

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
9.0	RED			The Red Route is attractive for the Ballard Ave portion. However, the Ballard Ave to Market St intersection is very challenging for cyclists. This location (at 22nd St) has already been the site of at least one very serious accident involving a cyclist and a car.
9 9a	RED			This route is a good way to stop people bicycling. Not just cyclists.... Parents w/ strollers, people with dogs - NOW WHY ON EARTH would you force them into Market St. traffic???
9a	RED			This might be an ok alternative if traffic didn't get routed on to Market St. It'd be a great thing for the businesses on Ballard Ave. if it was established as a pedestrian mall. However, building a trail/commuter route should be based on moving people safely - not about businesses. This is "almost" as good as the green route. But why would we want to settle for second best?
10.0	RED			Why mix "trail" with urban street - go one block south to the Green Route and have a separated trail.
10.0	RED			Probably best of the 3 (Green only option). But, to be honest, <u>all</u> 3 are dangerous beyond belief. To "bless" any one of them is a bad idea. Is "NO" an option?
10.0	RED			Rights-of-way are too narrow for mixed bike-car-pedestrian use.
10.0	RED			As a bike commuter, I'd never use the 'red' route - too far out of the way. If the trail gets built here, I'll still be riding on Shilshole.
10.0	RED			Can you imagine taking your small children on their bikes on this route? NO WAY. Build a separated trail.
11.0	RED			Not enough room for cars and bikes.
11.0	RED			On Market between 22nd & 24th there is NO room for bikes.
11.0	RED			This one will work - it's the way I ride now when I have to go east. Please don't jeopardize the industrial job base - I'd like my kids to be able to work in Ballard. Not all kids go to college.
12.0	RED			You are a family with middle-school aged kids who can safely handle bikes. You live in Fremont or Wallingford and want to ride to Golden Gardens Park on a Saturday. Would you choose to bike down Market Street??? Where do you tell your kids to ride when you approach the "gore point" by the Taco Restaurant where most (but not all) cars in the right lane go straight and most (but not all) cars in the left lane bear left towards the Locks? Where do you ride for the 1/4 mile before that, when two lanes of car & bus traffic comes barreling at you from behind at 30-35 mph?
12.0	RED			A frightening, un-enjoyable bike ride.
12.0	RED			The one block on Market between Ballard Ave & 24th makes this route impossible! I tried it for 3 months and gave up, luckily still alive.
12.0	RED			Market St. is already too busy. This makes it even worse. It is heavily used by Metro buses. Don't slow them down.
12.0	RED			Ballard Ave ok - Market?
12.0	RED			Bad option. Bad for merchants on Ballard Ave. Bad for cyclists. Putting cyclists on market St. makes no sense.
12.0	RED			The Ballard Historic District is a precious resource - don't send bikes through!
13.0	RED			Don't waste your \$\$. People can ride this as is.
14.0	GREEN			I think green is good because when I ride my bike through the Locks to the Burke-Gilman there is a lot of uneven, badly paved land. It makes it hard to ride and easy to pop a tire.
14.0	GREEN			This is the trail. Build it. The other "proposals" are direct attempts to get rid of the bikes and bicyclists - nothing more. Don't take away the one time corner we have.
15.0	GREEN			I think it's the best route, but not at grade level. As shown it's an accident waiting to happen. Bicyclists won't stop at stop signs. Someone will get killed. What's needed are tunnels or overpasses to avoid key driveways.
15.0	GREEN			Let's purposefully decide to do NOTHING for now. Spend the \$ on social services. Declare a moratorium on pushing this forward - give a 7-10 year time frame for industry to decide if it can be sustained. If the corridor "goes condo", then we can make a green trail. If industry makes it, then do something else. There's no need to do anything now - - - the property isn't going anywhere...
16.0	GREEN			Green - by far the best, safest, most direct.
16.0	GREEN			Ditto.
16.0	GREEN			Putting bikes, trucks, trains, and cars on the same street? Going both directions? Are you kidding??
16.0	GREEN			The Green Route is a direct alternative that a significant number of cyclists already use. It is time for Ballard to be honest about the fact that the RR is an unmaintained eyesore and safety hazard for not only cyclists and pedestrians, but also for Ballard motorists. The Ballard Terminal RR is impeding further economic development on the Shilshole waterfront.
17.0	GREEN			This happens to be my preferred route - every weekend!
17.0	GREEN			I use this route to bike to and from work 2-3 days/week. I prefer this route because it is the simplest and safest and most direct. I will continue to use this route whether there is a trail or not. I think a trail would be great and I have never heard <u>of</u> a bike/pedestrian trail hurting businesses.
17.0	GREEN			Please put the bike route along the rail route! The trail would be used by thousands of bikes and pedestrians a year! It would greatly enhance our bike/ped route infrastructure in years to come.
17.0	GREEN			I've always preferred this route; why does its implementation keep getting delayed?

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
18.0	GREEN			<p>This is the only real alternative.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public already owns the R.O.W. 2. Only place where a separate path is possible. 3. Safety issues can be addressed through engineering (e.g., bridges over driveways, tunnels) 4. R.O.W. only level route. 5. Zoning industrial can preserve the industrial corridor. 6. Look at trail at W. Marginal Way. Rails with trails and business works! 7. Other 2 routes not safe for kids. <p>For high truck traffic areas (e.g. Salmon Bay S+G) why not build a flyway (bridge) - can't that be done for \$1M? Greg Nickels' staff increase for next year would pay for 1/2 of that!</p>
18.0	GREEN			Owners of industrial property have shown readiness to sell/redevelop for commercial uses compatible with trail: Quadrant, Fred Meyer, Fentron - it's just a matter of time and money.
19.0	GREEN			We're both in our 50s and we bike through this area 3-5 times a week. Safety is very important to us. This is the only safe route!
19.0	GREEN			Sometimes only common sense is required. And we all make sensible driving/cycling/walking choices every hour of every day. Take a look at your own choices. I'm sure that most of the time you take the smooth, direct, easy-to-follow route - - - in this case, it's the Green Route. Simple. Obvious. Human.
19.0	GREEN			There appears to be strong bias against the Green Alt. On the presentation boards in this open house. And yet every person I have met here tonight finds Green the best route choice for bikers. Who is this trail for? The convenience of a few industries? I bike the Green Route already... I think most bikers like myself know how to respect larger and all motor vehicles. We can coexist.
20.0	GREEN			Best option because it is most direct. As a bicycle commuter, this is my 1st choice. Although there is industrial traffic, there is less total traffic than other routes. I truly believe that with the proper training, truck drivers can learn to respect bicyclists' rights. It's about living in community. This is also an option that recreational cyclists (read: families) may enjoy to see our fair Ballard.
20.0	GREEN			Best option for: homeowners, businesses, bicyclists in the area. We have and do bicycle all those routes. The Green option thru the 'business' area - don't forget that most of the bike traffic will be on weekends when the trucks do not work. The businesses now have liability issues - this option is the best for all concerns even tho it may be "inconvenient" for the trucks!
20.0	GREEN			Best option! No question about it. Blue route has too much unregulated traffic and intersections with many traffic accidents (one occurred tonight on 57th & 20th on my way to this open house). What about parked cars lining both Red & Blue Options. Very dangerous to bikers encountering opening car doors.
21.0				<p>Bloodied broken eyeglasses included - These are the glasses I was wearing one time day in June 2000 (6/28). I was a bike commuter Ballard to U.W.. One the way home, as I began to execute a slight left adjustment in order to make a perpendicular crossing of the tracks just west of 11th on 45th, a car began to pass me. Result: (1) Serious concussion. (2) Torn rotator cuff. (3) Wrecked bike. Thanks to the Swedish ER staff!! Cost: incalculable.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We need to link the Burke-Gilman Trail to Seaview Ave. 2. The existing railroad track crossings are an unmitigated hazard. 3. The bicycle traffic is already there as people commute by bike.
22.0	GREEN	2	3 & 4	The green route seems to be the best compromise. The directness of the route would make it the most likely to be used. The one concern I have is with how the industrial and bicycle traffic can be integrated. The "Missing Link" proposal seems to have some interesting solutions. By limiting the areas in which industrial traffic intersects, it would be easier to regulate the bicycle traffic (i.e., gates proposed by the "Missing Link" option). Seattle as a city would be well suited to promote bicycle use city wide.
23.0	GREEN	1 & 2	4	<p>I ride the green route often as do many other cyclists because it is the most direct way to go. Cyclists will always ride the Green route even if the other alternatives are picked. By opting for the green alternative the City is 1) acknowledging what is already happening 2) making it safe to ride to Ballard on a route that people will always use. We can look to other cities such as Vancouver B.C., Portland, OR to see industrial uses, pedestrian and cyclists coexisting. We can already see the change of land use along the Ship Canal and the Ballard industrial users need to acknowledge the change and work to make it positive for all parties. This does not have to be an us against them issue!</p> <p>The Blue option is too long and out of the way to be used. The Red alternative dumps cyclists in Market which is equally as dangerous, if not more so than Shilshole because of the amount of traffic and parking.</p> <p>The Green Option is the only viable alternative for the Burke-Gilman Trail.</p>
24.0	GREEN	1 & 2	4	I'm incredibly excited that the city is seriously looking for ways to connect the existing Burke-Gilman w/the new trail to Shilshole. The only satisfactory proposal is that of the Green Line. The Blue Line is not acceptable - it's so far out of the way that no bikes will use it. 57th is crowded with parked cars & driveways w/inattentive drivers, speed humps & traffic circles, while good traffic calmers make bicycling no fun & will certainly discourage more riders. The Red Line is very problematic - there is no way that I would encourage anyone riding with children or bicyclists not comfortable w/traffic to ride this route - the bricks of Ballard Ave are slippery when wet & the intersections very difficult to check for safety (due to their large size & unique angles).

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
24.0	GREEN	1 & 2	4	The Green satisfies the needs of bikers, walkers, & joggers to safely & efficiently connect from Ballard/Fremont to the Locks & Shilshole. A vibrant city needs to find ways to accommodate diverse interests & activities in the same area. I have commuted on the Burke-Gilman past the gravel plant at 39th & the bike trail & have never seen nor experienced any conflicts/ altercations/ difficulties between trail users & trucks entering/exiting the plant. HOW WOULD A ROLLERBLADER GET FROM FREMONT TO THE LOCKS/SHILSHOLE WITHOUT THE GREEN LINE? BUILD IT!
24.0	GREEN	1 & 2	4	I'm appalled by your presentation of the different options in the different areas of the various proposed routes. The pros & cons are heavily slanted towards business considerations, obscure the difference between separated trails, signed routes & striped bike lanes. The various options for the Green Route in particular are incredibly unclear & poorly described & it's very hard to find anyone here who can clearly explain the differences.
25.0	GREEN	3	1	Green route follows the route already used by cyclists riding west from the current end of the dedicated trail. Shilshole Ave is also a major commuting route to the Ballard Bridge from west Ballard. The green route would make this area safer for both cyclists and motorists. The one area that needs to be better designed is the RR crossing under the bridge. If there is no safe way to make this a perpendicular crossing, then efforts should be made to relocate businesses that depend on the railroad to areas closer to the main N-S rail line. The red & blue routes would not get used because non-motorized users would continue to use Shilshole because it is more apparent & direct. The "conflicts" between industry & trail users are an unreasonable fear, particularly since most use would take place outside of busy times for the industrial neighbors. Along the existing trail east of Fred Meyer, there are plenty of industrial access roads but very few adverse interactions between trail users & motorized traffic. In this area & the T-91 path, Seattle has a history of successfully accommodating both trails & industry.
26.0	GREEN			The green seems the ONLY logical route. All trail's benefit this city, so more is good, but extending the Burke-Gilman much better than the "other" routes.
27.0	GREEN	3	1	I think that the green alt. Is the best option out of the three. Red - crosses too many busy streets. Blue - most recreational riders are not going to ride further than they need to. However, the green route, which is currently used by most cyclists now, has some safety issues, such as, the railroad tracks under the Ballard Bridge, which takes out cyclists on a daily basis. This safety concern should be addressed.
28.0	GREEN	1		Overall comments: When you can have a dedicated multi-use trail instead of bike lanes w/in traffic, then this option is better. I like the idea of riding down either 45th or 46th. I like turning 45th into a one way street as long as it doesn't greatly impact business access and parking. Of the 5 options, I feel most comfortable with Option 4. It's a dedicated multi-use path that's isolated from traffic and also allows for parking. 45th also puts me closer to downtown Ballard businesses than the Blue alternative. Question about Option 5: Where is parking? Is it on the south side? If yes, then does traffic have to cross path to park?
29.0	GREEN	2		I am uncomfortable riding on Shilshole, even if it's a dedicated path, however, I think this is the best alternative proposed. As long as cross streets are clearly marked and security lighting is installed, it should work well. Since I bike commute and run errands in downtown Ballard, I like Option 3 which provides additional routes on 45th & 46th. I also like having the direct route along Shilshole for when there is no train. The more direct a route is, the better chance it'll get used.
30.0	GREEN	3		I'd like to have more explanation the open shared road in options 1 & 2. This area is very unclear to me. As long as this section can still be used safely by bikers & pedestrians and there's adequate lighting, then I'm ok with either option.
31.0	BLUE			I am not comfortable with this route. I believe a big part of getting people to use alternate commuting is having accessibility to safe trails that take you to places you need to go, like work, shops, schools, etc. This trail bypasses downtown Ballard businesses, which is a shame. I am also concerned that moving the path so far north & up a healthy hill will discourage many people to not use this route and to continue riding down congested & unsafe roads to get to their destination quicker. I am also uncomfortable with the large number of busy streets you would be crossing, e.g., Market, 14th, 15th, 24th, etc. Having to ride along Market around the sharp corner near the Locks also makes me nervous. Whatever decision is made in the end, I highly recommend that you take lighting solutions along the entire route into consideration.
32.0	RED			This is better than the Blue alternative, but I see conflict between drivers, parkers, and bikers. Making the street one way would help as long as you can arrange parking so that cars do not have to cross the bike lanes. This is not a good solution for recreational riders and those pulling trailers with small children. I like the idea of the trail taking me closer to Ballard businesses. Having to ride along Market St makes me nervous. Traffic along this street is too congested already. I do like having a dedicated trail west of 24th, though. This route is better than the Blue route. However, I think the Green route is a better choice. Regardless of which route is chosen, please make sure safe and adequate lighting is taken into consideration.
33.0				Why not take the trail from 11th Ave NW and make 46th & 47th one way to Ballard Ave for bike path?
34.0	GREEN			The Burke-Gilman Trail is the best thing for bikes in the city. I commute nearly every day on this trail. Better serving the community by taking bikes off the street, enabling more people to safely commute or ride would take more bikes off the road - ultimately reducing traffic, global warming, etc. This mitigates the distress to industry in the end, we can negotiate their concerns without moving the trail so far north. I would not use the blue alignment.

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
35.0	GREEN	All	4	The green alternative option 4 is the most consistent with the existing B-G trail. No matter which way you go, there will be dangerous intersections that need to be resolved during design & acquisition. COMMENTS ABOUT THIS OPEN HOUSE: The drawings were confusing at first. It seems that it might have been better to have someone present each trail alternative and accept questions. At a minimum, a key for highlighting colors would have been useful. Also having continuous "area" instead of broken trails on one page... even if you had to CUT & PASTE it manually. Also, orient the schematic with the pictures.
36.0	GREEN	All	4	The green route is the most direct and keeping the idea of the Burke-Gilman trail as a separate trail and not just along the street. I like option 4 the best because it stays a bike path (as opposed to just a bike lane). For the blue option to work, it seems like either a side of street parking needs to be removed or a parking strip. My main problem with the red route is the section along Market.
37.0	GREEN	3 2 1	2 4 4	Area 3 Option 2, but separate trail preferable. <u>NOTE: I turned in another that does not include the area/option preferences. This second sheet was completed in order to designate my area/option preferences, after further study of the exhibits.</u>
38.0	GREEN	2	4	Davidya Kasperzyk's presentation, though unofficial, more clearly displays the option or a green route - city drawings should be larger and easier to read - options a bit composing on several area/option drawings for the green route.
39.0	GREEN	2	4	Please, please be done with further studies (I believe this is the fourth) and move on to completion of the trail along the Green Alt. I believe this route is the safest for all concerned (including the recalcitrant businesses which have held this project hostage to their short sighted selfishness). Bike traffic will be facilitated along the route most suited & most likely to draw commuters. Recreational users will benefit from a complete uninterrupted route to the Locks & Shilshole. "Ballard Ave" businesses & future housing density will also benefit. Do the best you can to ease the pain of the complaining businesses, but remind them they'd had free use for a number of years and that right of way for the trail was assured when the Ballard short line RR was given its franchise. Thank you.
40.0	GREEN			I think it is important to note the bike route currently used by the majority of cyclists and consider how to accommodate the needs. When I bike to Ballard I am concerned about nails and glass in the road puncturing my tires, dangerous sections of the route involving intersections with blind spots for motorists & taking a route that is direct (Green Route) and will allow me to go to the Ballard Locks or connect with the marina area. Parked cars to the right hand side of cyclists are hazardous, but perhaps more threatening are industrial trucks backing up into narrow driveways - cyclists may not exercise enough caution to stop and allow these trucks to do their business. Of all the proposed routes, I think that the blue route seems like it will be best for high school kids, but worse for recreational cyclists. Commuters going from Shilshole Marina probably already take Shilshole Ave NW and have the sense to be aware of safety factors around industrial trucks.
40.0	GREEN			I would be encouraged to see some of the alternative recommendations for motion sensor detection to warn cyclists of trucks approaching factored into the construction budget, for if the path is built, more recreational cyclists will come, and some of them may not be as safety savvy as the commuters who currently use Shilshole Ave as their preferred route. In my opinion, the most critical areas to develop bicycle friendly commuter plans after this trail is decided is in the U-district. So many cyclists go to campus every day and there is ample opportunity to generate more cyclist-friendly streets on Roosevelt Way, NE 11th, and even NE 17th - the main entrance to campus. University students often rely on their bicycles to get all over Seattle, and as one, I strongly urge the transportation commission to support the green route in Ballard, factor in safety concerns with trucks, and continue to maintain the other sections of the Burke-Gilman.
41.0	GREEN			I live on 57th St and this street has been built up with townhomes since the display photos were taken. There is much more population density now and there will soon be even more - new townhomes are still going up. This means MORE CARS and SINGLE FILE auto traffic, as well as obstructed views for cars entering & exiting driveways. DO NOT put this on 57th - dangerous!
42.0	GREEN			It's the most direct & continuous.
43.0	GREEN			The only route that will be used by cyclists is the green option. Spending money on others will not force cyclists to use them. Put the money into making Shilshole Ave safe.
44.0	GREEN			The green route is my preferred choice. This is the route I currently take and I doubt if I'd switch. In fact, it's highly unlike that I would use any other route. The blue route will not be used because it's out of the way. The red route won't be used either because it's too dangerous with the cars and bricks. The trucks on Shilshole can get along w/bikes - they seem to be doing ok right now. Other cities have bike routes through industrial area (Milwaukee) so can Seattle. The green route is the defacto route already. Let's make it official!
45.0	GREEN	2	4	I prefer the green alternative because it is the most direct route and it is located on the streets that already have less vehicle traffic and wide right-of-ways. Option 4 is preferable because the crossings of the tracks are more straightforward. Having the trail in the same place relative to the road is the safest for bicyclists. Trails should be 10-12 feet wide.
46.0	GREEN			Green alternative is the only viable alternative for safe travel through Ballard for cyclists and pedestrians. High traffic volume on the Burke-Gilman trail requires a trail separate from the roadway (i.e., not a bike path). Separate bike and pedestrian sections are best, for the safety of everyone (e.g., area 1, option 4). Most important - stay off the roads, away from traffic and preferably away from parked cars.
47.0	GREEN			I prefer: Green Alt. Both blue and red routes are totally unthinkable: One of the major uses for the trail is as a commuting thoroughfare, so the length of blue is not acceptable. The trail should be a trail this is not what I see for options blue & red. It is important that the character of this sections match the rest of the trail so that cyclists don't get confused or lost.

