or adjust existing sign. | 32 | EA | \$ 100 |  | \$4,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Subtotal |  |  | \$ | 199,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | \$ | 4,193,000 |
|  |  |  | Contingency @ 20\% |  |  | \$ | 839,000 |
|  |  |  | Design @ 12\% |  |  | \$ | 504,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | bilization @ 8\% | \$ | 336,000 |
|  |  |  | TESC + Traffic Control @ 12\% |  |  | \$ | 504,000 |
|  |  |  | Construction Management @ 20\% |  |  | \$ | 839,000 |
|  |  |  |  | and | al 2021 Dollars | \$ | 7,220,000 |

Planning Level Cost Estimate - Right-of-Way
PROJECT NAME: Battle Ground ADA Transition Plan
TG PROJECT NUMBER 1.21034.00
transpogroup $\sqrt{5}$
NOTE: This cost estimate i s planning level in nature. It should be considered preliminary and for planning purposes only. It specfically exludes right-of-way

This planning cost estimate covers only the pedestrian features within the firsts stage of data collection.

| Quantity by Priority |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Low |  | Medium |  | High |  | Very High |  |  |
| Feature | $\begin{gathered} 1-15 \\ (0-10 \text { hazards }) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \% | $\begin{gathered} \hline 16-30 \\ \text { (11-20 hazards) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \% | $\begin{gathered} 31-45 \\ \text { (21-30 hazards) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \% | $\begin{gathered} 46+ \\ \text { (31+ hazards) } \end{gathered}$ | \% | Total |
| Sidewalks (SY) | 538 | 1\% | 17,783 | 32\% | 23,347 | 42\% | 14,336 | 26\% | 56,005 |
| Driveways (EA) | 16 | 5\% | 126 | 39\% | 127 | 39\% | 57 | 17\% | 326 |
| Non-compliant vertical discontinuity (EA) | 7 | 1\% | 72 | 14\% | 214 | 41\% | 226 | 44\% | 519 |
| Non-compliant horizontal discontinuity (LF) | 105 | 1\% | 1,680 | 18\% | 3,170 | 34\% | 4,420 | 47\% | 9,375 |
| Fixed Obstacles (EA) | 6 | 1\% | 59 | 12\% | 173 | 35\% | 262 | 52\% | 500 |
| Moveable Obstacles (EA) | 6 | 6\% | 32 | 33\% | 35 | 36\% | 24 | 25\% | 97 |
| Protruding Obstacles (EA) | 14 | 3\% | 127 | 25\% | 222 | 43\% | 153 | 30\% | 516 |
| Curb Ramps (EA) | 0 | 0\% | 25 | 4\% | 190 | 27\% | 499 | 70\% | 714 |
| Pushbuttons (EA) | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 1\% | 25 | 30\% | 58 | 69\% | 84 |
| Bus Stops (SY) | 40 | 3\% | 638 | 50\% | 440 | 35\% | 145 | 11\% | 1,263 |
| Parking (EA) | 0 | 0\% | 1 | 33\% | 1 | 33\% | 1 | 33\% | 3 |


| Cost by Priority |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Low |  |  | Medium |  |  | High |  |  | Very High |  |  |  |  |
| Feature | $\begin{gathered} 1-15 \\ \text { (0-10 hazards) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | \% |  | $\begin{aligned} & 16-30 \\ & 20 \text { hazards) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \% |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 31-45 \\ & 30 \text { hazards) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \% |  | $\begin{aligned} & 46+ \\ & + \text { hazards) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \% |  |  |
| Sidewalks (SY) | \$ | 77,997 | 1\% | \$ | 2,578,580 | $32 \%$ | \$ | 3,385,315 | 42\% | \$ | 2,078,764 | 26\% | \$ | 8,121,000 |
| Driveways (EA) | \$ | 46,400 | 5\% | \$ | 365,400 | 39\% | \$ | 368,300 | 39\% | \$ | 165,300 | 17\% | \$ | 946,000 |
| Non-compliant vertical discontinuity (EA) | \$ | 2,306 | 1\% | \$ | 33,556 | 15\% | \$ | 87,389 | 39\% | \$ | 100,944 | 45\% | \$ | 225,000 |
| Non-compliant horizontal discontinuity (LF) | \$ | 525 | 1\% | \$ | 8,400 | 18\% | \$ | 15,850 | 34\% | \$ | 22,100 | 47\% | \$ | 47,000 |
| Fixed Obstacles (EA) | \$ | 18,000 | 1\% | \$ | 177,000 | 12\% | \$ | 519,000 | 35\% | \$ | 786,000 | 52\% | \$ | 1,500,000 |
| Moveable Obstacles (EA) | \$ | 1,200 | 6\% | \$ | 6,400 | 32\% | \$ | 7,000 | 35\% | \$ | 4,800 | 24\% | \$ | 20,000 |
| Protruding Obstacles (EA) | \$ | 7,000 | 3\% | \$ | 63,500 | 25\% | \$ | 111,000 | 43\% | \$ | 76,500 | 30\% | \$ | 258,000 |
| Curb Ramps (EA) | \$ | - | 0\% | \$ | 140,060 | 3\% | \$ | 1,105,210 | 26\% | \$ | 2,994,000 | 71\% | \$ | 4,240,000 |
| Pushbuttons (EA) | \$ | - | 0\% | \$ | 5,900 | 1\% | \$ | 123,600 | 27\% | \$ | 335,600 | 72\% | \$ | 466,000 |
| Bus Stops (SY) | \$ | 5,800 | 3\% | \$ | 92,700 | 50\% | \$ | 63,800 | 35\% | \$ | 21,550 | 12\% | \$ | 184,000 |
| Parking (EA) | \$ | - | 0\% | \$ | 4,000 | 36\% | \$ | 4,200 | 38\% | \$ | 2,200 | 20\% | \$ | 11,000 |



