Below is an index of comments received on the Draft EIS. Copies of these letters and responses are included. Please note that comment letters may not be sequential as duplicate letters have been removed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Matthew Sterner</td>
<td>Department Of Archaeology And Historic Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Lindsay Pulsifer</td>
<td>Port Of Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Paul Sivesind &amp; Eric Stoll</td>
<td>Ballard Chamber Of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Kji Kelly</td>
<td>Historic Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Eugene Wasserman</td>
<td>North Seattle Industrial Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Jon Hegeman</td>
<td>Ballard Farmers Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Lisa Quinn</td>
<td>Feet First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Elizabeth Kiker</td>
<td>Cascade Bicycle Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Joshua C. Brower, Veris Law</td>
<td>Ballard Business Appellants (BBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jamie Cheney</td>
<td>Seattle Children’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kevin Carrabine</td>
<td>Friends Of The Burke Gilman Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Doug Dixon</td>
<td>Pacific Fishermen, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Larry A. Ward</td>
<td>PFI Marine Electric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gordon Padelford &amp; Bob Edmiston</td>
<td>Seattle Neighborhood Greenways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Warren R. Aakervik, Jr.</td>
<td>Past Seattle Freight Advisory Board Member/Past Owner Of Ballard Oil Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Moe Moosavi, P.E.</td>
<td>Fremont Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Brian Estes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Audrea Caupain</td>
<td>Centerstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sean Cryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jennifer Maculba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Gregory Lyle</td>
<td>Ballard Mill Properties, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Rick J. Leavitt</td>
<td>Northern Lights, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Dawn Hemminger</td>
<td>Groundswell NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Suzanne Dills</td>
<td>Commercial Marine Construction Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Robert Wagner</td>
<td>Ballard Insulation, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Aaron Shaver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Alan Warwick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Andrew Dannenberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Andy Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ann Holstrom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Bjorn Davidson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Bruce Sanchez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Carolyn Mcqueen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Charles Costanzo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Chris Covert-Bowlds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Citizen 1 (N/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Citizen 2 (N/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Citizen 3 (N/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Citizen 4 (N/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Citizen 5 (N/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Citizen 6 (N/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Citizen 7 (N/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Dave Mccabe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Denni Mccabe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Dm Hoge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Dorothy Talbot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Douglas Farr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Elizabeth Alexander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Eric Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Fred Young</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Glen Buhlmann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Jacques Pugh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Jeff Winter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Jennifer Warwick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Jessica Baloun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>John Gillespie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Jon Mathison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Jonathan Loeffler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Jordan Lowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Linda Melvin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Luke Larson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Margaret D. Moore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Mary Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Mike Keller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Nicolette Neumann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Raymond Pye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Rhys Van Bemmel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Rudy Pantoj Jr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Ryan Stauffer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Sarah Cullen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Selena Carsiotis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Seth Schromen-Wawrin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Stephen Gose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Sushiil Shettigar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Tarrell Kollaway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Terry Hendrickson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Thomas Griga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Tiffany A Bode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Tim Hennings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Vivian Mackay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Alan Echison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Anson Thurston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Bill T.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Brian Estes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>C. Drake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Candace Reiterhegeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Carol Singler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Craig Bray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>D. Adams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Dave Boyd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>David Folweiler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Demian Godon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Dom Blachon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Emily Kotz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Gil Youenes</td>
<td>Seattle Farmer’s Markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Jean Darsie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Jennifer Goldman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>John D. Foster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Judy Davis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>L. Hammack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Laura Kett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Laurie Hammack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Laurie Hammack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Lee Bruch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Mark Foltz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Matthew Saunders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Melissa Gaughan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Merlin Rainwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Michael Cosgrove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Morgan Hougland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Norm Tjaden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Ross Fleming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Ross Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Tim Gould</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Tom Friedman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Uwe Bergk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Willow Russell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Bob Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Tim Connelly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Mason Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Aaron Piper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Ada Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Alex Morrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Alex Watts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Allen Wycoff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Andrea Dahlke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Andrius Simutis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Anitra Ingalls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Anthony Castanza</td>