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
48.0	GREEN			Green route is already route I take - only alternative is up Ballard Ave & walking through 2 blocks of Market. Blue is asinine - too narrow.
49.0	GREEN			<p>The preferred alternative is one that has a separated facility. The only option that has separation components is the green alternative. As I review the different areas, the options that minimize crossings and blind corners are preferable.</p> <p>Area 1: Option 4 looks the best and appears to be consistent with other sections of the trail (i.e., Fred Meyer) there is however, a problem with crossing at NW 46th.</p> <p>Area 2: Option 4 appears to be the best alternative. This configuration is very close to the arrangement by Salmon Bay Sand & Gravel - there appears to be some minor configuration to be safer.</p> <p>Area 3: Between 24th & 26th there appears to be no separated facility. It causes confusion when bicyclists have to move from separate facility to roadway to separated facility. Please have an option that allows for separation in this area.</p> <p>The Burke-Gilman Trail is a jewel within the city. It has been a dream of residents of the region to have a Sound to Mountain Trail - let's do it right and make a safe, simple and connected facility to this next section. Neither the</p>
50.0				<p>The green alternative is by far the best option. This would be the safest route. The blue route is not a good option as bicyclists will just bypass the bike path and use Shilshole anyway. The blue route requires crossing of many intersections and would be dangerous. The red option routes bicycles down Market St and would be dangerous. The green route requires the least amount of dangerous crossings, a much preferred alternative. The green route would provide a great safety improvement for cyclists and would be a benefit to Ballard. If the blue or red alternative was selected, I would get off the path and bike along Shilshole anyway. The blue and red alternatives would be a waste of money.</p> <p>Options on the green alternative were presented at the meeting, unfortunately, due to the large turnout at the meeting today, it is difficult to see the specifics of each option of the green alternative and make comments. Hopefully after an "alternative" is selected, there will be a chance to comment on the "options".</p>
51.0	GREEN			Go green, second choice is red.
52.0	GREEN			The green alternative makes the most sense, with modifications. Much needs to be done to ensure that cyclists ride responsibly and business owners & employees act responsibly. Business' liabilities should be minimized however possible. Signage and more could allow rights-of-way for trucks, trains, and equipment. All can exist peacefully.
53.0	GREEN			The green route is the only useful alternative. The others, if constructed, will get no "mixed trail" use and few cyclists. The green would create several crossings which are not perfect, but they will exist in cyclists' path even if not designated, i.e., they will ride Shilshole Ave no matter what. It only makes good policy to accommodate that need and build it in such a way to minimize conflict.
54.0	GREEN			The green route is the most logical and safe for all kinds of riders/walkers/trail users. Small children riding on bike lanes thru town is not safe. The railway is separate from cars and the most scenic and direct. Please go with the Green Route, these trails are very, very popular.
55.0	GREEN			The green route is the best alternative; "rails to trails" completes the Burke Gilman and is safer. It also allows a park like environment for the city and brings bicycling to the fore by being obvious and not obtrusive and dangerous (as on streets).
56.0	GREEN			Try to make the green alternative work. I was unable to get close enough to the options to read them because of the large crowd of people parked too close to the displays.
57.0	GREEN			The Green Route is the only alternative that makes sense and would improve safety through Ballard. If we want to provide safe, efficient, non-motorized transportation alternatives in our City, we need more well-placed bicycle/pedestrian trails through our City. The opportunity is here and now. Please choose the Green Route!
58.0	GREEN			Green Route is superior choice. Fewer high speed vehicle/bike interactions. The other parts of the B/G cross driveways and business entries and still work fine. The path along Alaskan has dozens of trolleys going by and much more traffic and it works reasonably well. Please, to ensure the greatest safety for all - choose the Green Route!
59.0	GREEN			The green route is the clear winner. It is the only alternative even remotely consistent with the Existing B/G. Although I understand the cons re: sharing the green route w/local industry, it is far safer overall vs. the other two routes which are much riskier in terms of traffic. I can't imagine families w/young children riding the blue or red routes. GREEN! GREEN! GREEN! GREEN!
60.0	GREEN			<p>Green alternative is the only alternative that is in character with the existing Burke-Gilman Trail (and connecting Sammamish Trail). The B-G Trail is Seattle landmark and point of pride. It should be completed as envisioned in the Green Alternative.</p> <p>The only part of the Red & Blue alternatives that is worthy is routing along Ballard Ave. Although out of character with the rest of Burke Gilman, Ballard Ave could be "calmed" enough to be acceptable. Example: take out parking on side of street to wider bikes lanes (proposed). With the passage of the monorail, the use of bicycles in the area will increase. Bicycles will be very practical feeder access to the monorail. All the more reason to implement the Green Alternative and attract bicycles as a means to get to the monorail. Thanks for your consideration. /s/ B. Darley</p>
61.0	GREEN			I'm unable to clearly see the difficulties resulting from specific access driveways/RR tracks, etc. due to the crowd tonight and admit these may present some problems, but I still feel this is the best option. Cyclists & trucks must coexist on every other road in town & they can do so here. The other 2 options include biking on 15th - madness - & Market St. - worse madness as well as circuitous routes through narrow, inappropriate streets. Pave the way for co-existence & tolerance & use the Shilshole option. Let's encourage cooperation by forcing it!

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
62.0	GREEN			Even 5 years ago and years before that, I have favored the Shilshole route, a nice broad street that can accommodate bicycles in good numbers. As to the safety of truck & bikes together - I live near the garbage transfer station in Wallingford which has a painted bike lane (on 34th). This has not, to my knowledge, created hazards.
63.0	GREEN	1	2	Area 1 - Option 2 preferred due to RRxings in Option 1. Options 4 & 5 may push industrial traffic into Ballard due to 1-way on Shilshole.
63.0	GREEN	2	4	Option 4 is preferred - least confusing and safest.
63.0	GREEN	3		Either option looks okay.
64.0	BLUE			5 lights!! Way off route from connecting pts. I'm a commuter & need an efficient, safe route, the Blue Alternative is neither. I would never go that way.
65.0	RED	2		Area 2 has 3 turns in short space - this will discourage bicycles.
65.0	RED	4		Area 4 requires crossing Market St. - gets crossed again in Area 5 - not efficient, no safe.
66.0	GREEN	1	3	Be sure to put excellent signage and/or lights to indicate areas where trucks would cross the BG trail to alert riders and make drivers more aware of both car and cyclist traffic.
66.0	GREEN	2	4	Be sure to put excellent signage and/or lights to indicate areas where trucks would cross the BG trail to alert riders and make drivers more aware of both car and cyclist traffic.
67.0	GREEN	1	2	I think this route will be the least costly (less signage) and most frequently used. It makes no sense to send recreational riders down and across busy streets (as proposed in the other 2 routes) many rec. riders are fearful of traffic even with bike lanes - that is why they choose to ride the BG trail. It is scenic and restricted to pedestrian & bike traffic. Cars moving at traffic speeds are a greater threat to riders than the occasional truck moving slowly through a loading area. Also, the other 2 alternatives do not consider pedestrian traffic. BE SAFE, SAVE TIME, SAVE MONEY, CONSIDER ALL POTENTIAL USERS.
68.0	GREEN			Ballard as far as Market, then one block on Market and thence back to the red alternative via 24th (misses most of the conflict (?) on Shilshole). Is this reasonable?
68.0	RED			Ballard as far as Market, then one block on Market and thence back to the red alternative via 24th (misses most of the conflict (?) on Shilshole). Is this reasonable?
69.0	GREEN	1 & 2	3 & 4	Strong preference for green alternative! Changing times require that everyone make changes to benefit whole community. Waterfront industries are part of this community, and have for too long squatted on land they don't own. The B-G is a TRAIL - red & blue alternatives DO NOT MEET this very simple test. By all means, accommodate legitimate needs of local industry, but do so in the context of fulfilling a 30 year old REGIONAL vision. This is not the place for bike lovers and wide curb lanes. Build the trail as a trail.
70.0	GREEN			Most direct. Fewest lights. Most likely to be used.
71.0	RED			Not direct. No room for bikes. Too many lights.
72.0	GREEN			This is the best route. It is direct for commuters and beautiful for recreational cyclists. I think a compromise can be worked out so that the green route is used, but the options are chosen to best accommodate the local businesses. I bicycle commute along Shilshole every day and I love the ride (except for the railroad crossings).
73.0	GREEN			Preferred route. City should seek to design a route that connects w/the existing route along the old rail line.
74.0	BLUE			So far out of the way (from existing Burke & future and that it won't be used by most trail cyclists.
75.0	RED			Too far off the obvious route of Burke. In the business districts paralleled parked cars will be a big conflict w/cyclists. Too dangerous for cyclists.
76.0	GREEN			The Ballard Neighborhood Planning process resulted in three top recommendations. (1) New NSC/Library complex (2) Rail station (3) Burke Gilman Trail along public rail right-of-way. After no action on trail for several years, we formed Friends of Burke Gilman Trail (Inc.) 3 years ago. Last year, we urged the City Council to study options and we're patiently waiting for results. Our group has demonstrated that a trail can co-exist with rail in this corridor. We're committed to seeing this project completed.
77.0	GREEN			Green is the only alternative that makes any sense. The other two are complete non-starters and clearly unacceptable and not functional as a link between the rest of the B-G Trail. Red alternative endangers bikers - most of all by making them ride on Market St. Blue is such a huge detour that no one will use it. The Friends of Burke-Gilman Trail's proposal minimizes trail user/non-user conflicts, why not use it? Finish the trail - it's long overdue.
78.0				I appreciate that enormous amounts of time and effort have gone into discussing possible routes and designing these plans, but I have such serious reservations about all 3 that I cannot support any of them.
79.0	GREEN			This is the only logical route to connect the current BG trail with the trail from the Locks to Golden Gardens. I ride to work along Shilshole (Green route) 2-3 times/week to get to the BG trail. This is the safest route, most direct and simplest. I am going to continue riding this route whether there is a trail or not - a trail would make it much better. I do not believe and have never heard that a bike/pedestrian trail will hurt businesses/industrial area. Being from Denmark where 32% of all commutes in Copenhagen are by bicycle and there are bike trails everywhere (in cities that are 500-1000 years old). I simply do not understand the logic in the arguments that the industrial and business owners along Shilshole Ave put forth. I would like to know for instance if any studies have been done of the number of bike accidents along the Burke-Gilman Trail on the stretch from Fred Meyer to the Fremont Bridge. This is all an industrial area, there are 12 intersections/driveways to the businesses across the BG Trail. How many accidents have there been? This is one of the arguments the industrial leaders along the Green Route use to

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
79.1	Green			Another argument they use is that a trail is going to destroy the businesses. Ask the business owners along the rest of the BGT if they have been harmed by the trail. It does not make any sense. The bicyclists do not want the businesses to go away, but it seems that the businesses want the bicyclists to go away. Seattle, get up to speed with the rest of the world - build more bike trails - more people will then commute by bicycle - less transportation problems, less pollution, cleaner, greener, more energy efficient, less dependence on oil. I could go on and on, but all I really want to say is: This is the safest, most direct and simplest route. Bicycles, pedestrians, and businesses can peacefully coexist - choose the Green Route.
80.0	BLUE			This route has 160 driveway crossings & intersections. It is not safe as a bike route. Too risky, potential for a high number of bike accidents. Would not ride on this route even if there were painted bike lanes.
81.0	RED			This route is not safe - going on to Market St is hazardous - I don't do there now and I will not go there in the future. This is not a logical route when riding on the BG Trail.
82.0	GREEN			The Green Route is the clear choice. As a resident of Ballard & an avid cyclist, I currently use this route frequently. It is accessible and much "friendlier" than the red route. There is more room for cyclists here versus the red, which has minimal traffic but is a budding retail destination in Ballard (this will only continue & increase as condos move into the area - currently under construction). I've heard arguments about rail use interfering & possibly resulting in the injury of kids. I often ride this route & have only ever seen a moving train in the wee early hours of the a.m., and not at "peak" times, such as 2 o'clock on a sunny Saturday afternoon. Seattle is very fortunate to be among those few American cities to have a trail such as the B-G. Its value is not only in its length and very existence, but in the interesting areas, unique to Seattle, through which it passes (i.e., Gasworks, N. Lake WA). We must continue this pattern and continue the unique growth of the Burke-Gilman Trail by GOING GREEN! I cycle through Ballard every single day and have traveled each of these routes on my bikes - as an experienced rider through this neighbourhood, at varying times, day, evening, weekend, I earnestly express my cho
83.0				Keep all bikes off of Shilshole Ave or expand the road just enough on Shilshole for the bikes; do not hamper the existing businesses that are taxpayers that have more to contribute to the Ballard industrial area! At least pave the street known as 54th St for safety! As a truck driver for Ballard Hardware, I am concerned daily for the safety of teh bike riders I have to dodge!
84.0	GREEN			This is rail banked corridor intended for trail. Please exercise this option.
85.0	GREEN			LOVE THE GREEN CONCEPT!
86.0	GREEN			I led bike rides all around Seattle for 10 years, but seldom rode into Ballard because of the dangerous conditions on all of the major routes. Please make a completely separate safe trail along the Green Route - or better yet, trade that right-of-way for the actual shoreline like was done in Fremont. Do not Mix bikes with parked or moving cars on the streets except at controlled intersections. Thank you. /s/ Jack Tomkinson
87.0	GREEN			We should look to the future - as time goes by, many or all of the industry along the Canal will move or cease. If the Green Route is established & dedicated bike/ped path, it can grow into a wonderful non-motorized arterial for the area.
88.0	GREEN			The green route is the only one worth considering for a plethora of reasons. Perhaps the most important is the danger to the bicyclists on the other routes, on the city streets. This contradicts the advocates of the red and blue. I ride frequently from 8th NW to the University of Washington through a very industrialized area with little problem. The accidents I have seen have been on the street. The truck drivers are very courteous and often wave me on. It is too bad their bosses are not more considerate of the general public. I am a bit unhappy to see the advisory committee has a large majority of anti-trail people. They want us bicyclists out on the street where we are more vulnerable. I have been going to these meetings about five years starting at the Nordic Heritage museum. Two years ago at the meeting at the Maritime School, Byron Cole, I think from Ballard Terminal Railroad company, stated that bicycles would never go down the RR right-of-way. The movement of freight is a joke. I am really po'ed at the City Council/SDOT for allowing the franchise. The green
89.0	GREEN			I live at 6th Ave NW & NW 43rd St and commute to Pioneer Square by bike every day. I'm sensitive to the needs of industry in Ballard, but I haven't seen any evidence that the Green alternative will impede their business operations in any way. Gravel trucks cross my path every morning & there's no problem -- we let each other by. What would make me feel less safe and cut down on potential bike commuters, I'm sure, is to foist the bike traffic off the previous railroad grade onto streets. It's a bad plan and really bad precedent. After all, rails-to-trails preserves public rights-of-way. A bike lane on a public street isn't going to do that. In addition, which would a parent feel more comfortable letting his or her kid learn to bike on, a separated grade like the rest of the BG trail, or a bike lane. The BG grade is a precious public resource. We can't surrender it.
90.0	GREEN			The green alternative is the only bicycle friendly route. The multiple major intersection crossing of the Blue & Red Options are serious safety hazards, particularly for children on bikes. The other options are not solutions & will scatter bicycle traffic along other shorter routes resulting in even more traffic complications. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.
91.0	GREEN			I feel strongly that the railbanked corridor should become the trail. We have been waiting for this option, not for some other option that takes a more difficult route with more traffic. I want a separated, dedicated trail along the original planned route - less elevation change, direct route, etc. I am confident that with thoughtful & detailed design, all user conflicts can be resolved in a safe & responsible manner.
92.0	GREEN			As bicycle commuters, we use the Burke-Gilman Trail for its safety and its efficiency of route. The Green Alternative is the most direct connection between the end of the existing trail and the start of the new portion, and it bypasses the more heavily traveled areas of the red & blue alternatives. Living on 57th St., we know that the pace of traffic is already slow due to heavy parking. As such, speed control measures would do little to address the real safety problem - two lanes of parked cars on a narrow street.

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
93.0	GREEN			Green Option is the only good trail option. Red & Blue are non-standards as bike trail. Green Trail Area 1 Option 4: Best option for Area 1. One way is great idea. Green Area 2 Option 4: I like the treatment of the corridor in this area. Trains should be moved out of the way for the trail. Green Trail Area 3: No good option to deal with truck turn around.
94.0	GREEN			Best route - many already use it. Separate on both sides of street - good for bikes, but maybe too narrow for bikes & pedestrians both - especially passing multiple pedestrians. So would also need a sidewalk. A single, wider trail would accommodate both. Green Alt #3 Area 2 - If tracks are closed when in use, trail users can adjust - just like times when work is being done on the B-G Trail.
95.0	GREEN			The green route is safest & most likely to be used. It creates good continuity and will bring more people to our wonderful neighborhood. I would recommend that whatever can be done to save the railroad be done! That is a wonderful link to our past! Can the route bypass the railroad section? The other routes are poorly planned as they do not allow for a dedicated bike trail. Thanks for asking.
96.0	GREEN			Green is likely the only viable alternative. Please keep in mind Shilshole Ave is already being used as the primary bicycle commute route so any trail upgrades will make this route safer. Have you talked to any other cities that already have bike paths in industrial areas to confirm that this does work? It is proven not to be a problem. Milwaukee WI has such a system and it works.
97.0	BLUE	ALL		I am a 5th generation boat builder/fisherman. I have worked along this waterfront for over 25 years, my family over 80 years. My sons work here now 6th generation and my grandson is interested possible 7th generation. Due to various areas being rezoned and "development" on the Seattle waterfront, the usable industrial space has been drastically reduced to very few area like Ballard's waterfront. The Green Alternative is clearly just another squeeze on the little space we have left to operate. Those of us WHO HAVE TO USE this area struggle daily with so many people sharing such a limited space. We have learned to watch out for the many hazards and have a measure of patience for each other. As I said, WE all HAVE TO BE HERE and get along. On the other hand, the pedestrians & bicycle riders DO NOT have to be in this area, they have a choice where they can ride, we do not have a choice, there is no place for us to move to EVEN IF we could afford to.
97.0	BLUE	ALL		Another issue you had best list to is, the caution you have received about truck crossing & traffic. Having worked here 12-14 hrs. a day, 6 days a week for years, I can assure you that if there is a "trail" built through this area (Green Alt.), there will be very tragic accidents. No matter who is "liable" legally, SDOT is liable morally to not allow the creation of such a hazardous situation. The bike riders simply don't realize what a poor idea this is SDOT, on the other hand, should know better. For example, do any of you realize how often this trail will be completely blocked by trucks waiting to enter or exit or deliver, double parked, etc., this IS NOT going to be an enjoyable route for a biker. These guys are notorious for believing everyone should get out of THEIR way. This whole idea is unworkable and ridiculous (Green Alt.).
97.0	BLUE	ALL		Another thought to consider is that there are several hundred people that could not be at the open house or be here in time to comment on this, but live here and rely on using this area every year upon their return to Seattle. That is the commercial fishing & maritime community. If this group could have been there (had they been in town), there would not have been room enough for the bicycle rider Green party group to even get in the doors. Frankly, it really makes me very mad that the hard working people that have worked this area for many years are being pushed aside for the likes of these green party folks who don't seem to have anything better to do than cause problems & bitch about RR crossing & signaget, etc. If it is the long term intention or desire of this city to get rid of us & finish making a part out of the entire waterfront, PLEASE let us know now so we can try to gracefully leave.
98.0	GREEN			The green route is the only realistic choice. I use it everyday from Ballard to Bellevue. The section along Shilshole Ave is currently hostile. A simple section of pavement between Shilshole & the tracks would solve the bicycle problem and be advantageous to the businesses. I have no idea why that hasn't already been done. The train line is a complete joke. Get real! Eliminate the hobbyist & get him to play with a scale model at home.
99.0	GREEN			I think the Green route should be the preferred route. And it should include a separated bike/hike path to avoid confrontations with traffic. It is the shortest route and would be used by many, if not most, user anyway. I live on 24th & 75th and I use this route now without too much hassle. Leave Ballard Ave alone. The bricks could be dangerous and it is just a block away for anybody wishing to visit the Ave.
100.0	GREEN			I prefer a SEPARATED bike path - IF POSSIBLE wide enough for walkers as well (I don't have a bike right now).
101.0	GREEN			It is practical, simple, direct.
102.0	BLUE			Best alternative - safest, least conflict among existing uses. Option 2 is NOT desired, however. Proliferation of stop signs is not preferred or necessary thru this neighborhood. Keep it to traffic circles.
103.0	RED			I live in QA - Interbay area. As a recreational rider, I like the red line integrating with Ballard main streets. I think the line - Green - thru the tracks will benefit only commuters.