| Medium  <br> $16-30$  |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| $\$$ | $3,476,000$ |
| $\$$ | 696,000 |
| $\$$ | 418,000 |
| $\$$ | 279,000 |
| $\$$ | 418,000 |
| $\$$ | 696,000 |
| $\$$ | 696,000 |
| $\$$ | $6,679,000$ |


| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { High } \\ 31-45 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| \$ | 5,791,000 |
| \$ | 1,159,000 |
| \$ | 695,000 |
| \$ | 464,000 |
| \$ | 695,000 |
| \$ | 1,159,000 |
| \$ | 1,159,000 |
| \$ | 11,122,000 |


| Very High |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| \$ | 6,588,000 |
| \$ | 1,318,000 |
| \$ | 791,000 |
| \$ | 528,000 |
| \$ | 791,000 |
| \$ | 1,318,000 |
| \$ | 1,318,000 |
| \$ | 12,652,000 |


| Total |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\$$ | $16,018,000$ |
| $\$$ | $\mathbf{3 , 2 0 4 , 0 0 0}$ |
| $\$$ | $\mathbf{1 , 9 2 3 , 0 0 0}$ |
| $\$$ | $\mathbf{1 , 2 8 2 , 0 0 0}$ |
| $\$$ | $\mathbf{1 , 9 2 3 , 0 0 0}$ |
| $\$$ | $3,204,000$ |
| $\$$ | $3,204,000$ |
| $\$$ | $\mathbf{3 0 , 7 5 8 , 0 0 0}$ |

Planning Level Cost Estimate - Parks
PROJECT NAME: Battle Ground ADA Transition Pla
PROJECT NAME: Battle Ground ADA Transition Plan
TG PROIECT NUMBER: 1.21034 .00
transpogroup
NOTE: This cost estimate is planning level in nature. It should be considered preliminary and for planning purposes only. It specfifally excludes right-of-way
acquisition and all associated costs, structural impacts to buildings and parking structures, and ssles tax. Potential it tems such as retaining walls, earthwork, etc.,
are assumed to be incuded in the planning level estimate contingency unless otherwise indicated.
This planning cost estimate covers only the pedestrian features within the first stage of data collection.