<td>Phd Student, University Of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Art Valla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Barbara Orchard Aragon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Ben Johnson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Bette Pine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Bill Cortes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Bill Fortunato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Bill Mcgee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Linda Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Paul L. Anderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Mike Nichols</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Anders Svendsen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Tim Morgan</td>
<td>Covich Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Josh Drenth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Scott Hazard</td>
<td>Covich Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Mark Barth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Brian Larmore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Brooke Barnes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Bruce Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Bruce Parker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Bryan Paetsch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Carolyn Hughes</td>
<td>CD Stimson Companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Charles Kiblinger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Chelo Gable</td>
<td>Cashew Crème</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Chris Dowsing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Chris Nichols</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Chris Warner And Pam Murray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Clay Vredevoogd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Courtney O’neill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Dave Boyd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Dave Cuomo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>David Goll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>David Ramenofsky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Denise Henrikson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Derik Hickling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Diane Turner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Donn Cave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Doug Ollerenshaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Doug Trumm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Ed Garrett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Ed Lazowska</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Ed Pottharst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Elham Simmons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Ellie Winninghoff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Eric Berg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Eric Mcneill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Everett Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Gabe Murphy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Gary Anderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Glen Buhlmann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Harriet Baskas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Jack Whisner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Jamie Swedler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Jason Dougherty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Javier Ortiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Jim Keller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Jon Connolly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Jonathan Jenkins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Jonathan Scanlon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Judy Moise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Julie Hecht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Julia Velonjara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Justin Mayo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Karin Kubischta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Katherine J. Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Katie Lewis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Ken Schiele</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Kirk Griffin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Kriston Mcconnell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Lance Farr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Lee Roberts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Leif Espelund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Lisa Enns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Lizette Hedberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Lyon Terry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Marc Waite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Margy Zimmerman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Mark Foltz</td>
<td>Mark Parker Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Mary Ann Mundy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Mary Slavkovsky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Mark Parker</td>
<td>Mark Parker Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Michael Jaworski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Michael Murray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Michael Redman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Millie Magner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Nathan Soccorsy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Niall Dunne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Nicholas Weikel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Nicholas Sharp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Nick Wagner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Nicole Bradford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Nicole Pawlik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Olga Kachook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Paul Chapman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Paul Tomita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Paul Weiden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Peggy Printz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Perry Sproed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Phillip Singer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Randy Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Richard Becker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Robert Cherry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Robert Neely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Robert Norheim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Ron Dickson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Ruth Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Sarah Vincent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Scott Grandlund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Serena Mora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Shelly Bowman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Shwan Rasheed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Jason Walker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Jason Wax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Jeannette Kane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Jeff Parsons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Jerry Scheller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Jessica Kelley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Jessica Lucas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Jessie Rymph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Jim Liming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Jim Stark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>John Alving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Julia Michalak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Kevin Carrabine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Kevin Kaldestad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Kimberly Kinchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Kristel Wolf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Kyle Steuck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>L. Mishefski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Lauri Sweeney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Linda Mendelson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Linda Schwartz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Lisa Corey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Luke McGuff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Marc Schrameck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Marjorie Bunday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Mark Rubel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Mary Englund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Mary Goldman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Matt Leber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Matthew Snyder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Melinda Mullins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>Merlin Rainwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Michael Hanson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Michael R Wolf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Mike Boyle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Nathan Murdock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Noah Glusenkamp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Peter Krystad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Gary Anderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Rebecca Barnes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Richard