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
104.0	RED			I have lived in Ballard for 3-1/2 years. For all of that time I have commuted to the UW using the BG (4.5 miles each way). I now commute to downtown (6 miles each way), but continue to use the BG for recreation. I live in downtown/historic Ballard because I like the mix of commercial/retail/residential uses. This 24 hour activity and mix of scale of uses is very unusual. I defend the existence of these multiple uses to stay in the area between the Fred Meyer and the Locks. For this reason, I have the following thoughts on the routes. GREEN - This route would disrupt the industrial activity and slow a major arterial. These railroad tracks are still used and should not be taken away for cyclists. BLUE - This will not be used by people using the trail for transportation, as it is not a direct route. RED - This does not interfere with commercial/industrial traffic, allows the cyclist to see the nicest part of Ballard, and is a reasonably direct route. This is the route I already use! GO RED
105.0	BLUE			This is not a multi-use option. Bicyclists will not use it - most will continue to use Shilshole Ave or Ballard Ave from/to Fred Meyer - Locks. Why spend the \$?
106.0	RED			Market is not a bicycle-friendly street! Also not a multi-use trail. One of the frequent destinations is Locks - so need to be able to get easy access.
107.0	GREEN	1	4	Currently I use Ballard Ave and 20th to 22nd to cross Market @ 22nd and proceed up to 65th then west a few yeards to 23rd and continue north to 73rd then west to my house on Earl (between 27th & 28th). No matter what happens with this process, I will probably contine to use that route to cross Market. If the Green, Area 1, Opt. 4 is done correctly, along the ROW (below Market St) then I would use that to go over to 28th, then north to my house reverse to go downtown or U District. The Blue option is okay for weekend casual riders, but is way out of the way for practical use. Red is close to what I use today, but agin, using Market St. is a joke (!) with the bus stops already causing a marjor mess for these 2 or 3 blocks to 24th. Thanks for listening. /s/ S Colman
108.0	GREEN			The Green Alternative should be funded and completed by the City of Seattle. It is safest for cyclists and best for the motorist and merchants. It would keep cyclist away from cars and away from merchant area. The green alternative would be Seattle's tax dollars best use and choice. The Green Alt. would be safest for children and families.
109.0	GREEN			I believe that the Green alternative - the railroad corridor along Shilshole NW - is the very best bike route - the most sensible way to go. We'll have to all work together to work out the problems.
110.0	BLUE & RED	Entire		I do not support putting the bike trail on Shilshole Ave. City bike planners/engineers have not evaluated the liability associated with bicycles, pedestrians, skate boarders, skaters, joggers, children riding on a trail so close to very large trucks and the railroad. The blue and red alternatives are much more in line with addressing less liability. I understand that the trail up on 57th appears to be "longer", but what's the hurry getting to Shilshole?! In addition, the 57th access fits well with bicycle commuters from the North portion of Ballard that use the Burke-Gilman for commuting. Perhaps the 57th route fits well with the northern route to Shoreline? (not presented in any of the alternatives). The City needs to take each of the segments presented and include cost per segment to fully evaluate each route. Without a risk analysis regarding liability to businesses along Shilshole and liability to the City of Seattle, and a detailed cost analysis per segment, it's difficult to know the entire picture. However, I would estimate that Shilshole route is the highest cost and the highest liability to businesses and to the City of Seattle and
111.0	GREEN			I bike commute to work daily. And ride recreationally regularly too. I support the Green Alternative whole-heartedly. Bicyclists already use this route - it's the shortest, most direct, safest route than thru this area of town. Too many of the comments I heard against this route were from businesses who say trucks & rail traffic cause safety concerns. That's not the real issue - they just want to have things just the way they want them. The businesses will have to change & find creative ways to support this alternative, since it is the ONLY reasonable routing for bicycle, skate, jogging, walking traffic thru this are.
112.0	GREEN			This is the missing link to the system - hence the most difficult to design. Bicyclists/both reacreatonal & commuter use the green route. It's the most direct connection. No one will use 57th too out of the way - no easy way to cross 15th & Market Streets. Ballard Ave is okay for recreational users, but has many sight distance issues with parked vehicles. Shilshole is the route most used today for clear reasons. The design of the BGT can achieve safety for all users, trucks, trains, vehicles, cyclists, etc. The biggest problem facing industrial prop/bus. owners is not a multi-use trail, but rather the large number of commuting/local vehicles which currently BLOCK RESTRICT traffic to driveways and properties - MUCH MORE THAN BIKES EVER WILL. Also most of the busy use of Shilshole with a trail will be during non-business hours on the weekend - hence minimal conflict w/businesses & acces. It's also known that various property owners would love to get their hands on the railroad right-of-way for their own use and value. These property owners have been using this land for storage and parking
113.0				Displays/information too technical for this kind of open house.
114.0	GREEN			The Green Alternative provides the most continuous route of the three options. There is some difficulty in the truck-traffic areas, but these problems can be mitigated with education and good signage. The red and blue alternatives do nto provide a bike TRAIL which should be a goal for the City.
115.0	GREEN			The Green Route is far superior for addressing the needs of the non-motorized traveler. For promoting the values espoused in our City's comprehensive plan, the Green Route is what I endorse.
116.0	GREEN & BLUE			The most important thing is to GET IT BUILT! Bikes have been treated as an afterthought for too long. The right thing would be BOTH Green & Blue, so there would be an additional route through the business district. But if only one can be built, make it GREEN. We need a serious, separated bike trail!!!
117.0				Why wasn't 59th St considered? It is wider than 57th & 58th combined!!
118.0	GREEN			As a daily bicycle commuter, the green route is absolutely the best choice. I currently ride in the mornings along Shilshole and would very much appreciate completing the Gilman Trail along the railroad grade. I realize there are businesses that function along this route, but the trail exits further east w/other industrial functions and it certainly can as well along the green line!

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
119.0	GREEN			As a father of two small children, who are learning to ride bikes, I would only allow them to ride on a separate designated trail. I would prefer to travel slowly and stop more frequently than mix with cars passing in near proximity w/ an on the road part way. I also commute along the Duwamish trail along West Marginal, this area shows a blend can happen between bikes & industrial. Go Green -
120.0	GREEN			When the choice is between inconvenience & possible liability (covered by insurance) vs. physical safety - including the safety of children - I don't think it is a close call. The most separated trail possible is the best. Blue alternative is horrible - & speaking of liability! With every accident comes liability - maybe not for the Shilshole businesses, but for someone. So we're really only trading inconveniences - against safety. This City needs to support bicycling, for the health & environmental benefits. Green - area 1 option 4; area 2 option 4; area 3 A-A or C-C with some further improvements. Thanks.
121.0	GREEN			The safest, most scenic, and most obvious connection is the green route. Conflicts w/existing businesses, parking, and local industry can all be resolved if we have a LONG TERM approach to a solution. The red and blue routes are markedly band-aid solutions, not as safe, and less likely to be used! Excellent examples can be found at Grandview Island in Van. B.C. (cement factory in middle of Vancouver's #1 tourist attraction!) and in Portlane with the newly completed East Bank Esplanade (industry and pedestrians coexisting again!)
122.0	GREEN			The Green Route is the only route that will work in this area. Why can't businesses and bicyclists get together? GO GREEN GO!!
123.0	GREEN			I would not take my small daughter biking to Shilshole on any other route than the green one. I won't use red or blue even if you do build them. From 10+ years biking around Ballard, those red/blue routes are UNSAFE!
124.0	GREEN	2	4	The best route. See all other comments.
125.0	GREEN	2	4	This is the only safe option.
126.0	BLUE			This needs to have residential zoning considered. If zoning permits any increase in density, we should know that BEFORE we consider a trail in the residential areas - - - a house is 1 car/1 driveway, but a condo is 8 cars/1 driveway and an apartment building is 30 cars/1 driveway!
127.0	GREEN	2	4	This is the safest route and most likely to encourage people to ride.
128.0	GREEN			This is a direct route with wide area for path - it is and will remain route to Shilshole. Paths have worked everywhere else through industrial area.
129.0	GREEN			I strongly favor the "Green" alternative for several reasons. (1) the "Blue" Alternative via 11th St & NW 57th exposes the biker to significant contact with speeding cars. There are few stop lights on 11th Ave and getting across 15th - the busiest street in the area is scary & slow (3) The "Red" Alternative shunts the bicyclists onto NW Market - a really scary street for a biker with heavy bus & truck traffic as well as speeding cars (3) By a country mile the "Green Route" is the safest, the shortest and the most bike friendly route. Please, please do the right thing. In September of this year my wife - while standing over her bike at a busy intersection was hit when two speeding cars collided and one of them was literally shoved across the street, striking my wife - this resulted in a fractured hip. DO THE RIGHT THING. /s/ James I Plorde, MD
130.0	GREEN			Don't truncate the trail. A few signs and a line on a street is NOT a trail.
131.0	GREEN			I'm a regular bicyclist & I'm for the Green Alternative, GO GREEN!
132.0	GREEN			Safety is the 1st concern. Anytime we can have a multiuse trail to separate cyclists, joggers, walkers, roller skaters, etc., from cars, we must seize the opportunity. THIS IS A NO-BRAINER. For the safety of the citizens of this community. Ballard is one of the fastest growing areas in the city and this would make the area safer and more enjoyable for multiuse. Plus it is public land to be used by the public as a whole. BIKES NOT BOMBS!! I know of no cyclists or pedestrians who would not give right of way to a truck or train crossing a trail. It's time for Seattle to have a trail that goes all the way to the Sound waterfront park. We don't have one. Make Seattle the progressive cycling city that the national media portrays it has. Cycling has become riskier with bigger cars and a hurry-up society. So PLEASE PASS THE GREEN LINE FOR SAFETY'S SAKE. /s/ Kenneth Hamm P.S. The car traffic on a summer evening & weekends going to Golden Gardens is extremely heavy & FAST, sometimes reckless.
133.0	GREEN			For bicyclists (and other multiuse users except perhaps pedestrians) this route is the ONLY one that makes any sense; from issues such as direct line ("as the crow flies") to the reality of a need for a separate trail and not just lines on the roadway (Red) or the ridiculous idea of the blue route option. I'm sure many people have made points which I would reiterate, but I would, at this point, note the following: There seems to be some lack of forward looking/common sense/flexibility/taking on a basic challenge attitude by the opponents to the Green option. I am continually surprised especially considering Ballard's apparent attachment/rooted to the Scandinavian countries where multi-use trails exist in all areas of the countries, including cities, inner cities, industrial areas, etc.... so why not the ability to put it through Shilshole Ave with its relatively short distance?
133.0	GREEN			Surely, with a creative and safety-first design, there is absolutely no reason why the trail cannot be constructed in this area. It's time for a wake-up call! Ultimately, it's just a matter of time that the most sensible option will be constructed (as was true for other "controversial" segment of the B-G Trail in the past). Change is hard for some people to accept, I guess, but I do have respect for SDOT to make the right choice.
134.0	GREEN	1 2 3	4 4 1	Green route is the most direct & is the most bicycle friendly. I understand that the largest hurdle is the opposition of industry along Shilshole. I think education of the drivers & caution by the bikers will alleviate the problems. This solution is still less dangerous in my opinion than red/blue alternatives.
135.0	GREEN			Without an overview map showing the alternatives overlaid, the trade-offs are VERY hard to evaluate here for anyone new to the options. As a cyclist and semi-regular user of the BG trail & routes through Ballard, I'm strongly in favor of options that keep the two cycling lanes together.

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
136.0	BLUE	Gen'l		Considering that this alternative will be about 2x as long, not separated, not as fool-proof for first time riders AND involve a slow traffic light crossing of 15th Ave NW, I think it's fair that the cycling community is unenthusiastic. I, for one, would simply ride on the road along Shilshole Ave instead.
137.0	GREEN			In favor of the green route. All the others will not work & will not be used by bikers. The other two have too many left turns in traffic or put you on slippery cobblestone. Bikers will use the green route no matter what you do as it's safer & the logical conclusion of the BG Trail.
138.0	GREEN	1 or 2	4	I support the Green Trail . The past 3 years I have been commuting by bike to the downtown area. Presently I'm commuting southbound on 24th Ave, Shilshole, then over the Ballard Bridge. I strongly support the green that has a good connection to the Ballard Bridge. I want a bike path or a bike lane. I believe even car drivers would prefer bike riders on a separated lane.
139.0	GREEN			It's along the water and wil be really pretty. I've ridden along most of it and it's the best route. I've ridden on Market St. and I think it's dangerous.
140.0	GREEN			I've ridden the route, as far as possible with my family. We all agree that the green is best. We found ourselves on part of what is designated as the red. Even with bike lanes I would consider it too dangerous for a family ride. The green is the only logical alternative which makes sense. It is the best finish for a LONG AWAITED completion. Let's get it done!
141.0	GREEN			Complete the Burke-Gilman Trail using the "Green" route.
142.0	GREEN			Please complete the Burke-Gilman "missing link" keeping separate the bike path, from traffic. Approve the 'Green' Route. Support bicycle commuting - I commute to work by bicycle year round.
143.0	GREEN			On all sections, I prefer the safest route for cyclists. One-way traffic on 45th is a good idea.
144.0	GREEN			As an avid rider to work & for exercise, I believe green is easily the best alternative. The only truly busy times on the trail are week days @ rush hr & on weekends when most commercial traffic is slower. The next alt. Is red, but I don't think it is any step forward for commuters or cyclists in general if there are no specific lanes designated.
145.0	GREEN			Green route along the rail bed - this is the least dangerous route. Simple - Safer Connected. I can't understand what the hold-up has been - we need the Green Route - the trucks will not be a problem; in truth, that is a non-issue. The polluters in Ballard are feeding a line to the City - the Ballard Neighborhood Plan has this as the preferred route - I would think that all of the people in this entire region would like a safe - simple connected route. Also, forklifts are unlicensed vehicles and should not be on Shilshole Ave.
146.0	GREEN			The City acquired railroad right of way for a trail. The City should build a trail in the railroad right of way. Short line rail & trail can coexist, but short-line rail should NOT trump trail. Other alternatives are not acceptable.
147.0	GREEN	All	Any	The Green Alternative is far superior to the others for the following reasons: (1) it is already the defacto bike path and seems to be used naturally by most bikers and has for many years (except for the part on the old railroad right of way) (2) it can be made much safer than it currently is with the planned enhancements, whereas the blue and red include many intersections and driveway crossings which cannot be avoided (3) the industrial traffic and crossings on Shilshole and the railroad right of way can be easily married with proper design and bikers will, after multiple uses of this route become careful users and partners with the businesses to make it work and the businesses will accrue much good publicity. (4) this route, properly landscaped, will add much more aesthetically to the Ballard community.
148.0	GREEN	1	4	The green route is the ONLY option that will be safe for families with young riders.
149.0	GREEN			Only green is acceptable.
150.0	GREEN	1 2 3	3 4 1	I feel that crossing a major road (Market) is a larger problem than dealing w/a twice w week railroad and daily truck loading. I favor the green alternative with Option 3 for Area 1; Option 4 for Area 2; Option 1 for Area 3.
151.0	GREEN	1	4 & 5	I am a firm believer in the green route. I believe the green route offers a safer path for trail users. I believe the trail shold run along the rail bed for as long as possible as opposed to using bike lanes on the side of the road.
152.0	GREEN			[1] It would be great if the trail was completed with any of the alternatives. [2] I think it would decrease the transients in the area (I bike this way daily and often see homeless people). [3] If the trail was completed hopefully more families would use the trail to get to the Locks (rather than driving). [4] This would encourage more people to commute via bikes. [5] Bicycling is a great alternative to driving. [6] The trail from Fred Meyer right now goes through an industrial area. I never have had problems with truck crossing the trail. [7] Completion of this trail would be wonderful. Let's keep thinking that Seattlites are bicycle friendly people. [8] When the trail was completed between the University and Kenmore (Bothell), a lot of people didn't want this to happen. The result of this trail increased property values. I can't think of anything negative that resulted from the trail. [9] This is a win/win for everyone if it is handled correctly. LET'S DO IT.
153.0	GREEN			Add access points to Ballard Ave for pedestrians.
154.0	GREEN		1	Green alternative - much safer.
155.0	GREEN	1	4	Makes the best connection w/out as many vehicular conflicts shown in over 2 options.
156.0	GREEN			Green is only real choice. Blue is longer and thus undesirable for commuting. Nothing scenic to recommend it as a recreation route. Red is too hectic on Market St. Too much competition w/pedestrians.
157.0	GREEN			Any route that does not have trail use only, but has cars and bikes sharing the road is often dangerous to the bicyclist. There have been a number of accidents already this year in the university area where bikes are forced to share the road with cars due to Burke-Gilman trail maintenance. Added to that, the green route is direct and poses less impact to the already strenuous relationships that exist between bikes and cars. Trail use is by definition for pedestrians and bicyclists, NO CARS. Do not succumb to the corrupt ways that have already created a 30-yr. lease with a railway that is used very little and has no benefit to the community.

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
158.0	GREEN	1	4	The green route is the only bike route of the three that appeals to all. The other two are diversions. I ride for fun and interest, not to be shuttled through traffic and residential neighborhoods. I currently ride the Shilshole (Green Route) and will continue to ride it even if one of the others are implemented. I suspect a lot of other riders will to, so red or blue will not significantly rid Shilshole of bikes.
159.0	GREEN			I bike thru this area 5 days/week, 52 weeks/year. The green alternative is the only alternative that makes sense.
160.0	GREEN			Please DO the GREEN ROUTE!!
161.0	GREEN			Although SDOT failed to fully explore the Green Line as Friends of B/G Trail DID, this is the only alternative that is realistic, is less expensive and is by far safer than the other. We purchased the RR corridor for a trail - USE IT.
162.0				I am a bike rider + pedestrian. I occasionally drive a FLEX CAR when in need of auto transportation. I work in Ballard at 1763 NW 57th so I am quite familiar with daily traffic on the Blue Alt. Route. It is very difficult to imagine regular bike trail traffic on streets where one already takes one's life in one's hands walking across intersections such as 17th + 57th NW or 20th + 57th NW or 22nd & 57th NW!! I have seen countless fender benders and have been nearly hit on a MONTHLY basis. These intersections are being used by Ballard's many elderly drivers and pedestrians. The Ballard School of Driving is a common local joke - but it is not funny. These intersections would require serious REVISIONS (including ligths) and parking regulation changes. It seems at this presentation that the Blue and Red Alt. Routes are being PUSHED ont he users of Seattle bike routes. A very heavy BIAS against the Green Alt. by INDUSTRY. Seems extremely unfair.
162.0	GREEN			As I write this, the Monorail is losing in the polls. We have no transit solutions in town and region. This missing link is such a small & inexpensive bone to throw the way of us "environmentally correct" bikers that it seems a foul blow to let the industrialists win this battle. VOTE GREEN, PLEASE. We CAN coexist w/trains + trucks. We're willing to work with the industries along the Green Alt.
163.0	GREEN	1	4	I now live in Wallingford, but lived before this in Ballard for 10 years. This one makes the most sense, is safest of all of the "green" options, and will reasonably complete the trail.
164.0	GREEN	ENTIRE		The Green Route is most practical, safest and the best option for all trail users. Other options are indirect and dangerous. Green is the most useful and most viable.
165.0	GREEN			Green Route is safest; most practical and by far the best option. Thanks for the Open House.
166.0	GREEN	1 2 3	4 4 no pref.	Strong preference for Green Option - traffic - hills - aesthetics, distance.
167.0	GREEN	2	4 or 3	The green alternative is the only route that makes sense. In addition - Option 4, Area 2 is the preferred alternative to avoid sending bicyclists across a busy street twice. Option 3 may also be okay, but the added expense is probably not worth it (show me the economics of this railroad before we agonize so much about savings it).
168.0	GREEN	3	2 or 1	Again, since the Green Alternative is the only viable alternative over all, Area 3 either Option 1 or 2 seems viable through this area.
169.0				How will pay for it? Will bike riders? No on this. What happens when all the trucks start using road? Do you know that 1 box = two truck trailer? DO you know ICC date 1 Jan 1980 all rail line can be converted back to rail. The bikers should pay their way. How pay the property tax? All of us increase, but no bikes. Just like Seattle take out and pay more.
170.0	GREEN			I have ridden on all these options and much prefer the green route. I commuted from the Locks to the Gasworks area for 5 years and that portion of the trail crosses numerous shipyards, Lakeside Sand & Gravel, Fred Meyer, tug companies, and seafood/fishboat docks. There were no major problems. Industry, residents, commuters, and recreation users can and do coexist successfully.
171.0	BLUE			The printed materials & representatives from the City did not do justice to presenting the Blue Alternative. [1] The printed material leads off with b biased-sounding statement "Industrial interests tend to favor . . ." This will immediately influence a lot of people NOT because of the merits of the plan, but because the "industrialists" are simply in favor of it. It may be a true statement, but it certainly seems to present a fact in a biased manner. Contrast that with the oepning descriptions of the other two options, which emphasizes their benefits. [2] Whe asked by the Blue Option is being considered, Eric Tweit's initial response was "The industrial interests are in favor of it." That is not an answer to the question, while it might indeed be true. The answer would be one which explains how it would help solve the connection between the two parts of the BG Trail.
172.0	GREEN		Any one	One of the green options left out a sidewalk for pedestrians. That is not good. Any other GREEN option is acceptable. God Speed & Thanks, /s/
173.0	GREEN			The trail should be consistent with the rest of the trail and not be shunted off to surface streets. By using surface streets, people who normally don't ride their bikes will be intimidated and not use the trail.
174.0	GREEN			The trade-off between industrial use and bicycles is a clear one for me. Bicycles. It would be far safer to ride through an industrial area than one with pedestrians, cars with opening doors, busy arterials. A separated bike path, even with some driveways, would be preferable. I commute most days and there is nothing worse than being on the road with cars.
175.0	GREEN			Please use the green alternative. It's the only route that is a bike path SEPARATE from the roads. The other choices are not suitable.
176.0	GREEN			I sincerely hope that SDOT selects the Green Route alignment. It maximizes safety and separation from traffic flair compared to Blue & Red. I speak as a casualty of the Ballard Terminal track crossing. Thanks. /s/