| Cost by Priority |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Low |  |  | Medium |  |  | High |  |  | Very High |  |  | Total |  |
| Feature | $\begin{gathered} 1-15 \\ \text { (0-10 hazards) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | \% | $\begin{gathered} \hline 16-30 \\ \text { (11-20 hazards) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\%$$32 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 31-45 \\ \text { (21-30 hazards) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \hline 61 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 46+ \\ \text { (31+ hazards) } \end{gathered}$ |  | \% |  |  |
| Sidewalks (SY) | \$ | 112,436 | 4\% | \$ | 1,022,603 |  | \$ | 1,950,368 |  | \$ | 109,692 |  | \$ | 3,196,000 |
| Non-compliant vertical discontinuity (EA) | \$ | 4,167 | 5\% | \$ | 18,944 | 23\% | \$ | 47,278 | 57\% | \$ | 12,250 | 15\% | \$ | 83,000 |
| Non-compliant horizontal discontinuity (LF) | \$ | 400 | 4\% | \$ | 2,575 | 29\% | \$ | 3,150 | 35\% | \$ | 1,900 | 21\% | \$ | 9,000 |
| Fixed Obstacles (EA) | \$ | 3,000 | 3\% | \$ | 18,000 | 17\% | \$ | 54,000 | 51\% | \$ | 30,000 | 29\% | \$ | 105,000 |
| Moveable Obstacles (EA) | \$ | - | 0\% | \$ | 600 | 15\% | \$ | 2,400 | 60\% | \$ | 600 | 15\% | \$ | 4,000 |
| Protruding Obstacles (EA) | \$ | 1,000 | 2\% | \$ | 14,000 | 32\% | \$ | 24,500 | 56\% | \$ | 4,500 | 10\% | \$ | 44,000 |
| Curb Ramps (EA) | \$ | - | 0\% | \$ | 1,030 | 0\% | \$ | 72,000 | 20\% | \$ | 294,000 | 80\% | \$ | 368,000 |
| Staircases (EA) | \$ | 6,475 | 5\% | \$ | 49,375 | 40\% | \$ | 66,350 | 54\% | \$ | - | 0\% | \$ | 123,000 |
| Wheelchair Ramps (EA) | \$ | - | 0\% | \$ | 15,802 | 26\% | \$ | 43,377 | 72\% | \$ | - | 0\% | \$ | 60,000 |
| Parking (EA) | \$ | - | 0\% | \$ | 25,100 | 13\% | \$ | 157,200 | 79\% | \$ | 15,500 | 8\% | \$ | 198,000 |



| Medium <br> $16-30$ |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| $\$$ | $1,169,000$ |
| $\$$ | 234,000 |
| $\$$ | 141,000 |
| $\$$ | 94,000 |
| $\$$ | 141,00 |
| $\$$ | 23,000 |
| $\$$ | $2,013,000$ |


| High <br> 31-45 |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| $\$$ | $2,421,000$ |
| $\$$ | 485,000 |
| $\$$ | 291,000 |
| $\$$ | 194,000 |
| $\$$ | 291,000 |
| $\$$ | 485,000 |
| $\$$ | $4,167,000$ |


| Very High <br> 4 |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| $\$$ | 469,000 |
| $\$$ | 94,000 |
| $\$$ | 57,000 |
| $\$$ | 38,000 |
| $\$$ | 57,000 |
| $\$$ | 94,000 |
| $\$$ | 809,000 |


| Total |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\$$ | $4,190,000$ |
| $\$$ | 838,000 |
| $\$$ | 503,000 |
| $\$$ | 336,000 |
| $\$$ | 503,000 |
| $\$$ | 83,000 |
| $\$$ | $7,208,000$ |

## Appendix G - Facility Prioritization Criteria
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## Appendix H - Accessible Pedestrian Signal (APS) Policy

## City of Mercer Island - Policy for Installation of Accessible Pedestrian Signals and Pushbuttons

## Intent:

It is the City's intention to be consistent with the most current version of the Public Right of Way Access Guidelines (PROWAG) in the provision of and location of accessible pedestrian signals and pushbuttons (APS) at traffic signals. Further guidance is available in 28 CFR Part 35 and Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) section 4E. 08 through 4E. 13.

## Purpose:

The purpose of this plan is to establish a reasonable and consistent policy for installing APS.

## Scope:

1. Requests: Requests for APS systems from the public will be responded to in a timely manner and the consideration for installation will be done in accordance with applicable sections of the ADA.
2. New construction: New construction of traffic signal projects requires installation of APS and associated accessible features when pedestrian signals are installed.
3. Alterations: When the signal controller and software are altered, the pedestrian signal head is replaced, or pedestrian detectors are replaced, the existing pedestrian signals shall be upgraded to APS on poles in accessible locations.
4. Curb ramp replacement at traffic signals: Altering or replacing curb ramps does not require installation of APS unless the curb ramp cannot be altered or replaced without the alteration, installation or replacement of any pole to which a pedestrian pushbutton is attached. Then, installation of APS on poles in accessible locations is required.
5. In addition to the above conditions, APS will be installed through fulfillment of the City's obligations to complete its ADA Transition Plan.