Petters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Ron Adams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>Ron Whitman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Russ Mead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>Scott Bonjukian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Shaina Akidau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Stephen Spencer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>Steve Malone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Sumner Parkington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>Susan Helf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>Susan Johnston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>Tarrell Kullaway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>Todd Wathey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Tom Walker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>Whitney Neufeld-Kaiser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>Zach Nostdal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>Ronald Eber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Adam Sherman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>Amanda Scharen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>Andrew Reed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>Annika Elias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>Anthony Hodsdon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>Aura Ruddell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>Blaire Berry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>Brian Ferris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>Brian King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>Briana Orr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>Brooks De Peyster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>Chris Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Chris Loeffler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>Daniel Rowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>Daniel Weise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>David Moise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>David Raible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>David Rust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>Debbie Bermet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>Doug Nellis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>Ed Ledger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Elizabeth Watson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Fulvio Casali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Glen Koski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>Greg Arden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>Jack Brautigam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>Jacqueline Thiebe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Jennie Laird</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>Jenny Heins</td>
<td>Sustainable Ballard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>Jerry Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Jessica Cohen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>Jessica Munns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>Jill McGrath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>Jim And Marsha Lemoine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>John Jordan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>Jon Mcaferty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>Joshua Shanks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>Juan Valera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Julian Davies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>Karen Howell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>Kathy Harris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Katie Idziorek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>Ken Walkky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>Laura Middleton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>Liz Mccarthy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lizmikio@Seanet.Com">Lizmikio@Seanet.Com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Lurline Sweet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Margot Kravette</td>
<td>Seattle Children’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Martha Dilts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Mindy Vredevoogd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Nicole Clopper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Nigel Barron</td>
<td>CSR Marine Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Noah Ketejian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>Pamela Belyea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Paul Obrecht</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Rebekah Strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Rex Wardlaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Rhodri Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Robert Heller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>Robert Kangas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>Ryan Bergsman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>Ryan Kellogg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Sabrina Souza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>Sarah Doherty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>Sasha Kemble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Scott Duckworth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>Scott Travis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>Shirley Savel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>Steve Hurley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Tara Mixon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>Ted Wayland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>Thomas Bayley</td>
<td>CD Stimson Company (President)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>Whitney Holody</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>Andrew Burkhalter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>Andrew Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>Anthony Vallone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>Catherine Hennings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>Chris Rodkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>Colin Grist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>Corey Endo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>Dave Pippin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>David Sabban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>Dayna Loeffler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>Deborah Dickstein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>Eli Brandt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>Elizabeth Andersen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>Eric Crahen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>Hannah Hickey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>Jack Tomkinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>Jake Tracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Jared Clement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>Jen Landry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>Jenn Pierce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>John Carpenter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>John Parejko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>Julie Goldberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Keri Drewry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>Kimberly Malone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>Kristen Mccormick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>Leah Pastrana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>Liam Bradshaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>Liz Gallagher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>Maarten Van Dantzich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>Matt Welsh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>Merlin Woodman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>Mike Wagenbach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>Rachel Nagorsky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>Rebecca Kettwig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>Reid Farris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>Richard Shelmerdine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>Robert Wahlborg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>Robin Briggs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>Simon Pelchat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>Steve Lovell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>Stephen Newman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>Tim Hesterberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>Tim Lewis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>Vicki Shapley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>Alan Greenbaum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>Andrew Dipietro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>Beth Boram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Sean Sheldrake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>Betsy Bruemmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>Carey McGilliard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>Carol Tobin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>Cary Foster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482</td>