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
177.0	GREEN			Any connection from 11th & 45th to Shilshole and 24th would be super. The green route is best for both commuters and rec users. A bike trail there would ENHANCE safety. I used to commute to and from UW for school and then works every day by way of Shilshole and 45th to the trail. On June 28, 2000, I was on my way home (going west on 45th) when a car tried to pass me as I attempted to cross the RR tracks just W of 11th. Result: severe concussion, torn rotator cuff, loss of opportunity, etc. The existing situation is the hazard. P.S. I did NOT sue anyone!
178.0	GREEN			The green alternative seems to be the one which is most feasible and would be the most direct for the cyclists/peds that would use it. The blue option is TOO far north for cyclists to use (chances are cyclists would continue to use Shilshole despite the official decision). The red route is too dangerous & would be unbeneficial to both cyclists & drivers. Market St. is busy enough as it is, to put a much-used trail there would be laughable. THE GREEN ROUTE IS DIRECT, SCENIC AND MOST USED!
179.0	GREEN			As a regular user of the Burke-Gilman trail, I would prefer the green alternative. The representations of the areas and options were not clear enough for me to comment at the moment. The green alternative is a logical extension of the existing trail.
180.0	GREEN	2	4	Please select the above option. Arguments against this option regarding driveway access don't hold water. I ride this route a lot and don't feel that it is significant. Best option the route as it stands now is TREACHEROUS!! Alternatively choose Area 1, Option 4.
181.0	GREEN			I am in total support of the Green alt. route. I feel like rail corridor should be used to maintain the overall integrity of the trail. A well designed trail will be safe and work for all.
182.0	GREEN			I support green route 100%.
183.0	GREEN			I use the route from the Locks to 8th 1 or 2 times a week - I use Shilshole and would never use 58th.
184.0	GREEN	1	4	Use existing rail right of way.
185.0	GREEN	2	4	This is the logical choice, perhaps more expensive, but worth it in the long run.
186.0	GREEN	1	4	Use preferred option - Area 1, Option 4 - Green line on NW 45th.
187.0	GREEN			This is the ONLY good route. I am 55 years old. I bicycle 2-4 times a week round trip through this area. This route allows for smooth passage with no arterial crossings eastbound and only needs to find a safe way to get westbound users across Shilshole and behind the Market St. businesses. By contrast the other alternatives put cyclists in busy, almost suicidal, traffic. The blue route just won't be used. Would you drive it as an alternative to Shilshole Ave? Of course not. Neither will cyclists.
188.0	GREEN	All	Any	I bike this route everyday. I have tried Ballard Ave and gave up because of the one block on Market between Ballard Ave & 24th. Any option on the green route is much better than the red or blue routes. The blue route is too dangerous because of businesses - cars entering and exiting.
189.0	GREEN			The industrial users have been blocking this trail at every turn along the whole route. They should not be allowed to delay any longer. Their concern about driveway crossings is bogus. The UW has thousands of crossings a days w/o problems the driveways should have stop signs on them so the motor vehicles have to stop not the trail users.
190.0	BLUE			How many people will get injured (killed) at 11th Ave - NW Leary + 15th - 57th. What are you going to do put lights across every street on 15th Ave NW? Additional bike route on 56th might work better.
191.0	GREEN			Elevate bike portion from just west of underpass under Ballard Bridge to 24th St then onto rail right-of-way rather than Market St. Rail right-of-way to Locks parking lot, etc.
192.0	GREEN			I fully support expansion of the BG Trail. The green option seems to be the best for several reasons. It's the most direct & efficient route - also, it's a great way to see what Ballard really is/was about - the industrial base, etc. Finally, it's the most congruent with the existing trail, Give cyclists & truckers both credit - we can share the road safely.
193.0	GREEN			Green all the way! Blue is too indirect - accidents, traffic disruption. Red will disrupt the Ballard Historic District and riding on Market will be terrible. Green - scenic, direct, enjoyable.
194.0	BLUE			It is absolutely the worst idea to go up 11th & 57th. Cars are parked on both sides of 57th & traffic is too much for the street as it is. Please don't plan to do 57TH!!!
195.0	GREEN			The Green Alt. is by far the best route! Please build it!
196.0	GREEN			Several elevated areas (where trucks load & unload) for bikes. There are elevated bike paths over railroad switching yards in Interbay. Thanks for the info.
197.0	BLUE			I have biked and driven 57th. There are way too many cars (many elderly drivers) pulling out of businesses or trying to park or opening car doors. There is no room for a bike lane unless you do away with parking. A bike MUST take the whole lane. It's too dangerous!
198.0	GREEN			Favor the simplest use of the railroad corridor for a multiuse trail keeping to the south side & using "Not 54th St.". I have been a bicycle commuter (4 seasons a year) for 22 years. I would not use either the red or blue routes because they are not designed for safe bicycling. Being hit by parked cars opening their doors without seeing bicyclists is dangers, almost killed my father. Since Shilshole will be the route of preference for commuter bicyclists from Sunset Hills, something must be done to make Shilshole safer.
199.0	GREEN	Any	Any	Blue - dumb idea. Further, I am pretty sure 57th is closed to traffic btw 14th & 15th on school days. Please check this. Red - I only ride on Market when I HAVE to run an errand there. Way too much distracted traffic or aggressive traffic hurrying to get through. I think mixing shoppers in cars with bikes is a dangerous idea. Green - any alternative would work best. This is so clearly the best option for those of us who ride and/or drive. I am sure the businesses are the only reason this one isn't done yet - why don't they admit they're just being stubborn jerks.
200.0	BLUE	2/5		Any trail crossing Market TWICE and Learny once will be too dangerous for families when these crossings are added to all the sharers on this route - people will take the easier alternative - Shilshole and no money will have been spent for safety on this route (the shortest distance between the points).

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
201.0	GREEN	1	4 or 5	The blue alternative just has too many intersections to merit expending # on it; and I must admit it is further out of the way than I would be inclined to use. The red alternative would be reasonable (on Ballard Ave), but seems to pose significant problems west of 24th with use of Market St. The green alternatives seems much better for cyclists & recreational users (me). Area 1 option 4 or 5! Best of luck with a difficult decision.
202.0	GREEN			Take a video out at each area and see what people already feel is a direct safe place to ride. Then make this area better and safer. Obviously, I feel the green is this route as a liveaboard I support this option.
203.0	GREEN	ALL	*	*whichever is endorsed by Friends of The Burke-Gilman Trail. The fact is that people are going to continue along the green route one way or another, so why not try to make it friendlier? If not green, don't waste the money or effort. This is a prime opportunity to clean up and make a community asset, a forgotten historical corridor. The area needs rehabilitation so why not do it in cooperation with the BGT? Try to keep it dedicated trail wherever possible.
204.0	GREEN			The green is the obvious best choice for both commuter and recreational use. Engineers employed to create tunnels or flyovers (through truck driveways) is much more humane than police employed to investigate accidents and ambulance drivers employed to rush to Harborview.
205.0	GREEN	1 2 3	4 3 2	The Green Trail is the only one that will be used by bicyclists. Make it as straightforward as possible. The trail could be improved from the suggested options by using some of the solutions developed by the Friends of The Burke Gilman. Quit wasting our time and money and put in this needed trail along the green path.
206.0	GREEN	2	4	Green option in general seems safest and most practical. However, I prefer the one I've chosen above (Green Area 2 Option 4).
207.0	GREEN			The trail should follow the same design and use pattern as the other sections of the Burke-Gilman Trail. The trail is unique and special attribute and valuable asset to the community that allows for alternative transportation, healthy life style exercise and a close connection of a broad away of the region with the Ballard community. It takes a long view to look at the value of these kinds of amenities for citizens today and for the distant future when the auto based & industrial environment will change to accommodate density in housing, clean industry and quality of life. People need to take a leadership role in assuring that the interest of a few do not outweigh the interest of the larger good.
208.0	GREEN			The Burke-Gilman Trail should continue on the rail right-of-way as it does from Kenmore to Ballard. The same arguments have been given by business owners throughout the development of the trail (i.e., too busy - too dangerous - too much truck traffic). In every case these concerns have faded away. The trail can coexist with residential and commercial. Don't be afraid to make the right decision. Use the rail right of way, it is safer than Ballard Ave or Market St. Green Route - the only real route.
209.0	GREEN	1 2 3	2 2 or 4 ?	Blue is too far out of the way. Neither blue or red offer the "safe haven" that users expect from the rest of the Burke-Gilman Trail. I wouldn't take a child on either of these routes. Bike lanes are nice, but they are inconsistent with the rest of the Trail. Rollerblades are great on the trail, but I'd never take them on the road, a bike lane, or a sidewalk.
210.0	GREEN	1 2 3	2 2 or 4 no pref.	I strongly prefer the Green alternatives that offer a 10-12 foot bi-directional trail. This is the natural extension of the existing and hugely successful Burke-Gilman Trail. It's the natural "desire line" and minimizes major street crossings. I can't imagine rollerbladers and little kids on the blue and red alternatives, which involve crossing Market St. twice to get to the Locks. One way traffic on 45th/46th is ok if necessary. Important to have grade separation or buffer between trail and vehicular traffic wherever feasible. Bicyclists will use Shilshole Ave regardless of where trail is constructed. NW 57th will experience a lot of growth in traffic due to new construction.
211.0				RED ROUTE - Ballard Ave has less traffic, but still has large commercial vehicles and semis blocking one or more lanes regularly. There are commercial enterprises on this route. The big problem with Ballard Ave & the Market St segments are parked cars. Without dedicated lanes, parked cars are a huge hazard, and especially in commercial areas. Drivers are distracted locating businesses and parking, and often don't look when getting in and out of cars. Besides getting "doored", this route isn't family friendly. It would still be convenient enough to go shopping, eating or to the clubs (music & athletic) as I do.
211.0				BLUE ROUTE - Street use of this route continues to increase as infill replaces bungalows (15th NW past Aurora) with condo & apartment complexes. This is not a direct route - people/ bicyclists won't use it. It has no destination or benefit to going out of your way. TRAFFIC CALMING DEVICES - traffic circles are a crazy idea for bikes, [1] cars turn left in front of them, [2] they take out may sq/ft of spaces for maneuvering - less room to recover from a mistake, [3] as you ride along straight, you go from the left shoulder to the right shoulder - basically "cross" the lane. Bumps may slow traffic, but any "cuts" in the bumps for bikes encourage drivers to shoot for these cuts to decrease the effect of the bumps on their cars. One way to "calm" traffic along a route would be to have a dedicated lane INSIDE of parked cars. Have cross streets stop, and have the traffic along the route be one-way, with the direction changing every 3 blocks.
211.0	GREEN	1	2 then 3	BLUE - Build a trail and they won't come. GREEN ROUTE - my favorite route. I've been riding through this area daily (weekdays). Go with the flow - this is the route currently used. The City has the rights, as place and a design for it. This is the family friendly route that will lead to MORE business for surrounding businesses as people use it for commuting. The best compromise.
212.0	GREEN	1	4	This proposed route appears to be the safest option for all users of the path, and is also the most direct route (and route most likely to be used by cyclists). The idea of making vehicle traffic one-way and having a separate bike path to the south of vehicle traffic seems the best solution for keeping cars and trucks and cyclists on the same street/in the same area while minimizing traffic hazards.
213.0	BLUE			It seems pointless to put the resources into making this route a bike path - it's out of the way and cyclists who want to use it can do so without the added designations and signage. Crossing 15th Ave NW would also be inconvenient.

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
214.0	RED			While this route was the one I initially favored most, I now feel the car/vehicle traffic on Market poses too much of a hazard to cyclists. Reducing vehicle traffic to one lane each way and creating a dedicated bike lane would help, however, pedestrian traffic also poses a hazard. While this route is certainly the most aesthetically pleasant (as compared to Green Route), it's not as safe.
215.0	RED			Having watched the volume of traffic along Shilshole continue to build for the past 20 years, placing cars, bikes, and pedestrians together along this road only invites serious injury. The added distraction of industrial activity intensifies the liabilities of the Shilshole option. For every bike rider that understands that trucks are difficult to stop, another rider exists that does not have a clue to this danger. How many serious injuries and claims does the city settle under 1/2 m? Surely, this option is not sound financial policy, much less sound safety policy. Just drawing a dotted line across a driveway will bring back a fatality. Cities do not exist without jobs . . . Solutions that allow both are the most reasonable.
216.0	GREEN - 1st RED - 2nd			JUST BUILD A TRAIL!!! Why does this city waste so many resources debating transportation choices ad infinitum? City leadership needs to pick the safest route for responsible commuters & tell businesses to suck it up. Bike commuters deserve safe passage. We don't contribute to Seattle's awful traffic, we don't pollute nor contribute to global warming - please give us a safe way to get around the city. Based on the map & all the confusion w/the damn railroad. I actually like a route that goes from pt A to D to F to J to L to M to O to P to S. I think this would be the safest route for serious cyclists, but the trail would lose its multi-use character. With all the options that are listed on the Green route, I'm not sure what is the safest plan - but minimizing intersections & railroad crossings is key! Please just pick a plan; follow through, & build it (as long as it's not the blue route).
217.0	GREEN			Please consider other users of the trail beyond cyclists - walkers, joggers & rollerbladers when determining safe routes for the trail. Also consider that children will be using these trails also - safety is a big concern. Limit railroad & street crossings.
218.0	GREEN	1	4	As one who has ridden and driven professionally, I would like to offer my comments and preferences. Option 4 for Area 1 offers the greatest separation of cyclists and motorists (always best for both groups). While I find Option 5 attractive as well, Option 4 preserves parking more effectively. The blue alternative is rather irrelevant route through residential neighborhoods, which is, and never would be, used by any user group for access to stores, places of employment, nor recreation. The red alternative suffers from similar problems, but to a lesser extent. /s/
219.0	GREEN	2	4	As a cyclist and driver who has ridden and driven professionally, I would like to offer my comments and preferences. Based upon its provisions for motorists, cyclists, rail, parking, AND pedestrians, I would prefer to see Option 4 implemented in this area. Option 1 is merely a bike LANE, which provides no practical benefits for any user groups. Option 3 is attractive, but overly complex and "fragmented", meaning that 4-small human-powered lanes may provide less usable benefit than one excellent one. The blue alternative, unfortunately, does not lead directly to anywhere of interest. The red alternative suffers the same drawbacks, but to a lesser extent. /s/
220.0	GREEN	3	2	As a cyclist and driver who has ridden and driven both professionally and as a commuter, I would like to offer my comments and preferences. I would be happy with either Option 1 OR Option 2, but would prefer to see Option 2 implemented. Being both an automobile enthusiast and an avid cyclists, bicycle commuter, and bicycle store manager, I can assure people that most cyclists and experienced, trained drivers would be of similar opinion. /s/
221.0	GREEN			Strongly prefer Green Alternative, but want to retain BTR operation. Along Shilshole Ave NW & NW 46th St, provide curbs, sidewalks, & bike lanes on wider arterial right-of-way. Bike lanes would be concurrent flow. BTR operation would be unchanged. Less undisciplined & parallel parking would be provided. Curbs could be crossed by trucks.
222.0	BLUE			This route would be ok if you lived up 11th. Otherwise why cross Leary and other busy streets when the Green route can take you home w/o crossing arterials.
223.0	GREEN	1	3	
224.0	GREEN		ANY	The red & blue options are problematic: busy crossings, use of commercial streets, etc. All of these things make for accidents waiting to happen. Green, green, green.
225.0	GREEN			First of all, ONLY the Green Route is acceptable to me. A bike TRAIL is not 'completed' by adding bike lanes to existing streets. Look at the bike lanes all over the city - Ravenna and the Magnolia bike trails are good examples. They are just parking strips with a little space to open a door. Accident magnets. Only dedicated trails work for commuters or people with kids in trailers or on trailabikes or people like us who commute our kids to daycare by bike. Therefore we NEED the Green Route with the following options: Area 1, Options 2, 4, or 5. Area 2, Options 2, 3, or 4 and NEITHER of the current options for Area 3. Area 3, too needs a bike trail. The south side of this "wide street" could become a dedicated trail.
226.0	GREEN	1	4	This is the best option because it does not require cyclists to share space with strollers and this is a crowded area. Not all areas need separated bike/walk lanes, but this one does.
227.0	GREEN	2	4 & 3	4 is best, safest option, a dedicated trail without railroad conflicts. A dedicated trail is a must so #3 is next best option.
228.0	GREEN	3		I'm not happy with either alternative, because the bikes are all mixed in with trucks. Couldn't there be a trail or at least two bike lanes on south side of street - with say a small concrete median barrier between bikes and traffic?
229.0	GREEN	3	both	The Green Route is the only one that will get heavily used.
230.0	GREEN	2	4 & 3	The Green Route is the only one that will get heavily used.
231.0	GREEN	1	4	The Green line is the only one that will get heavily used. Option 4 is best for bikes.

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
232.0	GREEN			I favor the route that I think would have the least amount of car/truck traffic. I believe the GREEN route is the best choice. An attraction of a trail is to be close to the water. FOR A COMMUTER THIS IS THE MOST DIRECT ROUTE, WHICH IS IMPORTANT.
233.0	GREEN	1	4 or 5	I support the green trail alternative option 4 or 5. This section should be separated from traffic given current traffic flow for Fred Meyer and as a cut off for Leary Way. It maintains the character of the trail and continuity with the Fremont section of the trail. As far as conflicts with vehicles they will NOT increase as everyone will still take this route even if Blue or Red Alternatives are chosen. This is because it is the most direct route. I am a cyclist who rides 4000 miles a year and frequents this trail 3 times a week in the summer.
234.0	BLUE			I would NEVER take this route commuting from downtown. It takes cyclists way out of the way, making for a longer commute. Crosses too many busy streets. Too narrow a street with too many intersections.
235.0	BLUE			This route is TOO far out of the way. I would not ride a bike on the trail here if it was built here. Too much car/truck traffic. I would rather not ride past parked cars. Too many busy streets are crossed. Leary is too busy to cross.
236.0	GREEN			Sorry but I got to this meeting too late to fully study all options associated with each of the three plans. I do feel the Blue Option (58th) totally misses the mark as far as providing a usable recreational path for the residents of Ballard. The red options scares me due to the shunting of traffic across Shilshole on to Ballard Ave and finally out on to Market at 22nd Ave. This is a sure recipe for disaster due to traffic volume(s) on both Shilshole and Market streets. The true, viable, safest, and long-term best alternative for the user (and non-user) community is the Green Alternative. I'm most concerned with the coming increases in high density housing in the central Ballard area that will soon provide many, many more trail users! Please, PLEASE do the RIGHT thing and provide the best long-term plan for our community - Alternative GREEN!
237.0	BLUE			Ridiculous option. Have you ever biked Market St? It is terrible to ride on. It would be a waste of \$.
238.0	RED			Least desirable as it is too far north, on roads w/out bike lanes & no realistic use from a biker & bike commuter perspective. Would not be scenic or safe feeling for family leisure rides either.
239.0	GREEN			Appears to be best option design wise to maintain established trail integrity. Best multi use perspective for bikers, runners, and family use. While potentially more expensive & a concern from the industrial community/zoning, this option would be the most preferred from my bike commute & leisure riding perspective. As a landscape architect I feel that the driveways, train track issues are ones that would be out way'd by the tour & access options - Locks & Shilshole & Magnuson Park access.
240.0	BLUE & RED			I've seen a lot of emotions over the Green Line and it would look nice as Shilshole is now an ugly street. But, how in the world can it be safe? There are businesses on Shilshole that are very, very important to the community and ME! These businesses support ME! I live in the community and I think the other two are poor choices too, but maybe with more thought I think the Blue or Red can be much safer. I will e-mail more comments soon.
241.0				I live on 57th near 32nd. I use 58th to 8th for Burke-Gilman access + while the route works okay for me, I would have to echo comment ~ "save your money. I can ride them [red and blue] as they are today." I see the difficulties with the green route, but think the integrity of the trail demands that we keep working on finding a way to make the green route work. The businesses along Market have suffered enough with removal of parking in the recent sidewalk work. I don't see how routing the trail along Market could work - unless we turn Market into a pedestrian - bike mall (and I'm not holding my breath for that). There's tons of parking on 57th from 24th - 28th. There will be a huge outcry the day the signs go up saying NO MORE PARKING (and you are unlikely to hear from many of those folks until then). I appreciate all the thought and effort that's gone into this process until now. Will look forward to seeing how it progresses.
242.0				Much in favor of the Green Route, it already is a bicycle route. The Blue Route is ridiculously out of the way. The Red Route's interface with Market St is cumbersome to bicycles and traffic. I have a business at the NW corner of 15th NW & Shilshole Ave NW and from my office window see more injuries to bikers at the railroad tracks than could ever happen at Salmon Bay. A possible compromise would be to sue the Green Route east of 17th, the Red Route west of 17th, but switch back to the Green Route (south side of street and tracks) at Vernon Place. This would nicely connect to the train ROW towards the Locks. I still prefer the Green Route. Ballard Ave is still too tight for bikes and traffic. Visibility problems, too.
243.0	RED			I have a lot of sympathy for the industrial users on Shilshole Ave and can understand why they don't want yuppies on bikes. However, there already is lots of traffic conflicts on Shilshole and maybe having some clear traffic routings could actually help. Option 3 was not bad. I would support it if Green Alternative is unfeasible or too costly. I also do think that only having 3 lanes on Market will help out a lot.
244.0	GREEN			This is the best option for me, as a biker. Most direct, least traffic conflicts, able to have it be a real bike path.
245.0	BLUE			This is definitely the least preferred of the 3 - seems like it's a long way uphill, have to cross Leary and Market (twice!). I don't think it'll really be used by pedestrians at all - too indirect.
246.0	GREEN			I have been commuting by bicycle in Seattle since I moved here in 1972. Altho I appreciate the effort that has gone into creating bike routes in this city, it has become more and more dangerous to ride a bike due to the tremendous increase in the volume of traffic. Within the last year, while riding in "designated bike lanes", i.e., in the narrow lane between a line of parked cars and fast moving traffic (and while obeying all traffic regulations; I stop at red lights & stop signs), I have had kids in cars throw rocks at me, spit at me, curse and yell at me, I have had countless car doors opened in front of me, and I have had the owners of the cars - who opened the doors in front of me - get angry + yell at me because I almost hit their car!! Most people who drive cars are polite and willing to share the road, but it only takes one aggressive driver to ruin your day, and perhaps your life.

