

Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link Design Advisory Committee

Meeting #8 Summary

Friday, December 15, 2017 | 2:30—4:30 p.m.
Ballard Eagleson VFW Post

Attendees

Design Advisory Committee Members

Member Name	Represented Interest	In Attendance
Warren Aakervik	Freight Interests	X
Tom Bayley	Commercial/Retail/Marina Interests	X
Sue Dills	Water-dependent/Maritime Interests	
Tom Friedman	Pedestrians	X
Davidya Kasperzyk	Trail Users	X
Jennifer Macuiba, alternate		X
Armand MacMurray	Ballard Residents	X
Eric Nelson	Cultural and Historic Interests	
Sandra Nestorovic, alternate		
Mike Stewart	Ballard Businesses	X
Blake Trask	Bicycle Riders	X
Eugene Wasserman	Industrial Interests	X
Graham Pruss	DON Community Liaison for the Unhoused Community	X

Staff

Seattle Department of Transportation

- Louisa Galassini, Project Manager
- Maribel Cruz, Outreach and Communications Lead
- Matt Beaulieu, Transportation Operations

Seattle Public Utilities

- Joelle Torre, Ship Canal Water Quality Project
- Cynthia Blazina, Ship Canal Water Quality Project Construction Manager

Office of Economic Development

- Roque Deherrera, Business Advocate

Expert Design Advisory Team

- Hermanus Steyn, Kittelson & Associates

EnviroIssues Facilitation Team

- Penny Mabie, facilitator
- Chris Themelis
- Brett Watson

Note: This document is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It is not intended to be a transcription of the meeting, but an overview of points raised and responses from SDOT and DAC members.

Welcome and Introduction

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues facilitator for the Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link Project Design Advisory Committee (DAC), welcomed DAC members, Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), and Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) staff to the meeting. She provided an overview of the agenda and outlined the primary purposes of the meeting – to present the DAC with 90% Missing Link design updates and to share early work associated with the SPU Ship Canal Water Quality Project

DAC members approved the November 28 DAC meeting summary pending the inclusion of minor edits.

Schematic Design Updates & EIS Appeal Overview

Louisa Galassini, SDOT project manager, began the 90% Schematic Design update by providing DAC members with an overview of the November 2017 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) appeal hearing. She anticipated that the hearing examiner would have a ruling in late January 2018, which was about one month later than originally anticipated.

Louisa shared that, due to the status and schedule of the appeal and the number of comments received following review of the 90% design, the project team decided to extend the design process by about a month and a half. She noted the new schedule would push submission of 100% design to the end of February 2018 to give the design team additional time to consider comments and ensure all safety considerations.

Regarding the project schedule, Louisa explained that an independent audit of potential construction timing demonstrated that it would likely take 14 months instead of 12 months to complete construction.

Penny outlined the upcoming DAC work plan and noted the delay of the January DAC meeting (1/11) and the January public event (1/18). She explained the February 1st DAC meeting would remain on the calendar and focus on design updates. Penny noted the DAC could expect more information regarding the schedule of future meetings, based on results of the EIS appeal decision.

DAC members provided the following comments regarding schedule changes:

- Armand MacMurray, Central Ballard Residents Association, asked if there would be a new public meeting due to the scheduling changes.
 - Penny said a public meeting would likely be planned for mid-March, and the DAC would hold a meeting in advance of the public event.
- Eugene Wasserman, North Seattle Industrial Association, reminded meeting attendees that the meeting schedule could likely change further depending on the result of the EIS appeal decision.

He also asked for an email containing the current meeting dates and schedule to be sent to the DAC.

Louisa continued the 90% Schematic Design update, beginning with recurring design suggestions and comments received. She outlined pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle/freight ROW guidelines as defined by City municipal code. Louisa also cited motorized, non-motorized, corridor, intersection, collision and incident statistics to reinforce the need for a safe corridor. Louisa noted that cyclists in mixed traffic have a higher safety risk than any other bike facility.

Louisa shared an update on driveway design elements, including those that the design team considered but did not incorporate. She also noted that trail speed limit signs were still being considered by SDOT. Louisa highlighted corridor safety measures that have been demonstrated to be most effective in reducing harm to all corridor users, including:

- **Offset bike facilities (sited away from the street)**, which add a significant buffer between vehicles and trail users
- **Raised crossings and pavement markings (e.g. green pavement)**, which bring higher awareness to drivers and other users
- **Creating clear sightlines to increase predictability**
- **Narrowing the trail at crossing zones** (especially at driveways) to slow users
- **Motion-activated flashing LED warning signs at driveways**

Louisa said that new trail signage would be installed throughout the corridor. She explained that signs would be placed at either end of the industrial corridor to highlight that users could expect “Trucks Next Mile.” Louisa also said that “Rules of the Trail” signs would be placed at various rest areas along the Missing Link.

Louisa presented a map of AutoTURN analyses with the locations where SDOT and the design team conducted them to inform 90% design. She noted the AutoTURN analyses were completed with SU-30s (smaller-sized, box trucks) to model driveways; however, some driveways were modeled using WB-67s (semi-length). The size of trucks modeled was informed by the driveway counts conducted as part of the EIS process and additional input provided by the community.