Installation of APS is not required, unless otherwise noted, under the following conditions, but is recommended when inclusion in the project scope is possible:

1. Minor work and routine maintenance at traffic signals: Projects including but not limited to: emergency repairs, vehicular detection installation and repairs, installation and repair of CCTV or other cameras, vehicular signal head upgrades and repairs, and repair of pedestrian detection do not require installation of APS and associated accessible features.
2. Signal timing changes: Updating signal timing including cycle length, splits, offsets, and pedestrian clearance times do not require installation of APS and associated accessible features.

## Appendix I-Grievance Procedure

## City of Mercer Island, Washington <br> Example Grievance Procedure under The Americans with Disabilities Act

This Grievance Procedure is established to meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"). It may be used by anyone who wishes to file a complaint alleging discrimination on the basis of disability in the provision of services, activities, programs, or benefits by the City of Mercer Island.

The complaint should be in writing and contain information about the alleged discrimination such as name, address, phone number of complainant and location, date, and description of the problem. Alternative means of filing complaints, such as personal interviews or a tape recording of the complaint, will be made available for persons with disabilities upon request.

The complaint should be submitted by the grievant and/or his/her designee as soon as possible but no later than 60 calendar days after the alleged violation to:

Lia Klein
ADA Coordinator
Lia.Klein@mercerisland.gov
Within 15 calendar days after receipt of the complaint, City Engineer or their designee will meet with the complainant to discuss the complaint and the possible resolutions. Within 15 calendar days of the meeting, City Engineer or his/her designee will respond in writing, and where appropriate, in a format accessible to the complainant, such as large print, Braille, or audio tape. The response will explain the position of the City of Mercer Island and offer options for substantive resolution of the complaint.

If the response by City Engineer or his/her designee does not satisfactorily resolve the issue, the complainant and/or his/her designee may appeal the decision within 15 calendar days after receipt of the response to the City Manager or his/her designee. Within 15 calendar days after receipt of the appeal, the City Manager or his/her designee will meet with the complainant to discuss the complaint and possible resolutions. Within 15 calendar days after the meeting, the City Manager or his/her designee will respond in writing, and, where appropriate, in a format accessible to the complainant, with a final resolution of the complaint. All written complaints received by City Engineer or his/her designee, appeals to the City Manager or his/her designee, and responses from these two offices will be retained by the City of Mercer Island for at least three years.

## Appendix J - Maximum Extent Feasible (MEF) Documentation Template

## Maximum Extent Feasible (MEF) Template

## Project Description

## Highway/Building Parameters

- Roadway Classification:
- Design Speed/Posted Speed:
- Design Year ADT:
- Truck Percentage:
- Access Control:
- Building Type:
- Facilities Provided in Building:

Existing Pedestrian Facilities - general description (for new construction projects include a summary of the project pedestrian study)

Pedestrian Design Standards - cover the following subjects

- Discuss the criteria that apply to the pedestrian elements on the project that will be built to the Maximum Extent Feasible
- Include reference(s) to the appropriate PROWAG/ADA section(s) and City Public Works Standards [including revision date]

Alternative(s) analysis - needed for new construction projects only
Proposal - cover the following subjects

- What features will remain that meet guidelines
- What features are being built to guidelines
- What is being built to the maximum extent feasible


## Justification

- Discussion of what constraints/challenges there are to meet full design level
- See worksheet

Additional Benefits - new construction projects

## Attachments

## MEF Template - Public Right-of-Way Alteration Project Example

## Project Description

This Alteration project will mill \& fill SR "A" (from edge line to edge line) with 0.15 ' HMA (Class I/2" PG 64-22) from MP 4.03 to 4.45 and from MP 4.7I to 6.89 . This project will overlay the roadway (from edge of pavement to edge of pavement) with $0.20^{\prime}$ HMA (Class I/2" PG 64-22) from MP 4.45 to 4.71 . There is no proposed paving on the County Roads.

## Highway Parameters

- Roadway Classification: Non-NHS, U-I, Urban Principal Arterial.
- Funding Program: PI - Paving
- Posted/Design Speed: Mainline - 55/60 mph
- Average Daily Traffic: 25,000 (per Project Definition)
- Truck \%: 9\% (per Traffic Operations)
- Access Management Classification: Currently classified as Managed Access Class 3. On Master Plan for Modified Limited Access


## Existing Pedestrian Facilities

There are five curb ramps and eight sidewalk ramps (from sidewalk to shoulder) located along SR "A" within the paving limits of this project. All five curb ramps and seven of the eight sidewalk ramps do not meet current ADA standards. One sidewalk ramp is located north of the " $X$ " Street intersection (east side - EI, meets guidelines) at the north end of the sidewalk.
There are curb ramps and sidewalk ramps located at the four corners of the " $Y$ " Avenue signalized intersection. Pedestrians can cross this intersection via six curb ramps and four marked crosswalks.