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
246.0	GREEN			I regularly do errands on Market St by bicycle, and I will continue to do so, but it is not a bike route, and putting up signs + painting a line on the street does not make it so. We need DEDICATED bike routes - no cars - and the green line is the only plan that offers this. For the safety of people who commute by bike, families riding for recreation, and for pedestrians, we need the green route. As for the red and blue routes, save your money - I can & do ride them as is. Also, I believe the businesses on NW Market St will benefit from having a well used bike trail nearby.
247.0	GREEN			The only option is a separate bike trail. Any option that mixes motorized traffic with bikes or pedestrians is a losing proposition for the people on foot or bike. A separate trail for mixed use non-motorized travel is consistent with the rest of the trail system. The intersection on Shilshole can be managed the same way as those between 11th and Fremont. GO GREEN!!!
248.0	GREEN			The Shilshole right of way is very wide. Surely a well designed trail would allow for plenty of other uses and be safer than the existing situation with hundreds of cyclists daily on Shilshole Ave.
249.0	BLUE			Too many busy streets to cross - Leary, Market, 15th, 22nd, 24th. Too many pri driveways & parked cars. This route goes out of the way.
250.0	GREEN	2	3	Avoid having cars parked in such a fashion that they have to be backed out into bike lanes! (Accident waiting to happen!) (I think it exists in Option 1). Should also be able to make it work without buying additional RE.
251.0	GREEN			I favor the Green Route because it has fewer hazards [1] less traffic, [2] less parked cars, [3] bikes lanes so cyclists won't get squeezed out. This is the most direct route which is very important to commuters. I take this route to get to Ballard. Except for the condition & railroad tracks, this is a great route!
252.0	GREEN			I'm concerned that industrial interests are balanced with bicycle/foot ped. Interests to create this route. Though, it's obviously the most feasible pick (logistically, esp. for cyclists) due to overall less traffic, less/no traffic signals to compete with, and scenic continuing along the waterway from Frement. Currently I would only use this portion of the BG Trail recreationally.
253.0	GREEN	1	2	The green option is the one that will work - in the future better than now. The trail should be a separate, dedicated bike/ped path, consistent with the rest of the trail's design & mission. In Area 1, Option 2, with the path on the south side of 45th is the safest option. The blue route would be a waste of money. The red route is ok except the Market St. section.
254.0	RED			Red Route on Market is simply unworkable. There's hardly room on Market for cars & buses.
255.0	BLUE			Blue Route is bad idea. Too far afield. Would not be used.
256.0	GREEN			Green Route is best - keep B-G a dedicated bike trail. Separate bikes & rollerbladers from cars. I prefer option that preserves as much parking as possible. Blue Route goes too far afield - would not be used.
257.0	BLUE			Too far out of the way and has to cross too many arterials.
258.0	GREEN			GREEN! I always take the shortest route. I bike for transportation - from Fremont to Ballard. I use Shilshole then travel CAREFULLY along the south side of Market. This is a death trap, but in my mind safer on this stretch of sidewalk than ANY ANY ANY part of Market. Truckers are professional drivers. They need to mix carefully with our community. GO GREEN!!!
259.0	GREEN	3 2 1	2 4 4	The Green Alternative is very similar to the final solution that was resolved in Kenmore at the northend of Lake Washington where the businesses stated that "truck traffic" across the trail would cause serious problems and accidents. Several years later the trail's success has proven them wrong. "LET'S GET ON WITH IT" in the correct "right of way".
260.0	GREEN	1	4 or 5	Green line is the only line that makes sense.
261.0	GREEN			The Green Alternative appears to be the only option worth considering. While the traffic/driveway concerns are valid, these are already an issue on the Burke-Gilman between 8th Ave NW & Fremont. The Blue and Red options seem to be a waste of money. Under these options, there would be no significant gain for cyclists/pedestrians versus the current facilities.
262.0	GREEN			The Green Option is the better of the options. It is currently being used as a bike path at great risk to both cyclists and drivers. The trains do not run enough to be a problem. Let's be realistic about how the area is being used & improve the situation. The Blue Route is an embarrassment as a choice. It is terrible & even more dangerous than the current situation on Shilshole!
263.0	GREEN			Please develop the GREEN route. I love riding from U-district to Shilshole. Please make the trail separate and safe. Bicycles & trucks can coexist when everyone tries to make it work. Trucks don't usually work on the weekend when most people bicycle. The Burke-Gilman is terrific. Please give it a good finish.
264.0	GREEN	3		Section B-B needs segregated bike path. Where is the elevated concept in this narrow section - see Warren on this visualization.
265.0	GREEN			The green route is the only one bicyclists will use. Build a trail along the blue route & people will follow th bike trails signs - once. Two crossings of Market St & innumerable other smaller streets is unrealistic for commuters or recreational cyclists, esp. w/children. The red alternative is equally ridiculous and dangerous - I go out of my way to stay off Market St and congested business streets. If either the blue or red trails are built, you'll find me riding, as I do now - Monday thru Friday, 50 weeks a year, along Shilshole. Savvy bicyclists will ride here. Please make is safer for everyone and build the green trail.
266.0	GREEN			Ideally, the bike trail should continue to be a bike trail like the rest of it so I would support option (Green). I am a contractor and frequent Salmon Bay Sand & Gravel and I think that the parking and traffic situation on Shilshole is way below current safety standards. I think redesigning traffic on Shilshole and integrating a beautiful functional bike path would accomplish a lot.
267.0	GREEN			I came here to look at the three trail options & favor the green alternative. My points in favor (which all have been mentioned) of the green route are: having a separate trail which can be used by bikes, rollerbladers & walkers/joggers; it's a straight shot; it continues in the style/aesthetic of the current trail; and is not on a major roadway to the extent to the other options.

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
268.0	GREEN	1	5	I already ride the green route to work. I prefer the green route as the safest. There is too much traffic along the red and blue routes. I like the idea of making 45th & 46th streets one-way that is good thinking! Adding a bike route to this part of town should be done in conjunction w/modifying traffic patterns.
269.0	RED	4		NW Market section from Ballard Ave to 24th is not safe & should not be considered as a route. Option is to redirect to trail back to Shilshole Ave.
270.0	BLUE			Blue is NOT an option.
271.0	GREEN	1		Definitely need to mitigate the condition on 45th St. Railroad tracks are a hazard in the condition they are in currently.
272.0	GREEN			I support the Green option. I'm a bike commuter who is already riding this route at great risk. I'm not the only one riding either, it's the defacto route through Ballard. I've tried the other routes - the blue makes no sense, the red route isn't the Burke-Gilmen. Let's move forward & give the people of Ballard & the rest of the city the bike path they need!
273.0	GREEN	1	4	The north side of 45th should be designated as the bicycle/BGT "Link", not the south side. This would enable commercial & bike communities to coexist.
274.0	GREEN	ALL		The Green Route is the only way. It is basically the way I go now, even without a formal trail. Either side or any option is preferable to the other Alternatives.
275.0	GREEN	1 2	2 4 2	No other reasonable choice! Area 1, Option 2 - keep trail separated + bidirectional. Area 2, Option 4 - most direct. Blue plan is an absurdity - someone must have said "we need a 3rd alternative". Red plan ok, but why? When the green route is so obvious! and we own most of the ROW! Green plan rocks - Area 1, fo w/ option 2, keeps BG trails separated from traffic & bidirectional as it is now. Area 2, go w/ 4, but 3 would be ok too. Area 3, tossup, but I prefer #2. HOW ABOUT A PLAN FOR FINISHING IT TO GOLDEN GARDENS???
276.0	GREEN			Blue line is absurd - no commuter will use it. I use green route 2-3 times a week and will continue to do so no matter which route is implemented. I do not want to cross Market St anymore than necessary. Red brick on red route is unsafe.
277.0	GREEN			The RR is currently being maintained strictly to be an inconvenience to cyclists. I drive AND bike this route frequently (several times a week). Stop coddling the minority and TAKE the RAILS!!
278.0	GREEN			Having lived in Seattle now for over ten years and now being a home owner, I have chosen to invest in Seattle and I hope Seattle continues to dream and invest in its future. Cars and traffic are choking our roads, polluting our air and driving our maintenance cost up. Extending one of the country's greatest bike trails has so much benefit and provides an awesome gift to the future generations to live and enjoy a better means of moving easily, quickly and healthily around the Emerald City. Refine, polish, and expand this emerald. BUILD THE GREEN LINE.
279.0	GREEN			Please support the Green Alternative. We need this trail extension. It was supposed to be completed over 10 years ago. /s/
280.0	GREEN			The green alternative is the best alternative for bicycles & pedestrians. Option 1 of Area 4 seems to be my preferred as well as Option 3 of Area 2. I'm concerned with the railroad operations of Option 3 and feel restrictions must be made for RR operations, i.e., a business may be able to keep the detour in effect continuously if they keep the RR car open & a fork lift on the trail. I prefer option 1 of Area 3 because it allows more parking plus it requires fewer trail crossings to get to the parking. The green route is owned by the City and should be used because it is safest and the shortest less expensive alternative. Just because a few businesses want to keep using public property is no reason to cast the other citizens aside & bow down to a few.
281.0	GREEN			Use the "Green Line" alternate route. It is the safest and provides the best traffic flow, keeps bikers away from us car drivers.
282.0	RED	3		This section of the Red Route is a high risk of bike crashes due to the road surface. I would avoid this section even if it were signed.
283.0	GREEN			The long run preferable route for me & for continuing the pattern & glory of the BG Trail is the green corridor. Consideration should be given to place the trail on the north side of Shilshole Ave through the heavy truck area.
284.0	GREEN	ALL	*	*Use Davidya's Plan. The "Green" route, following the existing rail path is the only reasonable alternative for the bike trail to follow. This has been obvious for 30 years since the trail was first started. It has fewer cross streets due to its proximity to the water (a few large trucks are far better than 15,000 cars). It has the least elevation gain and it goes where people want to go. The only people that oppose this route are a half dozen business men on Shilshole Ave that want to divert the trail so they can expand their parking onto public property (the right of way). It is a political embarrassment that these few individuals have been able to block the will of the thousands who live and work in Ballard for so long.
284.0	GREEN	ALL		The train that is currently using these tracks is an example of the devious methods that have been used for years to delay this project. The trail (while pretty) has no economic reason to be. Its only job is to keep the rails in use to divert the trail. It is still preferable to build the bike path next to the rail line, however, if the DOT had any guts at all, they would put the train out of business by condemning the tracks and save us all a bunch of money in the process. It will be much cheaper to build the trail with the rails gone.
285.0	GREEN			The Blue Alternative would not be worth the trouble. The Green route is the route bicyclists will use regardless of the trail. There is enough room there for a nice trail, so let's build it.
286.0	GREEN	1	5	I support the Green Alternative and am a member of the Cascade Cycling Club. As a resident of Sunset Hills and a cyclist w/7,000 miles a year of riding, this route is very important to me. Please approve Green!

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
287.0	GREEN			Green is best except area 1 (the railroad safety issue) - maybe use red alt on this section. Green area 2, option 2 or area 2 could also go up Ballard Ave (like red route) and turn onto Shilshole near Vernon and continue with the Green route. The Blue option is NOT gonna be used & would prove to be a big waste of money. Red - way too dangerous along Market (between 22nd & 24th).
288.0				#1 - No bicycle will ride the 57th St. option. #2 - No bike will ride Market St. through Ballard. That leaves the green route, preferably hugging the south side of the R.O.W.
289.0	GREEN			Blue - dangerous cross streets for bikers - slower than Leary - WILL NOT GET USED!!! Red - status quo. We already ride this route, migh as well do nothing. Green - obvious winner for bikers. We currently deal w/this traffic we also deal with working train along waterfront downtown & trolley - it is no problem! Looking foward to spending more time w/alternatives so I can comment on these. Too crowded to really get a good look.
290.0	GREEN			Parts of the Green Route are already commonly used to bike to the Locks and beyond. I bike this route regularly on the weekends. The evening hours & weekends would be best served by this route due to the low amount of commercial activity during those times. No route will be perfect, but this seems to be the most direct & the best extension to the existing trail. Please STOP SPENDING ANY MORE TAX DOLLARS to study this issue, the choice should be obvious!
291.0	GREEN			Alternative (Green) is the route now used by & for organized (Cascade Bike Club) rides. To my knowledge, almost all bicycle riders (organized rides or not) ride Shilshole.
292.0	ALT			This argument has been going on long enough. In the industrial area where bike riders are already riding, put signs up in that area to let drivers know that there are bike riders in that area. Then finish the Burke-Gilman Trail past the industrial area, unto Golden Gardens. Doing something is better than nothing and with more time, maybe the perfect solution will come up. The Blue trail will not be used by the bike riders, the red route - not enough room for cars and bikes. Having a car door open in front of a bike hurts, alot!
293.0				Red Line - I wonder about utilizing the VERY WIDE sidewalks on Market Street to convert to cyclists/pedestrians only for the RED ROUTE. Green Line - The 54th St section seems too fraught w/logistics on the NARROW to non-existent space. Is it possible to elevate the path similar to the trail section adjacent to the railroad tracks south of Interbay & north of Magnolia Bridge.
294.0	GREEN			The Green Route seems to be the best. I'm concerned that both the blue & red routes would pose greater safety problems, particularly for less-able cyclists (e.g., children). For that reasons, having a dedicated trail seems superior (that is, one that avoids multiple intersections and numerous driveways). Though green trail opponents have some legitimate concerns, it seems that they could be addressed. It may be a slight hardship for some, but the benefit to the community of having the green route trail seems to outweigh any minor hardships the trail would improve. As someone who used the trail regularly between Fred Meyer & Fremont, there does not seem to be a problem w/truck traffic & crossings. So it strikes me that it is unlikely substantial problems would emerge on the proposed green trail.
295.0	RED	3		Red works best - this is a recreational facility and it should serve Ballard Ave NW - this is a "tourist" attraction & will work well with trail users.
296.0				Red and blue options unacceptable for ped & bike traffic. MUST continue BGT as separated multi-use path w/12' width; highly dangerous to switch to signed route or bike lanes in Fremont. Also a waste of energy and effort, since neither will be used. Green Route - only acceptable route because only route for multi-use path. Options that do not include multi-use separated path are not safe or acceptable. We must take the long-term view! Preferred alternative is groundswell proposal.
296.0				Personally, I feel it shortsighted to compromise the BGT for concerns and fears of a small number of existing industrial users. [1] owners of former industrial properties have shown little compunction about selling/converting to non-industrial uses - e.g., Quadrant/Adobe development flanking Fremont Bridge, Fred Meyer in Ballard, Fentron plant conversion, and more. [2] Ballard has been upzoned for dense residential and mixed use development, requiring more commercial services. [3] Existing industrial uses are becoming isolated and separated by new commercial redevelopment. [4] local railroad service is less needed because of above and will eventually cease - [5] city already owns railroad corridor. In short - multi-use separated 12' path on green route!
297.0				Blue alternative is not functional as it takes riders out of the way and thru problem areas. I believe that it will not be used. Green alternative is the best alternative. I am somewhat confused about the various options within this route; however, it is the most direct route and the obstacles along the way are not much more significant than the obstacles I face travelling the BG from 8th Ave NW to Fremont Bridge.
298.0	RED			While walking along Ballard Ave is always interesting, it seems out of the way to take Market to 22nd to Ballard out to Shilshole and on to 46th going out of the way back to 11th to 45th. Who came up with this route was "just" playing the devil's advocate to the Green Route.
299.0	GREEN			Green! Green! Green! Use it now - Industrial area safest for families (which currently the route is not) on weekends. They are there now. Businesses & cyclists can coexist. I am president of an auto-related business & bike to work. Ballard/Shilshole are great destinations from other parts of the city. Merchants would benefit from making this a scenic, safe route. The Green route is a plus - now fix the Ballard Bridge.
300.0	GREEN			The blue alternative is NOT an alternative. The # of road & driveway crossings is unacceptable. The red alternative is not bad, except for the section on NW Market from 22nd to 24th. This could be resolved by altering the route so that when you hit 22nd (heading NW on Ballard Ave) you go LEFT & drop down to Shilshole. Then take Shilshole to NW Market & head west. Still, having it this much on roads is not really acceptable. I much prefer the GREEN ALTERNATIVE. I currently bike commute along the roads covered by this alternative route. I understand that a SMALL number off VERY VOCAL businesses along Shilshole are concerned about safety issues.

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
300.0	GREEN			However, in my 3 years of biking along this route I've noticed: [1] I run into VERY little truck traffic on Shilshole during commuting hours. [2] I run into far more truck traffic on the section of the Burke-Gilman between Fred Meyer where it currently ends & Fremont than I do on the roads in Ballard. [3] Despite the fact that I see a fair amount of truck crossings on the current western end of the BGT (between Fremont & Ballard) I have not seen or had problems with bicyclists/trucks/cars hitting each other. [4] In THREE YEARS I have only ever seen a train moving on the railroad tracks TWICE! This frequency of use hardly justifies nixing a trail that could be used by many citizens. I would think that the number of truck/car-bicycle accidents on the segment of the BGT between 11th NW & Fremont would be a good predictor for whether accidents could be a problem on the proposed green alternative. From my own observations, it seems that the heaviest use of the BGT is early in the morning & in the evening, by commuters, in the winter & on weekday early morning/evening are not prime business hours - i.e.,
301.0	GREEN			I prefer the green area. This is the area that I use going from home in Ballard to the U of W - U Village. I have learned to live w/cars & trucks. The Blue Alternatives make no sense to me. There are too many busy roads to cross. It is non-intuitive to me as a cyclist. If you are going to Shilshole, it really makes no sense.
302.0	GREEN & RED			RED - Why bulbouts when attempting to mix bikes & motor vehs? Cyclists prefer vertical measures: raised intersections & crosswalks. If using Market St., need bike sensitive loop detectors at key left-turns at signalized intersections. GREEN - use formal restrictions on deliveries to weekday off-peak. Mixing traffic types is an issue - prefer Area 1, Option 4 because at greater separation, btwn cycles & trucks. Also prefer Area 2, Option 2 or 4. Area 2 Option 3 is not viable with 2 crosswalks required for some direction (expect many violations). BLUE - this kind of deviation is unrealistic - cyclists would find their more direct path on other streets. The city should not take this option seriously, it simply represents an expenditure as a token, not effective action.
303.0	BLUE & RED			I primarily use the Burke Gilman Trail for running; so my biggest concern is pedestrian safety. The very industrial Green alt (which seems to be the most popular from comments I hear at this open house) seems to have too many traffic hazards to be easily overcome. I prefer the Red & Blue Alternatives, which each have a few busy intersections to deal with - but no trucks backing up into the path every few feet!
304.0	GREEN			Bicyclists will continue to use the Shilshole corridor regardless of the route chosen. The focus must be on making improvements to this corridor that improve safety. As a bicyclist who rides the route daily, I commonly encounter wrong way traffic coming from the end of the trail - one of the most dangerous conditions for bicyclists. A completed trail would prevent this common bicycling error.
305.0				Although I can see the "hard core" bicyclists' point about the Shilshole corridor - I want to see the industries & jobs remain!! Everyone was very upset when a Fred Meyer was built in the industrial district. The bike trail along Shilshole would be the eventual DEATH KNEEL of industry & jobs along the canal. PLUS... why is no one saying anything about the LOCKS parking being taken away or all the new utility poles having to be moved. We need alternatives but not at the expense of jobs & industry!!
306.0	GREEN			The Green Route is the only realistic set of options. It is the one which I would use. People will shortcut the Blue Route. Red Route has too much pedestrian traffic. Trucks can stop and look --- Fred Meyer gets far more traffic every day than Ballard Oil and Salmon Bay Sand & Gravel combined. People can deal with this.
307.0	GREEN			Why are the green boards so negative? The City has gone to great lengths to make red & blue look like realistic possibilities and they still look awful. The only problem with green is political interference. The Burke-Gilman Trail is a good place to ride because it is the ONLY place for bikes. Don't take it away. All streets SHOULD be bike friendly - but DO NOT put bikes only safe place on the street with cars. Red & Blue will certainly make FEWER people ride. Don't give in to special interests!
308.0	GREEN			The Green Route is the only option appropriate for continuation of the Burke-Gilman Trail. The Blue route would make an acceptable bike route, but not a TRAIL, plus it is very out of the way. The Red route doesn't seem at all safe and enjoyable, as the B-G Trail should be. Some people have expressed concern over bikes interacting with trucks on the Green Route, but I ride 5 days a week on the path on Harbor Island and though not the most relaxing ride, I feel safe and smooth with few difficult interactions over the course of time. Use the designated corridor for the trail!!!
309.0	GREEN			Implement the Green Route without delay. Safe - simple - connected . . . The most sensible route. Don't let the businesses "excuses" slow it down.
310.0	ALL			Blue is nto consistent with the heritage of the BG Trail. Moreover, it is too far removed from the valuable aspects of Ballard. Red is ok - NW Market would be a challenge. Green - obvious choice. It follows the BG tradition. There is all kinds of wide open space. Salmon Bay mack truck driver will get over it.
311.0	RED			The Red Route is the lesser alternative to the Green Route without providing the benefits of the Green Route. The worst portion of this route is the part on Market.
312.0	GREEN			The Green Route is the defacto route now! Improve it. By separating traffic on Shilshole risks will be reduced. The route west of 24th will improve safety significantly by taking cyclists off Market.
313.0	BLUE	ALL		The Blue option is no option for family biking. I cannot imagine taking young kids out across Market twice. The imposition on home owners along the route won't be a problem because it won't be used.
314.0	GREEN & RED			Ballard Ave is a lovely, quiet street and only a very slight detour. BUT the section along Market between 22nd & 24th is completely unsafe and unacceptable. Therefore, I suggest going back to Shilshole at 22nd (then on out the green route). That is, I like (a) to (b) to (d) to (e) to (f) to (g) to (h) [or maybe (a) to (j) to (i) although that would be longer and awkward], then on out the green route from (i) to (s). In any case, as a separate issue, an improved shoulder for bikes should be added to Shilshole between (e) and (d) as this road will always get the bulk of bike commuters (like me). This does not need to be part of an official bike trail, just a safer route for bike commuters.
315.0	GREEN			Putting bikes, trucks, trains, & cars on the same street? Going in both directions? Are you kidding?!
316.0	RED			Not ideal, but better than trying to cram bikes, trucks, & trains (oh, and cars too!) onto the same street.