<td>Cheryl Haines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>Chris Mehlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>Clint A Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>Clinton Scharen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>Colin Ernst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>Colin Macdonald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>Daniell Heller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>Dave Rider</td>
<td>Simulab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Denise Mamanl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>Dieter Krumpelmann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>Donna Leard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>Douglas Farr</td>
<td>Seattle Farmers Market Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>Eli Patten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>Eric Buer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>G. Lane Soholt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>Gail Kieckhefer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>Hillary Edmonds-Banfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>Howard Langeveld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>James Whiting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>Jeta75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Joanna Hingle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Joanne Epping-Jordan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Jonathan Sirois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>Jory Wackerman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>Keith Jerome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>Kit Galvin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>Les Atlas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>Lila Woods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Lilli Ann Carey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>Linda Hanlon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>Lindsey Zielke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>Mark Olsoe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>Matt Duvall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>Matt Gardner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>Melody Palmber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>Michelle Gail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>Miles Crawford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>Mimi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Nancy Helm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>Neal Zeavy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Nicolas Leduc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>Pat Gilbrough</td>
<td>Ballard Health Club, Owner And Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>Rj Conn</td>
<td>Seattle Children’s - Transportation Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>Robbie Phillips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>Robert Drucker</td>
<td>Red Cottage Studios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>Sheri Mar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>Steve Shuman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>Sue Pierce</td>
<td>West Woodland Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530</td>
<td>Susan Dahl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>Tim O’conner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>Tom Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>Troy Glennon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>Tyler Akidau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>Multiple Senders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>Will Pierce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>Connie Kelleher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>James Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>Julie Alaimo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>David Parsons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>Matthew Peters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>Scott Miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>Robert Elleman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>Connie Combs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>Paul Sorrick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>Rob Snyder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>Rob Zisette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>David Caldwell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>Martin Pagel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>Bridget Hughes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>Peri Hartman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>Renelle Risley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>Multiple Senders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>Christine Ingersoll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>Leslie Hoge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>Robert C Strauss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>Karen Abelsen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>Miller Myers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>Ryan Machamara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>Steph Dietzel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>Mike Kelly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td>Aaron Czyzewski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>Waldemar Cerbinski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>Judy Kirkhuff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td>Thomas Van Pelt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568</td>
<td>Tom Capell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569</td>
<td>Jim Peschel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>Mark Durall</td>
<td>Manager Olympic Athletic Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571</td>
<td>Colleen Lennon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>Johawna Oleana-Perry:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>Robin Randels:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574</td>
<td>Ryan Reiter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td>Andy Lyle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>Lynsey Grunenfelder:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>Josef Mansour:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>578</td>
<td>Jayson Todd Morris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>Jeannine Welfelt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>Michael Wolf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>Doug Farr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>Jalair Box</td>
<td>Canal Station Condos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td>Bruce Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>Craig Hatton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>Robert Kosara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586</td>
<td>Mr. Ackermann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
<td>Jim Walseth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>588</td>
<td>Casey Gifford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>Jeff Dubrue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>David Moise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591</td>
<td>Shannon Koller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>Rudy Pantoja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>Jim Peschel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td>Millie Magner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td>Matt Stevenson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td>Jordan Lowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>Marcia Holiday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>Doug Farr</td>
<td>General Manager Farmers Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>Lee Bruch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>Becky Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>Brian Estes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Bob Edmiston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>Jennifer Goldman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>Gregory Lyle</td>
<td>Ballard Mill Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>Alice Royer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>Jean Darsie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Gil Youenes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>Anson Thurston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>Randi Starup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>Douglas Kingston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>Laurie Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>Warren Aakervik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>Rod Huntress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
<td>Demian Godon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>Lucy Rodriguez-Rogers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>Max Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618</td>
<td>Brent Howe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>Multiple Senders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for your letter. While the Preferred Alternative avoids the Ballard Historic District it would impact the Seattle Lake Shore and Eastern Railroad Grade (SLS&E RR)/Ballard Terminal Railroad (BTR) by relocating the tracks between 14th Ave NW and 17th Ave NW. These construction activities would be coordinated with the owners of the SLS&E RR/BTR and DAHP, as appropriate.
02 - 001 Thank you for your comments.