There are curb ramps and sidewalk ramps located at the southwest and northwest corners of the "Z" Way signalized tee intersection. Pedestrians can cross this intersection via three curb ramps and two marked crosswalks. There is one unmarked crossing on SR "A" located at the north side of this intersection. The unmarked crossing meets ADA standards, but the curb ramp located at the west side of the unmarked crossing does not meet ADA standards. This curb ramp is for the marked crosswalk on "Z" Way, is outside of our paving limits, and will not be addressed.

## Pedestrian Design Standards

## Curb Ramps - Landing, PROWAG 2005 R303.2.I. 3

The cross slopes of a curb ramp landing shall be $2 \%$ maximum.
This also implies that the gutter slope adjacent to a curb ramp landing shall be $2 \%$ maximum.

## Proposal

## Curb Ramps and Ramps (from sidewalk to shoulder)

North of the " $X$ " Street intersection (west side - W4)
This sidewalk ramp will be upgraded to meet City standards.
" $\gamma$ " Avenue Intersection
Three of the four proposed curb ramps and all four proposed sidewalk ramps at the " $Y$ " Avenue intersection meet current City standards. Proposed curb ramp "Y" Avenue SW2, located at the southwest corner, is designed to the maximum extent feasible.

Proposed curb ramp "Y" Avenue SW2 will maintain its current landing location to accommodate two crosswalks. All curb ramp elements will meet current City standards, except for the proposed gutter slope (4.4\%) and landing cross slope (5.0\%). These two elements will maintain the existing gutter slope $>2 \%$.

## "Z" Way Intersection

The two proposed sidewalk ramps at the "Z" Way intersection meet current City standards. Proposed curb ramp " $Z$ " Way SW2, located at the southwest corner, is designed to the maximum extent feasible.

Proposed curb ramp "Z" Way SW2 will maintain its current landing location to minimize the gutter slope and landing cross slope. All curb ramp elements will meet current City standards, except for the proposed gutter slope ( $7.4 \%$ ) and landing cross slope ( $7.9 \%$ ). These two elements will maintain the existing gutter slope $>2 \%$.

## Justification

To construct the curb ramps to be $100 \%$ compliant would require re-profiling the existing roadway. This type of major reconstruction is not feasible in this type of Alteration project.
To construct the curb ramps while maintaining the existing profile of the roadway would require rebuilding the roadway adjacent to the proposed curb ramps. The rebuilt roadway would not eliminate the transition from the $2 \%$ cross slope of the curb ramps as it matches into the steeper cross slopes of the existing crosswalks but would simply move the transition further into the active traveled roadway. The result would be a grade change transition within the driving lane that would be undesirable.

## Attachments

Vicinity Map
Spreadsheet
Curb Ramp Geometrics
Plan Sheets

## Appendix K - ADA Terminology

## ADA Terminology

Accessible Pedestrian Signals. A device that communicates information about pedestrian signal timing in non-visual format such as audible tones, speech messages, and/or vibrating surfaces.

Barrier. Obstacle that prevents movement or access.
Cross Slope. The slope that is perpendicular to the direction of travel (see running slope).

Curb Ramp. A short ramp cutting through a curb or built up to it.
Detectable Warning. A standardized surface feature built in or applied to walking surfaces or other elements to warn of hazards on a circulation path. Also known as "truncated domes".

Fixed Obstacles. Obstacles in pathways that cannot be moved without significant changes to the existing infrastructure.

Grade Break. Location where a pathway's slope changes.
Maximum Extent Feasible. The situation in which the nature of an existing building or facility makes it virtually impossible to comply fully with accessibility standards.

Moveable Obstacles. Obstacles in pathways that can be moved without significant changes to the existing infrastructure.

Pedestrian Access Route. A continuous and unobstructed path of travel provided for pedestrians with disabilities within or coinciding with a pedestrian circulation path.

Pedestrian Circulation Path. A prepared exterior or interior surface provided for pedestrian travel in the public right-of-way.

Ramp. A walking surface that has a running slope steeper than 1:20.
Running Slope. The slope that is parallel to the direction of travel (see cross slope).

Ramp Flare. Transitions the curb line to the elevation of the street.
Turning Space. Area that provides maneuvering space at the top/bottom of a ramp.

City of Mercer Island $\mid$ ADA Transition Plan