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
317.0	GREEN			The only real option is the Green. I can't see why you are even considering the other options - with the green you have the railroad ROW. And no traffic. Both Red & Blue have traffic problems. Be smart & be green.
318.0	GREEN			I support the Green Route along the railroad right of way. Let's move the side rail along Shilshole and allow the bike trail to go there. There is plenty of room for rail & trail. It is the safest route. It is the most direct route. It is the route that makes sense.
319.0	GREEN			The green alt is the route I now take - I commute to Sand Point 3-4 times a week. The route is very safe until the Trail ends at Fred Meyer. The tracks are a problem, especially at night. Cars seem to want to speed up or skip the stop signs around Fred Meyer - especially if a bike is coming. I think changes to the street with an actual place for bicyclists heading west toward the Ballard Bridge. This is a scary area - more signage - asphalt/rubber mats on track crossing if they must be crossed at all would help. Lanes or trail on both sides of the track would be great. I love living in ballard, I love being able to ride my bike to work - I see riders on the weekends looking for directions to the Locks, Golden Gardens, etc. Built it, they will come.
319.0	GREEN			They will have lunch & coffee on Market - they'll return at night. The business owners are out of line here. We are heading toward reducing car usage - we should all help. I know riding a bike is dangerous - I'm old enough (58) to appreciate the great thins in life and the freedome of riding, yes, even in the rain is incredible. I hope that the route for all will be the green. It's closest to the waterfront (a good sight for all) and a working waterfront is a sight children need to see. I know I would not commute down Market unless I had to - and I find the green route my quickest way home. This decision to build a safe green route is more than just a pretty sight - it could mean my life. Don't take it lightly. Thanks for giving me this opportunity to be heard.
320.0	GREEN			We need to find a community solution. Look at all the cyclists who already are using the "green" route. On weekends, when there will be more recreational users, the commercial activity is much less active. And M-F we're largely looking at commuter traffic. The trail should be something that serves the needs of cyclists, goes where they need to go, in a safe way, and with consideration of industry. Both can coexist on the green route. Blue & red don't work - traffic, intersections, destinations, etc.
321.0				The Blue Route is not a viable route. Bikers would avoid it regardless of signage. It would add impediments to vehicular traffic that don't currently exist - for a route that bikers would avoid. The Red Route puts bikers in harm's way until they reach Ballard Ave - and then Market . . . it was just remodeled and there is clearly NO place for bikes. It must be remembered that the trail is used by amateur bikers. Inexperienced bikers will be a liability along both the red and blue routes - and they will come. The population on the trail is very heavy and diverse. I think it is a bad idea to mix this group - and kind of traffi in this area. The Green Route is clearly the safest, most viable route. This section of the trail is an important link - i t needs the safest possible route available - that is the green route. I can appreciate the dilemnas with access to Shilshole Ave - I don't have a clear idea which option is best. I say with a strong voice GREEN ROUTE!!! /s/
322.0	GREEN			This is already the route most bicyclists ride because it is the safest. A separate trail would make it wonderful. Even if the trail was closed during railroad usage this is the best route.
323.0	BLUE			Please don't waste money on the Blue Route. Commuters won't use it and there is nothing pleasant enough to attract recreational riders. I would rather not see a trail extension at all than see the City waste millions. This route is absurd. Who would want to cross Market twice? Why not extend it to 67th while you're at it?
324.0	RED			I think most bicyclists would bypass the stretch of Market from 22nd to 24th. I love the character of Ballard Ave & I'm afraid a bicycle path would change it too much.
325.0	BLUE			This route doesn't follow the ideas behind the existing Burke Gilman route. Following "all" streets without a designated trail would mean 2 things. Fanatics would park at Fred Meyer and not use this new blue line but follow the trail east and south. And people would still bike down Shilshole to get from 24th @ Market to the existing trail.
326.0	GREEN			My vote would reside with the green trail. For the main reason of commuting. I commute to Westlake from 62nd @ 36th. I think the safest and fastest route to get to the existing Burke Gilman has always been to follow the water/Shilshole Ave. I would still find myself following Shilshole Ave if the other routes were introduced for just the ease.
327.0				As I will be unable to attend the Open House tonight, I would like to express a few concerns about the proposed Burke-Gilman route (Blue) across 57th street: [1] Bicycle/pedestrian crossing of 15th. For safety reasons, this would appear to require another stoplight, when there are already lights at 58th and 60th, as well as Market and 65th. This would further interrupt the 15th/Interbay/Elliott commute. (The alternative of no stop light would be dangerous for trail users). [2] The Ballard Condominiums on 57th are now doubling in size (to fill the south side of 57th from 15th to 17th). The portion of 57th on the north side of the condos is very narrow, and street parking in the area is already seriously limited. Will trail and road fit between the condos and the post office? [3] The post office is at the NE corner of 57th and 17th. Given pedestrian and auto access (especially with the curb mailboxes on the "wrong" side of the road), this corner is already a traffic problem without adding more pedestrians and cyclists to the mix.
327.0				[4] Ballard Manor. This retirement home on 57th between 17th and 20th necessitates visits from fire trucks, ambulances, and aid cars on an almost daily basis. If 57th were narrowed to accommodate the proposed trail, the road would become impassable when these aid vehicles are present. [5] The "skate park" on 57th between 20th and 24th already causes some skateboard and bicycle traffic on 57th. Creating a trail leading to the skate park would likely increase this type of traffic, and the noise that comes with it. [6] A stop light, or north-south stop signs would be required at the intersection of 57th and 20th, further congesting traffic. [7] Heavy truck traffic to QFC regularly uses 57th to travel east-west. This would be dangerous for trail users. [8] NW 57th is largely residential. The diagram available on your website for (Blue) Area 3 incorrectly identifies the driveways on 57th between 17th and 20th as commercial. There are no commercial driveways on NW 57th between 17th and 20th. Those of us who live there are concerned that increased traffic will bring increased noise, access, theft, loss of parking,

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
328.0	GREEN			Thanks for putting on the presentation at Ballard High School on Tuesday. Good information. Please put me down for the Green route. I don't see much sense in either of the other two alternatives because bicyclists just won't use them (too far out of the way, too many intersections, not bicyclist friendly, etc.) --- both alternatives would be a waste of money. Just thought I'd get my \$.02 in. Thanks again.
329.0	GREEN			I am writing to express my preference for the "Green Route" extension of the Burke-Gilman Trail through Ballard. It offers the safest, most direct route through town. I will not go into the pros and cons here, I'm sure you have heard many. When the City decides which route to pursue, please realize that cyclists, bike commuters and other trail users have needs similar to those of cars:safety and simplicity. Don't make us turn excessively or use busy roads. When making this decision, please implement the same care you would take in planning a new arterial for cars. Bicyclists, runners, walkers and other non-motorized folk deserve careful consideration. I am a year-round bike commuter and recreational cyclist who uses the Burke frequently. I have often wished for a safer route through Ballard, one of my "long routes" home is to go through Ballard, out to Shilshole then west and eventually home. Having a safe extension would be tremendous. I apologize for not being able to give my input in person at last week's open house. Thank you for your time.
330.0	GREEN			Scott, I saw the article in the DJC yesterday about the extension of the burke Gilman trail west-bound. If you're looking for votes, I would go green first and blue second. But blue has the problem of fairly heavy traffic on 11th and lots of stop lights. Also, that road is in very poor repair, and so the city would get stuck with a big bill. Red is not great, cause you don't want lots of bike traffic on Ballard and Market. Shilshole is already pretty wide and used to bike traffic. Thanks, Steve
331.0				Hello, As an avid cyclist and triathlete, I would like to express my interest in voting for the Green route. Thank you for helping make this project a reality. Thanks, Bryan Sandoz
332.0				I see problems with all 3 proposed routes. Since bikes can cover distances so much easier than pedestrians, I think an option for blue route - bikes, & green route - pedestrians, is a viable option.
333.0	GREEN			The green route is by far the best one for cyclists. It will be a great addition to this urban amenity, the Burke-Gilman Trail. I hope we can build it. Thank you. Janet Heineck
334.0	GREEN			I would like to endorse the Green Route alternative.
335.0				In my opinion a bike route on the blue or red lines would be no bike route at all. People can go those ways without a bike route now, but of course few do because of the added traffic, busy streets to cross, lots of cross traffic, and extra hills and distance. Very few bicyclists will use them. My main point is that it is better to do nothing than pretend that a few signs and a little paint makes a bike route. If the Burke Gilman trail cannot be connected directly along the railway corridor at this time then it is better to do nothing at all and accept the fact that a "missing link" still exists. Thank you.
336.0				From 10 years of my experience commuting to work by bicycle, I have found that separate bicycle lanes are essential to safety for cars, bicycles, and pedestrians. "Bike lanes" on city streets are an easy cop-out that is not safe for anyone. I support SEPARATE BICYCLE LANES for the Burke Gilman trail.
337.0	GREEN			Go with the green route! This route has the least number of intersection crossings, resulting in greater safety for both cyclists and pedestrians.
338.0	GREEN			I support the green route.
339.0				TAKE THE ZERO OPTION!!!! All three proposed routes ignore the ridiculous imposition caused by the railroad spur built on city property. Far better to do nothing than to waste precious city resources on an illogical route. NONE of the proposed routes will prove any better for walkers and cyclists than negotiating the surface streets. There is a good reason that the rest of the trail is built on railroad rights of way. First, do no ha and kill or delay the project.
340.0				Regarding the proposed extension of the Burke Gilman Trail. I live in Fremont and bike a lot. But I also drive to Ballard quite often. Having reviewed the on-line route alternatives, I fully support the Green Line route along the existing railroad grade. And I adjure you to pick an option that has a separated lane. We have three small children (2,6,8) and we bike around a lot as a family. Ballard, the Locks and Golden Gardens are high on our list of places we'd like to go. But our experience says kids this age cannot be trusted to stay inside striped bike lanes. As a bike commuter, I don't mind sharing the BG with walkers and joggers. But please don't put me or especially my kids in traffic!
341.0				In short, I support the Green route only. Ever since moving to Seattle over five years ago I have been using my bike for transportation and recreation. Living in the Wallingford area, I can hardly think of a week that goes by when I'm not on the Burke-Gilman trail. In most weeks I use the trail every day. One of the things that makes the trail so useful is that it has relatively few busy street crossings. For example, west of the U-Village, there is a bridge over 35th Ave. Further on, there is also a bridge over Sandpoint Way. Crossing busy intersections is a problem for everyone involved. More specifically, on the corner of 15th Ave and Pacific Ave near the UW car drivers often do not yield to trail users. Although the trail is extremely well marked, I have seen many drivers make blind turns while pedestrians and bicyclists have the right of way. The safest trail route will be the one with the fewest busy intersection crossings. Therefore, the Blue route looks extremely dangerous crossing NW Market not once, but twice. Likewise, the Red route is more exposed than the Green one. To continue the spirit and nature of
342.0				GO Green.
343.0				Please implement the green route. The reason people are out on the trails in the first place is to enjoy the outdoors. The closer they are to the water and coresponding view of lake washington, the happier everyone will be.
344.0				I support the Green Route. The Red and Blue routes are too far out of the way.
345.0				As someone who commutes daily by bike from the current end of the Burke Gilman and on through the locks, I strongly encourage the Department of Transportation to choose the "Green Route" for the Ballard Corridor. The other alternatives are unworkable, and in the case of the "Blue Route," so indirect as likely to be avoided by users continuing on beyond the end of the Ballard Corridor.

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
346.0				I would like to voice my support for the "Green Route" extention to the Burke-Gilman trail. Thank you.
347.0				i vote for the green route!
348.0				I think the green route makes the best sense for the community
349.0				Please extend the Burke-Gilman trail along the Green route. It is the most sensible alternative for people using the trail to get to homes, work, and recreation. The other options are significantly less useful to trail-users. The green line is the safest, most direct, most scenic, and most in-line with Seattle's desire to promote alternative transportation. Thanks!
350.0				I would like to take the opportunity to comment on the proposed additions to the burke gilman trail. as a daily bike commuter, I support the green line and I do not support the blue line. thank you. Heather
351.0				To whom it may concern: I strongly favor the GREEN option of the Burke Gilman extention through Ballard. I both bike on the Burke Gilman and work in Ballard and think that this is the best option for bikers and makes the most sense for continuity of the trail. Thanks! Anne
352.0				I want to comment on the three alternative routes. The red route is the worst of the three. It looks good at first, but the section where it runs along Market St. would be very dangerous. I used to live (and bicycle) just a few blocks from that spot, and I would never ride along Market St., especially in that busy retail core. The green route would be the ideal one if cars, bikes, and railway were adequately separated. A lot of bicyclists already use that route as an informal bike trail, so I think it's won popular approval. The second best is the blue route, which is a bit out-of-the-way but safe. Thanks for the opportunity to give feedback. I'm thrilled to hear that the Burke-Gilman is going to be completed and will finally to to Shilshole!
353.0				I vote for the "green" alternative, however, better lighting for safety reasons should be considered.
354.0				In order to guarantee that the Burke-Gillman Ballard extension is used to its greatest potential, the proposed route needs to guarantee ease-of-use and safety. I lived in Ballard two years ago and traveled most of its streets either by bicycle or on foot, so I know the landscapes through which your proposed routes traverse. In your proposal?s initial design criteria, you list a number of usage and safety criteria, most of which I do not believe will be met by the blue or the red routes. While the blue route proposed would increase accessibility of the trail to Ballard residents, it incorporates the greatest amount of elevation change, making it a greater challenge to people who would use the trail for increasing their fitness. The blue route also requires users, including families with small children, to cross many busy intersections. The fewer intersections users of the trail have to cross, the more safe it is for users, especially small children who may attempt to cross an intersection while unseen by drivers. The proposed red route, likewise, is not the safest of routes. By placing users on or alongside NW Market St., the city v
354.0				In addition to its heavy traffic flow, NW Market Street is a confusion of multi-street intersections and stoplights, making it difficult for drivers to navigate without the additional concern of a child cyclist or roller blader. The heavy use of NW Market and Ballard Ave. NW for customer parking also decreases the safety and desirability of this route. The green route appears to fit most of the usage and safety criteria listed in your initial design proposal. My one concern about the green route is whether the proposed route will avoid crossing railroad tracks. The more railroad crossings along the trail, the more likely it is for a small child or unaware adult to be involved in an accident. Will this route take that into consideration? Also, will all of these routes take personal safety into consideration once night has fallen? Will the route be well-lit throughout the night? There are several sections of the current Burke-Gilman that are not well-lit at night, causing travelers to have to choose other routes if they find themselves still on the Burke-Gilman after dark.
355.0				From a biker's perspective, the green alternative is best, the red alternative is next best, and the blue alternative is pretty bad. The businesses seem to think the green alternative is bad (due to safety concerns), but the fact that is that the proposed green route will probably offer a greater influx of potential customers (bikers), than the blue route.
356.0				I would like to encourage the city to support the green route alternative. This is the safest, most direct extension of the B-K trail. It is also follows the route most people already take. I think that if a different extension route is chosen, many people will still follow the route they already use!
357.0				The Green Plan is superior. Maintaining an autonomous path is much safer, more pleasant, and convenient for cyclists and other users.
358.0				My preference is for the "Green" Route extension. Of the three, I feel it is the safest alternative; as someone who bikes recreationally as well as commuting to school and activities, I plan my routes accordingly to follow those with dedicated bike lanes. Vehicles often seem loathe to share the road with cyclists, and I believe the Blue and the Red Route options will NOT ensure a safe route for bicyclists. The Green Route is the most direct route connecting the Trail. I urge you to choose the Green Route in extending the B-G Trail. to connect it with the existing trail that ends at Fred Meyer.
359.0				The Green route alternative is the most efficient and safest route for the proposed extension of the Burke-Gilman Trail. The other alternatives put cyclists and vehicle traffic in close proximity and do not seem safe.
360.0				As a regular user of the Burke Gilman from the northwest edge of Ballard I would strongly encourage the adoption of the green alternative. I believe it would be the safest and most logical extension of the Burke Gilman.
361.0				I prefer the green line as it most efficiently & safely moves bikers & pedestrians. Seattle's goal is to enhance alternative transportation so anything that adds distance or car traffic(danger) to a commute is a disincentive to ride. Good luck-looks great - go green!

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
362.0				I support the "Green" option for several reasons. First, it most closely follows the other portions of the Burke Gilman Trail and does not make an unreasonable detour through areas with heavier auto traffic. Second, this proposed Green route would be constructed in an area that would easily accommodate the construction of a bike and pedestrian path without disrupting the flow of existing traffic. Third, the other alternatives, Blue and Red, would force bicyclists and other trail users to compete with auto traffic, which would be both dangerous and disruptive. Many riders like to use the trail because of its continuity of flow (i.e., few stops to deal with). The rest of the Burke Gilman Trail does a good job of minimizing these conflicts, mainly by remaining on the abandoned railroad corridor. As with other attempts to create bike lanes out of existing roads, cars are too often oblivious or negligent when it concerns bikes.
362.0				The safest alternative is to remove bikes from roads altogether, which I believe the green alternative would largely do. The only concern I have about the green pathway proposal would be the issue of existing railroad use and safety. The city would have to make safety improvements at railroad crossings and minimize the potential for people and bikes to use (illegally) the tracks. Perhaps a low fence or other barrier could be constructed between the proposed trail and the railroad tracks to minimize this potential conflict. I imagine the operator of the rail line has worries about this from a liability standpoint, so this barrier would perhaps diminish this fear and make it reasonable from an insurance perspective. Thanks for making the "missing link" go away. I have ridden along that section a few times and have had a few near misses with errant car drivers. Sincerely, Jason Ontjes
363.0				I think the green line seems like the best option, and the safest for bikers and drivers.
364.0				The green route via Shilshole is the correct way to route the extension. This is my opinion as a person who lives and works around the Magnolia area. Difficulties now are minor compared to those in the future for all the cyclists and walkers affected. Henry Shenk
365.0				The Burke-Gilman Trial should be completed as a separated facility similar to the rest of it. Industry, commerce, rail, AND trail are proven compatible elsewhere in Seattle, across the country, and internationally. It is a design challenge but as your Green Route plans show, it can be done. The City can "build" the Red or Blue Route, but few users will use it. Therefore, there will continue to be cycling commuters in the road along Shilshole Ave NW. Don't spill the trail out onto Market Street. The Blue Route has 160 driveways and street crossings to negotiate. This would be the least safe and least used route, therefore, it would be a wasted effort to build it. The safest, simplest, most direct solution is obvious to any observer--the Green Route!
366.0				Overall, it looks like a lot of work and thought was put into the development of these three alternatives. Thanks for fine job. It seems to me that the route that will benefit the most and trouble the least would be the Green Alternative. The Blue goes to far out of the way. Further the amount of automobile traffic one would be riding with, and the number of intersections (albeit many controlled) would be unpleasant for more timid riders (ultimately the people who benefit most from bike trails). Also at issue would be the impact on the residents as the path is built, and the slowdown of adding additional stoplights on 15th and 24th.
366.0				The Red alternative is essentially what most people ride now and the challenging points are well known. Any time spent biking on Market is stressful. And the three-way turn at 30th and Market can catch anyone offguard. The green eliminates virtually all biking with traffic issues. The number of trucks one would encounter are fewer by an order of magnitude than the number of cars on the red or certainly the blue. If biker safety is the issue it seems that, clearly, this is the best option. And from the design boards displayed at the open house last week, it looks like this might beautify that warehouse district in South Ballard...nothing wrong with that. Again, thank you for your hard work. Let's see the Green Alternative get done!
367.0				Hi there - I think it's great that the trail is to be extended, and I'd like to encourage the city to focus their energies on the green alternative. It seems the most direct route from Fred Meyer to the locks and Shilshole. Please go ahead with these plans!! Thanks, Bekkah.
368.0				Green is the only way to go!!
369.0				I think that the green alternative would best serve the community.
370.0				I am an avid bicyclist and attended the Open House last night in Ballard. I strongly encourage you to proceed with a separated trail on the Green Alternative alignment. I feel that we should make this extension of the Burke Gilman Trail a pleasure for the whole family. The street options presented in the other two alternatives do not come close to living up to a bicycle friendly option.
371.0				I commute by bike to work on the Burke-Gilman Trail 4-5 days/week and use the trail recreationally as well. I have been waiting for years for the trail to be extended to Golden Gardens and would like to see this happen as soon as possible. I believe the route that makes the most sense is the Green route along Shilshole. This is the most direct and keeps the trail off the major streets. The red line subjects bikers to car doors and other traffic problems on Market Street and seems like it would be much more time consuming and logically difficult to implement. The Blue Line is just ridiculous--it goes way out of the way unnecessarily. Any issues with local businesses or truck traffic near the green line can be resolved, either with appropriately placed traffic signals or stop signs. Thank you!
372.0				We need the green route!