Louisa concluded her presentation by providing a summary of the 90% Design changes, including:

- Driveway removals and refinements
- Removal of the pinch point at NW Market St and NW 54th St (near the Ballard Locks)
- Refined concrete stamping patterns at mixing zones near the Ballard Locks bus stop and the intersection of NW Market St and Shilshole Ave NW

- Refined storm water management systems, proposed drainpipe relocation (on NW 45th St to avoid the railroad)
- Reduction of curb bulbs at 20th Ave NW
- Refined and simplified paving in several locations
- Signage revisions

DAC members made the following comments regarding the 90% Design updates:

- Eugene asked if the Burke Gilman Trail was considered a “public path”.
 - Louisa said that it was.
- Warren Aakervik, Ballard Oil, asked if the future trail would be considered a public path where it crosses driveways. He also asked how SDOT planned to relate these City laws and regulations to trail users.
 - Louisa responded that the laws/regulations would be conveyed through outreach efforts, website updates, and “Rules of the Trail” signs along the trail.
- Warren highlighted that an industrial business had logged +120 incidents under the Ballard Bridge in one year alone, and that the numbers could be low due to people failing to report all incidents.
 - Armand concurred with Warren, adding that if people wanted to file reports they would have been made with the police or fire department.
 - Roque Deherrera, Office of Economic Development, stated that the numbers displayed a baseline number of incidents, and shouldn’t be discounted.
 - Graham Pruss, Department of Neighborhoods representative for the unhoused community, agreed, noting that the statistics helped to indicate where incidents were occurring.
 - Eugene stated the corridor was not a high incident area, relative to other locations within the City.
- Tom Friedman, Ballard Running Group, asked what the text on the LED signs would be.
 - Louisa said they would display, “Truck Crossing”.
- Graham asked where the triggers for the LED signs were located.
 - Louisa explained the sensors were at locations unique to each business driveway but would be located within the public right of way, and they would provide ample warning before a truck reached the driveway crossing.
- Armand asked if the green pavement was striped or solid at driveway crossings.
 - Peter Trinh, SDOT transportation engineer, said the color would be solid.
 - Warren highlighted the importance of defining the green pavement, what it means for each user, and the need to communicate this information to all users.

- Mike Stewart, Ballard Alliance, asked what actuates the LED signs and which direction a vehicle would need to travel to trigger them.
 - Louisa stated signs would be triggered by vehicles and would do so when making right turns into driveways and exiting the driveway in both directions.
- Davidya Kasperzyk, Trail Users, asked why “Trucks Next Mile” signs were not planned at the eastern end of the Missing Link (at the Ballard Fred Meyer). He explained that many vehicles, including freight, move along 14th Ave NW and NW 45th, near Stone Supply.
 - Louisa said there were space constraints at Fred Meyer, but she would work with the design team to reconsider locations for sign placement. She added that the Major Truck Street designation began west of the Ballard Bridge, and thus the design was to place the first sign near the Ballard Bridge.
 - Blake Trask, Cascade Bicycle Club, expressed concern that signs could provide a sense of complacency. He asked if they could be installed at other locations such as Salmon Bay, Covich-Williams, and other major truck crossing zones. Other DAC members agreed.
- Armand expressed concerns over the wording of the “Trucks Next Mile” signs. He stated the importance of conveying that trucks were crossing the trail.
 - Other DAC members agreed, and they noted that “Trucks Crossing Trail” would be more illustrative.
- Warren said that given the various models used for AutoTURN analysis, not all driveways or intersections could support WB-67 movements. He asked the design team to include specific locations on the map where modeling was done for SU-30s and WB-67s. Warren added that WB-67s could only drive specific routes within the corridor.
- Armand stated that a comprehensive truck map showing routes could be useful.
- Roque stated the importance of recognizing every driveway in the corridor had been visited by the design team in-person, and all driveways were designed to accommodate their specific business needs.
- Tom Friedman asked if the SW corner of NW Market St and 24th Ave NW would have a different texture.
 - Louisa said it was a standard concrete sidewalk to show priority to pedestrians.
- Eugene asked why the corner wasn’t scored, like many other mixing zone treatments.
 - Peter explained that it would be scored, which is the standard detail for the City.
- Eugene asked if the number of parking spots along the corridor lost in the design included spots that were already unused spaces, both regulated and unregulated.
 - Louisa said yes, and clarified the comparison was done to be “apple-to-apples.”

SPU Ship Canal Water Quality Project

Cynthia Blazina, Ship Canal Water Quality Project Construction Manager, provided an overview of the Ship Canal Water Quality project, detailing its application and purpose of controlling Combined Sewage

Overflows. She explained that construction efforts in Ballard would include the installation of a 29-million-gallon storage tunnel, a new pedestrian pier, removal of contaminated soil, and new supporting utilities. Cynthia outlined the construction schedule, stating that early work and pipe construction would occur between 2018-2019, the tunnel between 2019-2023, and the pump station in 2021-2024.

DAC members asked the following questions:

- Mike asked if the conveyance schedule would run during certain Ballard events, and highlighted the need to coordinate access during these important times for community access.
- Armand asked if the conveyance would block specific areas off, and what the anticipated duration of construction would be.
 - Cynthia said there would be traffic impacts which could last for several months.

Cynthia thanked the DAC for allowing her to participate, and provided her contact information for follow up and fielding additional questions.

Public Comment

No public comment was provided.

Design Process Next Steps and Wrap Up

Penny discussed the next steps which included: pre-construction outreach, education campaigns, pre-opening and post opening monitoring efforts, ribbon cutting, working with local news outlets and the implementation of safety-oriented email updates about the corridor.

She outlined tasks for the DAC prior to the next meeting, asking them to thoroughly communicate with their constituents to learn about specific construction needs, and what they would like to see during the next phase of the project.

Penny thanked DAC members and SDOT staff for their participation in the discussion, noted SDOT's action items, and ended the meeting.

Action items

- Send a cancellation for January meetings and an email detailing upcoming meeting dates
- Send meeting presentation and roll plots to DAC members
- SDOT to follow up with Warren regarding 90% design channelization schematics
- SDOT to follow up on individual questions, as identified