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
373.0				I attended the open house last night. I left a comment there. I'd like to add a couple of things after thinking about it. The blue option seems to me to be very poorly thought through. What goal was achieved in this option? If it is indeed used, and I doubt that very much, it will be hostile to cyclists and a non-option for pedestrians. There are better alternatives that would achieve what you hope to achieve with the blue route which I presume is to keep cyclists out of the red-neck industrial area. Why not go 46th-Leary-54th or something like that? I guess new options are out of the question at this point. The red option seems to be devised simply to be an option that no one would likely consider. After all who would? It's hostile to cyclists, hostile to businesses, and not an option at all to pedestrians. Since the green option is truly the only option that meets the needs of pedestrians and cyclists alone, the goal should be to choose it and work very hard to make it work for businesses.
373.0				We should think hard about how to do that. After commuting along shilshole for a year on my way to Bellevue, I can tell you that the biggest problem with the route is dealing with the route under 15th Ave over the railroad tracks. I have been hit once when a car unwisely choose to pass me on the right while I was cutting right to cross the tracks. I've had at least 4 other very close calls in that exact location. I didn't see how the solution presented was going to resolve that problem. You cannot have cyclists crossing railroad tracks in a street filled with automobiles. You will kill someone most certainly. Speaking of crossing railroad tracks, the rubber mat just east of Fred Meyer on the trail is going to hurt someone very badly. There are two problems: 1. The mat is like a greased surface when it rains. I have gone down twice while riding extra conservatively crossing it. 2. If someone was going fast (15mph) and slipped, they would hit either the fence on the other side of the tracks or worse yet, the solid steel post in the middle of the trail. Please, please do not do this in the new trail. Use concrete, asphalt or
374.0				I cannot believe that you are stupid enough to create an extension of the Burke-Gilman Trail that would force cyclists to cross 15th Ave! This is ridiculous. You will be endangering the lives of those who wish to use the trail. Why can you people not realize the danger of this plan!??!
375.0				I highly recommend the Green Alternative for the Ballard Corridor. The Blue route is unacceptable because of the Market St leg (too dangerous, high traffic). The Red route is so far out of the way, and the crossing at 15th NW would be dangerous. The options within the Green Route which isolate the bikes & peds from traffic and the rare train would be the safest. Thanks for allowing the public to view the results of your very hard work. I know you can do it! A Phinney/Fremont/Ballard resident, Duncan Haas
376.0				I strongly support the 'Green Alternative' which is a route that I ride frequently. Since cycling is for enjoyment and recreation combined with commuting, the B/G trail offers a way of experiencing the city that I normally don't get in a car. Relocating the trail away from the interesting Shilshole Street route defeats the intrinsic value of the trail. I can ride through traffic and through neighborhoods anywhere, but that's not where or why I choose to ride. If the 'Missing Link' along Shilshole is relocated up into Ballard, I will still choose to ride through the most direct and interesting route as I suspect a lot of other cyclists will. So the bike/truck/car congestion will remain until the Green Route is implemented.
376.0				The Red and Blue Alternatives simply do not fit the spirit of the Burke-Gilman Trail. The presentation last night at Ballard High was disheartening to see so much effort and funds (that could have been spent for trail construction and safety) used to try to justify relocating the trail route that is currently the route of public choice. It appears that the deck is stacked by a PAC that has four industrial business owner members, only one trail advocacy member, and not one cycling club member.
377.0				I have a questins regarding the proposed trail extension for the Ballard Corridor. It looks as if the Blue option crosses 15thAve, which is very busy, will there be an over pass? This is true to a lesser extent of 24th Ave. Also, the red line brings us on to Market, which has alot of bus traffic and parallel parking activiy. I would opt for the green line which I already use and would probably continue to do so regardless of which option the city chooses.
378.0				The Green route option is by far preferable to the other two. The Blue route should be dropped from consideration.
379.0				Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the future of the B.G trail. I am a regular user of this trail and appriciate the opportunity to ride my bike free of traffic. Please support the Green Root option! so I can avoid the traffic. Many thanks for your time. Younghhee
380.0				As a commuter who uses the Burke Gilman trail daily I would like to take this opportunity to ask you to support the "green route" option as a solution to the "missing link" in the trail. The trail is an excellent example of the facilities that define the character of this corner of Seattle, on par with the Green Lake and Ballad Locks. One of the things that makes the B. G. Trail special is that it separates the many users from the traffic. To divert the B.G. Trail through the roads of Ballard is equivalent to diverting the I-5 freeway onto a dirt road. Let's take this opportunity to complete the B.G. Trail as originally envisioned, our children and grand children will thank us for our vision. At the same time, let's not forget the historic businesses that gave Ballard it's character and work with them to help them make this transition. Thanks for your time in considering this important matter.
381.0				For better or for worse, the land along the green route is becoming more and more valuable. The types of businesses that currently use that land now will find themselves priced out of the market within the next 12 years. As the land is developed it will pull in greater tax dollars. By thwarting the natural development of this area those businesses are, in effect, being subsidized by the residents of Seattle. If the businesses want such a special subsidy then they should make their case absolutely clear to Seattle residents so that the community can make that choice. It is clear from comments posted at the Open House that bicycle commuters will not use the Blue Route favored by those businesses. And it is unfair for the businesses to threaten other users of the Green Route by claiming they are not liable for the harm they may cause. I believe now is the time to be planning for the future of the entire Ballard community, not just those few businesses. The Green Route is the natural continuation of the Burke-Gilman Trail, any other route will be a short-term waste of tax dollars.

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
382.0				The Green Alternative is the most consistent with the existing trail. The other alternatives would place Burke-Gilman traffic on roads. This would be the only part of the entire trial to do so. Industrial and recreational interests will co-exist as they already do in the area west of Fremont.
383.0				I am voting for the green route!!
384.0				green route!!
385.0				I have just reviewed the proposed routes for the "Missing Link" of the Burke-Gilman Trail. I live in Fremont, and from time to time head west on the Burke-Gilman as far as it goes (currently I don't go much past the 15th St bridge, but frequently wish I can). I would most appreciate the proposed Green Line alternative to meet up with the Lock/Golden Gardens section of the trail. I have two main concerns when biking the Burke-Gilman: hills and cars. The Green Line appears to be the one that avoids the most of both these scourges to bicyclists. Thank you for your time.
386.0				Among the proposed options I prefer the GREEN ROUTE. Sincerely Fabio Governato
387.0				I won't be able to make the meeting on Tuesday, but would like to put in my vote for the green route. The other two routes don't make very much sense - the 57th street route is quite a ways out of the way (I wouldn't bother using it), and riding along market street is practically suicidal. Thanks!
388.0				I favor the green alternative. I have often cycled in the area, and find that the streets are much less safe than the railbed. The current arrangement of Shilshole Avenue is dangerous, however, because of traffic and holes in the pavement where the rails cross.
389.0				The green alternative (on Shilshole) is the only route that makes sense. Running the route up Ballard Ave. would be very disruptive to the character of the area and would be hazardous to pedestrian traffic on that street (which should be encouraged). The blue alternative is so unattractive from a cyclist's standpoint (i.e. having to cross Market St., etc) that it would likely not be used and the money will have been wasted.
390.0				Dear Scott: The probability of my being able to attend the November 19th Open House is slim, but I'd like to check in with my two cents worth re: the missing link in the Burke-Gilman. By way of introduction, I'm an avid sport/commuter cyclist riding between 7,000 and 10,000 miles annually, with approximately 60% of those miles being on the BGT. My family owns Louie's Cuisine of China at 5100 15th NW in Ballard, and I commute there regularly from my home in Lake Forest Park by bike. The only route option that makes any sense is the most direct one already in use by most serious cyclists, namely Shilshole Ave. Bikers have always and will continue to take the shortest route possible without risking serious bodily injury, and will ride as near to the water as possible in search of scenery/cool temps. I would favor a trail that ran along the south side of the roadway, as there are really only two major traffic points on that side (Salmon Bay Sand and Gravel and the entrance to the Yankee Diner, or whatever it is called now).
390.0				As has been noted, the Salmon Bay drivers are skilled professionals and a cement truck is an easily seen and slow moving target. I ride regularly up 11th and 8th, and I can assure you that there is nothing of scenic or other interest along those routes; nothing short of the next incarnation of Krispy Kreme on 57th would take me up there on my bike. Market St. is also a nightmare and will remain so for the foreseeable future (it will intensify if the Monorail goes in). Anyway, that's my vote. I've signed up for e-mail updates on the situation, so I presume you will keep me informed. If you're interested in more commentary on the Burke-Gilman, check out my website at www.obriencycles.com and click on the link for "on the BGT" Thanks, Greg Louie
391.0				I am a frequent user of the Burke Gilman trail, and resident of the area near the current end of the trail at 11th Avenue. I am in favor of the Green Line for the following reasons: -- It is the best alignment with the existing trail, and will provide the clearest and least confusing connection. -- It provides the best experience for trail users. -- It will involve the least disruption of auto traffic, compared to the other routes. I also happen to be a former resident of the Ballard Avenue Historic District. I feel that the Ballard Avenue alignment would be disruptive to pedestrian and commercial traffic in the historic district, as well as on Market Street. The Ballard Avenue District is a treasure, and should be preserved! The Blue alignment would involve a confusing route, numerous traffic crossings, and hence the potential for accidents and possibly reduced traffic speed through Ballard. Brian Johnson Cycle commuter, runner, and lifelong Ballard resident 344 NW 48th Street
392.0				I will be out of town and will miss the meeting on Nov.19th. I am strongly in favor of the Shilshole Ave (railroad right of way) route. This route is shown in green on the route proposals. It is the most natural and direct route for the trail. It is currently the route most bicyclists take. The rest of the Burke-Gillman trail follows the railroad right of way. The other proposed routes are on busy streets or include crossings of busy streets and are longer routes. They would also require taking of right of way of existing streets in order to separate the bike/pedestrian lanes from the traffic lanes. The Shilshole ave route has a wide right of way to allow a separate path from the existing road. The part of the trail between Hales Brewry and Freemont passes through a similar industrial area. Much of the argument against Shilshole ave. is the loss of free parking for the local businesses. This should not even be a consideration.
392.0				The city is not obligate nor should it supply free parking to private business. If the shilshole route is not chosen it will continue to be the route used by most commuter bikers from Ballard to other parts of the city. Currently this route is very dangerous because it has not shoulder for bikes. David Yarno
393.0				I think the green route--the one closest to the water--is the best option. It is the route that fits best with the current sections of the trail. It seems to also cause the least traffic crossings which are problematic along other parts of the trail.
394.0				I am for the southern most suggestion...Shilshole as opposed to Ballard Ave - due to the traffic. If I am on a bike...I am more likely to want a nice more quiet environment as opposed to competing with cars and noise. Thanks for doing this!

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
395.0				<p>Hi, I live on NW 57th Street, directly on the proposed Blue/Northern route for the Burke Gilman Trail Extension (11th Ave NW - Locks). I was unable to find any information on the informational web site regarding the impact that the trail extension would have on properties located along this proposed extension route. While I'm a huge supporter of the Burke Gilman Trail, and a bicycle commuter myself, it is my hope that an extension project does not involve construction or modification to the sidewalks or grassy area between the sidewalk and the street in front of my home or the homes of my neighbors. Any specific information that you can provide regarding the types of modifications required for a residential area extension of the Trail would be very much appreciated. Thank you for your time, Britton Piehler 2452 NW 57th Street Seattle, WA 98107 206.632.0445</p>
396.0				I definitely vote for the South option, as this does a better job of getting bicycles off the busy streets used by cars.
398.0				I think option "A" is the logical choice. That is the route I normally cycle right now. Unfortunately, there are several railroad crossings, and quite a bit of traffic on this route. Option "C" is impractical, because it deviates too far from the natural route along the waterfront, that most cyclists follow now, and bypasses the Locks, which is a scenic resting point. Route "B" starts off well, but quickly heads into high-pedestrian shopping areas, which are difficult to bicycle through safely. I prefer route "Green"
399.0	GREEN			<p>The green route is my recommendation. I agree with Chuck Ayers, and I think it is backed up by many other effective and safe bike trails around the country. It does not make sense to send a bike route through the city street grid if you can avoid it, and in this case it can be avoided. It loses the whole intent of what a bike trail should be and introduces far more safety issues than exist along the green route. The conflicts with the industrial uses in the area can be mitigated. Bikers generally have good visibility in that area.</p> <p>I hope the decision is made based on what is good for the City as a whole and not on the interests of a couple of business owners. All forms of efficient transportation are important to this City right now and the decisions are critical.</p>
400.0				I am writing in support of the Green option. The Burke-Gilman should be a separated trail whenever possible. It should also follow the water, and it should be flat. The northern option has nothing to do with the Burke-Gilman. It's fine to have bike lanes that way too, but that's for people going north.
401.0				I am a bike commuter from the university district to ballard. I strongly support the Green Alternative. It's safer for me and reduces the amount of detours.
402.0				I am a big fan of ultimately extending the trail. I have two small boys and we love to bike on the trail from Fremont (our home). Golden Gardens would be a much nicer destination than Fred Meyer. Good luck, and thanks. I just commented, but had not looked at the route alternatives. I would be much more in favor of the red or green as they are more direct, and pass under 15th. I assume the blue route would not include an overpass?
403.0				I live just off Shilshole Ave and ride a bicycle so I would be using the trail and feel I know the area pretty well. My opinion is that the green line makes the most sense. It also makes the best use of space. The other alternatives route through sometimes very busy roads where there is the chance of distracted motorists hitting pedestrians and cyclists. The roadside of Shilshole Ave is currently used as parking on occasion but for the most part is not being used except by the Ballard railroad, and that mostly for family sightseeing. (my perspective :)) I wish I had known about the open house, I don't recall getting any e-mail about it. Anyway, that's my \$.02, spend it wisely!! Thanks for asking for comments.
404.0				I would like to express my support for the green line alternative.
405.0				As a cyclist, I'd like to express my support for the 'green' option for Burke Gilman Trail extension through Ballard. It does the best job of keeping trail traffic away from busy streets. The 'blue' option is quite round about and looks more like a car route than a bike route.
406.0				After reviewing the alternatives, the green alternative along Shilshole Avenue is still my choice. It seems the only choice for a "multi-use" (bicycles, walkers, joggers) continuation of the Burke-Gilman Trail. The completion of that trail will be as important to the City of Seattle as many of its fine accomplishments over its history. In the future the completion of the Burke-Gilman Trail will be deemed a great accomplishment of our generation. I do realize that there are dangers, ie, trucks, trains, cars. However the other alternatives also present dangers, ie trucks, cars crossing intersections and driving along side users, backing out of driveways, narrow roads. I would think that with appropriate signage, fencing, railings, STOP/YIELD signs, education the possibility of an accident would be greatly reduced. I have noticed that along the Leary Way portion of the trail, some of those same problems exist. The Fred Meyer traffic and industrial trucks do cross the trail at several points. Lastly - no matter which alternative, bicyclists, in particular, will still use Shilshole Avenue (its more direct). That must be considered, and th
407.0				I prefer the green route; it's more safe, direct, and logical! thank you!
408.0				Please choose the green route for the Burke-Gilman extension. As a bike commuter (to Ballard) and recreational rider, I have found the Burke-Gilman and other regional trails to be valuable assets to our area. As a separated trail, the green option will be safer, more convenient, and more pleasant than the red or blue options.

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
409.0				I participated in the review program on November 19th at Ballard High School. I looked at all the options for routing cyclists through/around Ballard and found all the routes so problematic that I seriously question the viability and/or safety of all of them. The blue route involves new stoplights (one would hope) at at least two locations and possibly three. It also takes folks far out of the shortest route between the Locks and the current trail. Finally it creates problems at Ballard Market to solve same problem somewhere else. Not likely to be used and unsafe... The Green route has cyclists competing with trucks and cement mixers and God knows what else on Shilshole. Have we no regard for industry anymore? Are cyclists expendable?... The Red route runs through funky Ballard (where the farmers' market is just settling in on Sunday morns) and then dumps riders onto Market (presumably at 22d or "23d" for about two blocks of hell before you get to Limback Lumber and less traffic....There was also a fourth option being touted by some that night--it would take folks up to 58th and right
410.0				I just wanted to add my vote for the green line as the route of choice to the Locks. The Blue Line is a very unappealing detour and the route on Ballard Ave. is less safe for cyclists. The Green alternative makes the most sense geographically as well.
411.0				Shilshole avenue should not be considered for the trail. Due to the nature of the long-existing businesses located along this corridor there is already a lot of congestion from truck deliveries as well as company vehicles involved in the operation of these businesses. Adding a trail to this area would not be safe for anyone involved. There is no other portion of the Burke-Gilman trail that involves this amount of traffic, congestion, businesses driveways, loading docks, etc. It isn't fair to the existing businesses to expect them to suffer the financial impacts that putting the trail in this area would create. With the current economy the way it is, is it fair to ask these existing businesses to reconfigure their operations to operate around the proposed trail?
412.0				PLEASE SUPPORT THE GREEN ALTERNATIVE!! IT MAKES THE MOST SENSE FOR SEATTLE! This is the most direct route that makes sense to connect it with the existing trail that ends at Fred Meyer and the new one that will be constructed from the Locks to Shilshole. In addition there are businesses and property owners along this proposed trail route who would like to see this trail happen. Thank you.
413.0				I am writing, as Editor of the Cascade Courier, to ask that you consider the Green Trail as the best option. This is the only choice which is a separated trail, and it's also the only route along the publicly owned rail corridor. It will be the safest option. It is also the simplest option -- it is a direct line, closing the gap between the two parts of the existing trail, without complicated and confusing twists and turns.
414.0				Amidst all the route options presented at the November 19th meeting at Ballard High School for completing the missing link it is very apparent that each option has serious drawbacks. What is outlined below is a route that I often use which combines segments of the green, red and blue routes. By following this route I avoid most if not all of the problems associated with the proposed green, red and blue routes. Tracy, you and Rob Matson have been included in this mailing as the option presented below could have an impact on what is done with trail segment that passes thru the Lock's parking lot.
414.1				<p>Starting at the current end of the Burke-Gilman trail at 11th Ave. N.W.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.. Head west on either the first segment of the green route along NW 45th St. or the red route along NW 46th St. 2.. Right (north) on 17th Ave. NW. 3.. Left (northwest) on Ballard Ave NW. 4.. Right (north) on 20th Ave. NW (or 22nd Ave. NW) 5.. Cross Leary. (A pedestrian-bicyclist crossing light is needed if 20th Ave NW is used) 6.. Cross NW Market. (Lights already exists for either the 20th or 22nd Ave routes.) 7.. Left (west) on NW 57th Street. 8.. At the intersection of NW 57th Street and 28th Ave. NW several options exist for continuing to Golden Gardens and the Locks.
414.2				<p>To Golden Gardens..Option A, has an uphill segment whose grade can be reduced by a short jog up to 58th Street.</p> <p>.. Starting at the intersection of NW 57th Ave and 28th Ave NW.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.. Right (north) on 28th Ave. NW. 2.. Left (west) on NW 58th St. 3.. Cross 32nd Ave NW, NW 58th blends into NW 57th. 4.. Continue west and cross over railroad tracks via NW 57th St bridge and descend down 37th Pl NW to NW 61st St. 5.. Right on at the bottom of the hill (NW 61st St) to connect to future trail segment from Golden Gardens or to bike lanes along Seaview Ave.
414.3				<p>To the Locks and Golden Gardens..Option B, not as hilly as option A, uses bike lanes to avoid additional crossings of NW Market St and NW 54th St when headed west.</p> <p>Starting at the intersection of NW 57th Ave and 28th Ave NW.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.. Left (south) on 28th Ave NW. 2.. Right (west) on NW Market St 3.. Continue west, as NW Market becomes NW 54th St start painted bike lanes at this point on both the east and west bound sides of NW 54th St. 4.. Continue west, NW 54th St becomes Seaview Ave, still on painted bike lane. 5.. At NW 61st St, connect to future trail segment that extends southward from Golden Gardens or continue with painted bike lanes on each side of Seaview Ave.

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
414.4				<p>Advantages:</p> <p>1.. Avoids the heavy truck traffic at the western end of the green route. 2.. Uses the first segments of the green and red routes to pass underneath 15th Ave NW. 3.. Not as circuitous as the original 57th St blue route and also avoids the traffic congestion at the Post Office and The Ballard Market which border 57th St. 4.. Avoids the traffic congestion that the red route encounters when it joins Market St. 5.. Crosses Market Street using an existing light. 6.. This route connects the historic Ballard district with the retail shops along NW Market St and will pass by the new Community Center, which, by the way, should be outfitted with covered spaces for bike parking. 7.. For bicyclist not wishing to stop at the Locks the use of bike lanes on 54th allows riders a safe means of continuing to Golden Gardens without having to cross thru the Locks parking lot entrance area as do all of SDOT's existing plans. 8.. Provides a designated bike route to Golden Gardens without disrupting the parking situation at the Locks as</p>
415.0				<p>Dear Mayor Nickels,</p> <p>Your Transportaion Department is finalizing its corridor study of route options for the Burke-Gilman trail. Three routes have been analyzed, and only one makes sense as a safe, simple, connected and forward-looking solution to complete the Burk-Gilman trail. I have been a Ballard resident for over four years, and I know that completing the trail will enhance quality of life in Ballard and beyond and can provide the impetus and framework for a much needed development plan on the Shilshole corridor.</p>
415.1				<p>Your leadership and vision is needed NOW to make this happen. Please don't let false, self-serving arguments obscure the real issue -- in addition to safe, non-polluting transportation options for all Seattle citizens, our public rights of way must be shared, not only to promote optimum use to this end, but also to undo years of obstructionist actions which have prevented sensible, safe and aesthetic improvements necessary to promote economically viable development of the Ballard waterfront.</p>
415.2				<p>A separated trail along the rail banked corridor is:</p> <p>Safe</p> <p>There are no arterial streets to cross and far fewer driveway crossings on this route. Sfaety is enhanced on a trail by insuring separation and predictability for users.</p> <p>Simple</p> <p>The shortest distance between two points is a straight line -- the right of way route embodies 'simple math' and closes the gap in the missing link without requiring complicated and needless twists and turns.</p> <p>Connected</p> <p>Ballard's Neighborhood plan recognized the importance of connecting neighbor to neghbor, employee to workplace and citizens to their waterfront. Completing the trail will close the gap, make the link, and finally complete this trmendous and popular multi-use facility.</p> <p>A Wise Investment</p> <p>The Shilshole waterfront is a major asset for both Ballard and Seattle. It has been run as money lossing, resource-wasting private fiefdom for far too long. Completing the Burke-Gilman trail is the impetus and framework for a wise, forward-thinking investment in Ballard's economic future. Please help us create a vibrant, well-maintained</p>
416.0				<p>Lives on Seaview. Don't ride to freemont because it's not safe, but they would ride to freemont and to work if the green trail option were built.</p>
417.0				<p>Various people have asserted that extending the Burke-Gilman Trail through the Ballard Industrial Area ("the missing link") is not safe and will result in many bicycle/vehicle accidents. Proponents of this extension deny this. Why don't we see what historical accident data say?</p> <p>Bicyclists have for years been riding from Gasworks Park to Ballard by way of NW 46th St, Canal Street and Leary Way or by cycling through the Fremont and Ballard industrial areas, south or southwest of these streets. They ride either on the back streets of the industrial areas or by using the Burke-Gilman Trail extensions as they became available.</p> <p>City Councilmember Nick Licata was kind enough to provide me with information about bicycle/motor vehicle accidents in the Gasworks Park-to-Ballard corridor. Police reports were obtained and reviewed on 38 accidents occurring at 20 locations in this corridor between 1987 and 2000.</p> <p>Since, during these 13 years, NONE of the 38 accidents occurred within the industrial areas, it seems that safety</p>
418.0				<p>Thank you for posting the proposed alternative routes for the Burke Gilman trail through Ballard. I am strongly in favor of the green route and finding a solution that will work with the businesses in that area. Reading the recent article in the Sun Press, it seems to me that a very few businesses are standing in the way of an incredible resource for the community. I am a mother of three children, ages 2, 6 and 8. We all love to bike and go somewhere at least every week on bikes. We live in Fremont and would like a safe way to go to Ballard, the Locks and Golden Gardens via bikes. We would like to ride to the library.</p>

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
418.1				<p>The blue route is impractical. No one is going to ride UPHILL and out of the way 10 blocks north and cross multiple busy streets to go to Ballard. The bike traffic will just stay along shilshole ave. As for the red route through ballard, I can't believe this is actually a legal design. It doesn't look safe to me. Who wants to drive in the middle of oncoming traffic between two lanes of cars going 30-40 mph? Not me. Not with kids. Again, I would stay on the southern route and avoid this bike path.</p> <p>I appreciate very much all the city and bike clubs have done to help make this path a reality. I use the other part of the path toward Fremont all the time: to shop, to exercise, to relax, and to enjoy a small taste of outdoors. Those businesses that have enjoyed the free parking along the rail tracks all these years need to give it up and share with other people in the community.</p>
419.0				I like the green line option the best, it appears to be the most direct and mirrors the route that many bicyclists are already using through Ballard.
420.0				The green alternative as proposed will impact the Ballard Industrial area adversely. It will resemble the trail as it goes along the Seattle downtown waterfront, an uncomfortable, congested mix of vehicles, pedestrians, trains and bikes. It is also one of the most costly routes, and the city does not have funds at this time. A good alternative has been proposed by the some of the Ballard industry representatives that is similar to the blue alternative. They propose the pedestrian pathway follow the red alternative route (no cost except signage, sidewalks in place, could be ready immediately). The bicycle component would include a grid of bike boulevards one that would extend east-west along 57th or 58th, and continue west down 57th to connect with the waterfront trail at 37th. Additional boulevards could inclued NW 75th, 28th NW, 17th NW and perhaps 11th. These would be preferable bike routes throughout the neighborhood, easily accessible for anyone living in Ballard, and provide a faster commuting route than the green route. Although cars would be still allowed on these streets, the placement of speed bumps and
421.0	GREEN			The "Green" alternataive is the only sensible route to consider since it is a logical continuation of the Gilman Trail. Other routes mentioned would further congest the twon center and/or surrounding neighborhoods within Ballard.
422.0	GREEN			Although I live in Shoreline, I still own property on Holman Rd and Greenwood Ave N. I practiced veterinary medicine in Crown Hill for forty years. Thus, I feel entitled to express my opinions concerning decisions concerning the city of Seattle. I am 73 years old and bicycle over 3,000 miles annually. Much of my mileage is in Seattle, from Fauntleroy to Redmond. It is my definite opinion that the "Green Route" is far superior to either of the other two routes. I encourage the work to begin as soon as possible so individual cyclists and cycling familites can have a safe route to Shilshole area.
423.0	GREEN			The Shilshole Avenue route is more direct with fewer intersections to maneuver and would be much safer than the others suggested. Furthermore, it is doubtful that serious cyclists will use the other alternatives even if imposed upon them!
424.0	GREEN			No one is going to use the Blue Route and it will just mess up an already congested neighborhood. The Blue Route is much too out of the way. The Red Alt. has way too many intersections and Market St is already a big bottleneck with all the pedestrians, buses, cars, ____ and trucks. The Green Alt. is the only feasible route. The various businesses will have to learn to share this public corridor with the public. The Ballard Terminal Rail Co. should have no bearing on trail decisions since it was only created with the purpose of stopping the trail. In summary, any alternative but Green will be a waste of taxpayer money.
425.0	GREEN			As a current user of the Burke-Gilman Trail and its current unofficial continuation on my way to the Ballard Locks, I strongly encourage you to adopt the Green Alternative in finishing this missing link. The Green Alt. is the only route that makes practical sense for several reasons. It is a direct line from the current terminus to the locks. It would not crossmajor roadways and would avoid more driveways, resulting in a far safer route and less vehicular traffic interference. This rail grade would be an ideal extension to the current Burke-Gilman Trail, encouraging even more people to get out of their cars to make the trip to and from the Ballard Locks area. Thank you for working to make this a safe corridor!
426.0	GREEN			Please count me as one of those favoring the "Green" route as my favored choice. I commute by bicycle approx. 6-8 months a year to the University from my home in Loyal Heights by riding down 28th NW to Market to Shilshole Ave. to 45th before picking up the trail at Fred Meyer. I am a lifelong resident of Ballard and have long wondered why the industries along Shilshole Ave. are unwilling to compromise and accept the presence of the trail. We have to look out for their traffic, they should have to look out for us. The argument about toddlers in strollers is a canard. During the week traffic on the trail will be commuters like me, who know enough to look out for trains. I have nothing against the train operation or the many industries that operate there, I just think that compromise is the order of the day. That is a wide corridor, and I believe there is room for everyone. Keep working on it! Thanks, Mike Frushour.
427.0	GREEN			The green route is the only one that can be a true bicycle trail. It is the seperation of vehicles and bicycles that make a true trail. Bicycle lanes next to parked cars do not work. There are the real problems of being impaled by someone opening a door. (Remember that back seats do not have mirrors.) Another problem often not considered by planers is the lack of consideration for bicyclist by drivers. I commute using the Dexter bike route and every day I encounter things like delivery trucks entirely blocking the bike lane, large passanger vehicles parked to far from the curb, drivers walking out to their car into the bicycle lane without looking and a very discouraging attitude that bicyclist do not belong there and are entitled to no rights at all. There is also a psychological issue. Drivers expect bicycles to stay in the bicycle lane and do not leave room for bicyclist to manouver outside the lane to avoid hazzards inside the lane. All of us who commute on Dexter knows that staying in the lane is impossible. Please do the right thing and give us a true bicycle trail and give Seattle a real reason to claim it is a bicycle friendly city with a

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
428.0	GREEN			I strongly endorse the "green route" corridor option for the continuation of the Burke Gilman trail. The completion of this trail to and through Ballard will do much to link this community with the other neighborhoods. (longtime, active bike commuter).
429.0	GREEN			Of the three proposed routes, I think that the Green one (Shilshole Ave.) is the best one. The Green route offers these advantages that neither the Red nor the Blue route would be able to provide: 1) separation between the multi-use trail and motor vehicles 2) directness 3) hugging the shoreline as much as possible Shilshole Ave. has wide shoulders, and most closely follows the old rail lines, thus affording maximum separation between trail and street. Neither Red nor Blue can come close. I actually think this feature makes the Green line much safer than either the Red or Blue could possibly be.
429.1	GREEN			Yes, there will be exposure to some risk wherever the trail goes. However, SDOT, rider and other recreational groups, Fred Meyer and other Burke Gilman-area tenants have done a great job of making the Fremont-to-Fred Meyer Burke Gilman segment as safe as possible, even though that part is in an industrial area. The same can be done for a Green line route along Shilshole Ave. Shilshole Ave. is direct. In fact, many commuter bicyclists use it already as a route from west and south Ballard to the main Burke Gilman trail starting at Fred Meyer. Red veers away from the shore area, and runs along Ballard Ave. and Market St. before coming back to the shore area. Blue turns even farther inland, and I think most bicyclists would sooner ride along Shilshole Ave. than use a trail along the Blue route.
429.2	GREEN			Shilshole Ave. follows the shoreline as much as possible. Red and Blue turn away from it. A hallmark of the Burke Gilman trail is its shoreline nature and the panoramas of the shoreline it affords. Of course, panoramas can be blocked by buildings, as they would be much of the way along Shilshole. Still, users of the Green route would be in the shoreline area, and that is a key part of the Burke Gilman trail experience
429.3	GREEN			Warren Aakervik, whom I admire, is quoted as saying in a recent Ballard News Tribune article about the proposed Green route: 1- "What we're talking about is, we're putting a park (i.e., the Green route) in an industrial area. This doesn't solve any transportation problem" 2- "This will define whether there really is a maritime industry here or not." 3- "But all it takes is one accident. One bicyclist getting hit by a truck or train could make it very expensive for business to stay in Ballard. It's only a matter of time before someone gets hurt."
429.4	GREEN			In regard to point #1, putting in the Green route would only place a multi-use trail in the BINMIC area. The part of the Burke Gilman trail between Fremont and Fred Meyer is also in an industrial area. It would be a stretch for someone to call it a park. Extending the BG trail through Ballard will no more solve a transportation problem than building the monorail will. But it will offer people more options. In regard to point #2, I think there are many other far more important factors than a bike trail that will determine the future of Seattle's maritime industry. If anything, I think a bike trail along Shilshole will enhance people's appreciation of BINMIC's role in Seattle and the regional economy. BINMIC is largely invisible (apart from Fishermen's Terminal, and that is more about fishing than industry per se). I think BINMIC will help itself by embracing the Shilshole Ave. route as another way to weave itself into the community. In regard to point #3, safety of course must always be paramount. What Warren says is true of any multi-use trail. Accidents do happen, though we do our darndest to make sure there are none. Does tha
429.5	GREEN			I think tremendous effort and thought has gone into creating safety precautions for the segment between Fremont and Fred Meyer. If we can do it there, I believe we can do it along Shilshole Ave. I have ridden along Shilshole and 45th several times (most times I connect with BG at Fred Meyer, as I come down 9th Ave NW from my house). I've looked hard for obvious fatal flaws, and have yet to see any. I really believe that SDOT can work with all the various groups to create a safe Green route along Shilshole.
429.6	GREEN			In a nutshell, the Green route is the most direct route, and I believe it would be the safest of the three, since, of the three, it has the most room for separation from vehicle traffic. The Blue route is way out of the way - if I were a commuter from west Ballard, I'd just keep riding along Shilshole. And it simply is not safe to put a multi-use route so close to parked cars. The Red route (Ballard and Market Aves.) slices right through the Ballard historic district, which may or may not be good, but it also runs along Market St. for two blocks. I'd think long and hard before taking my kids along a trail that goes down Market St. Shilshole offers, to my mind, a much better and more viable route than the other two routes.
430.0	Red/Blue			I am writing to share my thoughts on the proposed routes for the BGT extension from 11th NW to the Locks. I like the Red Alternative best, except for its journey down Market St., which to me, is a very bad idea given the amount of traffic on Market. Such a proposal dooms the Red Alternative from serious consideration. However, I would vote to extend the Red Alternative North on either 20th or 22 NW, to join with the proposed Blue Alternative and continue to the Locks via that route.
431.0				<p>1) Please choose a trail route that cyclists will actually use. If the Trail does not appeal to bicycle commuters, then they will continue to ride on Shilshole Ave etc., and the time and taxpayer money spent on this trail extension will be wasted.</p> <p>I see bicycle commuters choosing to ride in 35-40 mph zones along 15th Ave, south of the Ballard Bridge, rather than on the trail in Myrtle Edwards Park. Likewise, many cyclists choose Alaska Way along the Seattle waterfront instead of using the paved bike/ped path right beside the street. I hope the PAC identified ways to make the BGT extension appealing to potential users.</p>

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
431.2				<p>2) Did the PAC identify solutions/mitigations for the concerns expressed by some business owners in the industrial area about the green route? If so, it's important for the Design Study to clearly set forth those solutions/mitigations. How many parking spaces will be lost, and how far away will employees and customers have to go to find new parking spaces? How many spaces are available? Will trucks emerging from business driveways have a clear view of the trail? Is there a way to provide enough room so that trucks waiting to pull out onto Shilshole won't block the trail?</p> <p>If the Study states only that solutions are to be worked out later, then the Mayor (and citizens) won't have the info needed to judge the relative impact of the route options.</p>
431.4				<p>3) I have no problem with the red route through the Ballard Avenue segment. However, the Market Street segment would not work - a bike route on Market St. would interfere with bus travel, and Market Street is already too congested.</p> <p>4) Please choose a Trail route that crosses busy streets only where there is a stoplight. Trying to cross Market or 15th Ave without a light would be unsafe. Please give a lot of weight to this safety issue.</p> <p>5) If the choice is between a) Trail width/safety/functionality and b) landscaping, PLEASE cut back on the landscaping. Narrow any landscaping strips rather than constricting the room available for RR track usage, for example. Also, don't let shrubs/trees obstruct truck drivers' view of bicycles approaching on the trail. I'm not sure what landscaping is planned.</p>
431.6				<p>6) Please choose a Trail design that preserves the spur line/Ballard Terminal Railroad's storage areas for refrigerated RR cars in the industrial area along Shilshole Avenue (near the Western Pioneer facility). I mailed documents on this matter to you.</p> <p>7) This is a question, rather than a comment: How do City Council resolution 29474 and Ordinance 118734 affect the green route? Would the City Council have to overturn the resolution?</p>
432.0				<p>My perspective on the "Missing Link" bike trail options may be somewhat unique, as I will be affected by many aspects of the decision. I use the Burke-Gilman trail to frequently commute to work on my bike, traveling from my home near Greenlake. I work as a foreman and safety officer at a shipyard that borders the railroad tracks (@ 26th Ave & 54th St NW) along the proposed "Green Alt." Without putting much thought into the detrimental impact of its location, it might seem nice for me to pedal directly to my job via the "Green Alt." The fact is, if the "Green Alt." is implemented, it is unlikely the business I work for, or many of the established industrial waterfront businesses will be able to remain along the corridor. My familiarity with cycling, the proposed "Green Alt.", the inevitable impact to local business and most importantly, the unsolvable safety issues that would be created by cutting through the heart of the Ballard industrial area makes me vehemently opposed to the "Green Alt."</p>
432.1				<p>Introducing large numbers of pedestrians and bike riders unfamiliar with the difficulties and practices of traversing a high density industrial corridor is irresponsible and unsafe. Short of building an elevated trail through this area, there is no design or signage that can be incorporated in the trail that can effectively permit a situation allowing any safe crossing zones. When was the last time anyone has seen a bike rider come to a full and complete stop when required by signage or light on a city street, let alone a bike trail? Imagine the driver of a tractor trailer, with the sun in his or her eyes having to be on the lookout for a 5-year old on a bike with training wheels as the truck and trailer try to cross the trail and enter traffic. It becomes a simple matter of probability before there is an injury or death, and the odds aren't very good. There seems to be a loud, fanatical and small contingent of bike riders that have put their self-centered desires of wanting a bike trail following the proposed "Green Alt." above and with no regard to the safety and livelihoods of thousands of citizens and nearly all the businesses in the area.</p>
432.2				<p>A rational well rounded approach, addressing the concerns of all the people involved and affected by this decision should prevail over those with an uninformed, unrealistic and inconsiderate agenda. In summary, industrial businesses along the Ballard waterfront cannot coexist and be hemmed in by a ground level bike path. Accidents will occur, businesses will be impaired, if not devastated, and the livelihoods of people working in the area (like me) will be severely compromised. Because of these reasons, I believe a reasonable and prudent decision would be to locate the proposed trail along either of the other proposed routes.</p>

Ballard Corridor Design Study Comments Received

#	ALT	AREA	OPT.	COMMENTS
433.0				<p>1. Bicycles have a constitutional right to access the working waterfront that cannot be denied.</p> <p>2. Dictating safe bicycle operation within rules of the road and increased signage and traffic control is not fully attainable.</p> <p>3. Bicycles accessing the working waterfront are a safety problem.</p> <p>4. It is in the best interest of the City of Seattle and the bicycle operators to limit access to the working waterfront in order to minimize the safety risk.</p> <p>5. Any form of path or stripe or encouragement to travel through the working waterfront will increase the risk of a truck or train encounter.</p> <p>6. One way to minimize risk is to ensure that there are other routes available.</p>
433.1				<p>The safety problem due to possible bicycle encounter with a truck or train on the working waterfront was recognized and agreed to by the City of Seattle with a No-Bike-Path clause in the corridor from 11th Av NW to 30th Av NW. This Operating Agreement was put into writing in the Ballard Terminal Railroad Contract, and signed by both parties in 1997. Why are taxpayer funds being spent on studying this non-route? The "Friends of Burke Gilman" have claimed this clause is breakable in a court of law. Whether it is or is not does not alter the root cause for the clause being written. Minimizing the safety risk for a bicycle encounter with a truck or train is the issue. If additional use by bicycles is encouraged in any form, the safety risk goes up. We all want the safety risk to go down. Therefore, a route outside of the working waterfront needs to be found. 57th St. has been suggested and could be developed under the boulevard concept with additional connecting streets. Putting it another way, are you willing to trade a train or truck collision resulting in a bicycle fatality and devastated train or truck driver for a water-view bicycle link to the Shilshole yacht basin?</p>
434.0				<p>Please move forward with finishing the Burke-Gilman trail, and in particular with the green route. I commute by bicycle from my home in Magnolia to the west side of Lake Union. I occasionally find myself returning home at night from the UW or from Fremont; I take the Burke-Gilman as long as I can, then take city streets to the Ballard Bridge. The green route, and to a lesser extent the red route, would improve the safety of this trip. The blue route would be worthless.</p> <p>I also prefer the green route because of my family (wife and two children). It would be great if we could cross at the locks and connect to the Burke-Gilman trail, to go to Golden Gardens or the UW, or for a longer ride on the BG trail (the kids are now getting old enough to do this). From what I can tell from the web site, this would work well on the green route, but the other two routes would use city streets, and would not be safe or pleasant for family rides.</p>
435.0				<p>I have worked with the City off and on for 10 years on an extension of the trail on the South Side of the Ship Canal and although not entirely thrilled with the idea, have been publicly supportive. The never ending public bickering saps the energy of limited municipal resources for a project that is popular with the General Public. I differ with my industrial friends and think it isn't such a bad idea. Build the most direct route with the funds available.</p>
436.0				<p>From The Director:</p> <p>In the past 3 days we have received 43 form letters and 61 emails supporting the proposed 'Green' route option for the Burke-Gilman Trail</p> <p>The path is currently being used as the ad-lib connector between the Ballard Fred Meyer and Golden Gardens</p> <p>These citizens say they support the 'Green' route option for the following reasons:</p> <p>(1) It is the shortest distance between the two locations.</p> <p>(2) It is the safest route as there are no major streets to cross, barring the intersection of 24th and Market.</p> <p>(3) It is the route which keeps the user closest to the waterfront, which provides for an excellent view.</p>