02 - 002 Please see the Final EIS for information on the Preferred Alternative, including potential impacts to and mitigation for driveway access, parking, and land use concerns. Responses to comment letters received on the Draft EIS from the maritime and industrial community are included in Volume 2 of the Final EIS. SDOT agrees that the EIS process must be a thorough and fair assessment of the alternatives, impacts, and mitigation, and continues to work with the community to address their concerns.

02 - 003 Ensuring the safety of trail users and motor vehicles is a critical component of the project. SDOT recognizes the importance of providing separation for different modes of transportation. SDOT is incorporating City standards and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guidelines for bicycle and trail facilities into the trail design. Roadway modifications, intersection treatments, driveway design, and parking lot changes that could be incorporated in the final design phase of the project to provide separation and address safety, access, nonmotorized users, and vehicle types are described in Section 1.7.1 of the FEIS, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations.

02 - 004 The Preferred Alternative avoids the maritime and industrial businesses along NW 54th St at the west end of the project by following a section of NW Market St. Refer to Section 1.4.2 of the FEIS for a discussion of the selection process, and Section 1.6.1 for a discussion of the Preferred Alternative.

Operation of any of the Build Alternatives would increase safety compared to existing conditions and support the City of Seattle’s long-term plans for increasing safe, nonmotorized transportation. In some cases, street improvements could facilitate freight movement. As noted in the Draft EIS, any of the Build Alternatives would require adjacent land uses to adapt to pedestrian and bicycle traffic using the trail, or to change how they use the existing rights-of-way. No direct displacement of any land use is expected under any of the alternatives. Further, none of the businesses are expected to be disrupted to the extent that it would cause them to cease operations (Technical Appendix A, Land Use Discipline Report).
Thank you for the opportunity to comment. The Port looks forward to working with you and members of both the freight and bicycle communities as the Burke Gilman Trail Missing Link Project moves forward.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Lindsay Putsifer
Managing Director, Maritime
Port of Seattle

Cc: McKendry, Courtney, Gettings, Goodwin, Poor, Stultz, Wolpa
03 - 001 Thank you for your comments. The Preferred Alternative was selected after consideration of all the factors mentioned in your letter. Please see the Final EIS for information on impacts expected from the Preferred Alternative, and refer to Section 1.4.2 of the Final EIS for a discussion of the Preferred Alternative selection process.

Letter No. 3

Scott Kubly, Director
Seattle Department of Transportation
c/o Mark Mazzola, Environmental Manager
P.O. Box 34996
Seattle, WA, 98124-4996

Dear Mr. Kubly,

The Ballard Chamber of Commerce recognizes the importance of completing the Burke Gilman Trail to the Ballard community and generally supports connecting the trail from the intersection of 11th Avenue NW and NW 45th Street on the east to 30th Avenue NW by the Hiram M. Chittenden (Ballard) Locks on the west.

Since the release of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the Ballard Chamber has hosted conversations with the Cascade Bicycle Club, Friends of the Burke Gilman Trail, representatives of the maritime and industrial businesses located on Shilshole Avenue, the Ballard Farmers Market and other businesses that are located within the footprint of the various route options.

As a result, we offer the following for consideration as you prepare the Final Environmental Impact Statement:

- The Ballard Avenue Alternative is not a viable option. The combined operational impacts of this route as it relates to safety, recreation, transportation and parking are too significant.

- With respect to the Shilshole and Leary routes, all present challenges for different reasons. With respect to both the North and South Shilshole routes, a significant portion (greater than one half) of the route is adjacent to industrial uses that depend on freight mobility, which is of concern to many of the businesses along those proposed routes. Also, the Shilshole routes will incur a significant loss of on-street parking.

- While the Leary alternative appears to present the least impact to the community and businesses within Ballard, many stakeholders have expressed concerns that the route may not be suitable for connecting the Burke Gilman.
We encourage you to significantly review the impact that each of those alternatives will have most importantly on safety, as well as parking, freight mobility, traffic and transportation.

Additionally, we encourage design creativity and flexibility with respect to the final trail configuration.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to engaging in this conversation in the months ahead.

Sincerely,

Paul Sivesind
Co-President, Board of Directors

Eric Stoll
Co-President, Board of Directors
Thank you for your comments. The Ballard Avenue Alternative was not chosen as the Preferred Alternative; therefore, impacts to the historic districts are not anticipated.

July 28, 2016

Scott Kubly, Director
Seattle Department of Transportation
c/o Mark Mazzola, Environmental Manager
P.O. Box 34996
Seattle, WA, 98124-4996

Via e-mail

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link

Dear Mr. Kubly,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Burke-Gilman Trail (BGT) Missing Link in Ballard. Historic Seattle is the only citywide nonprofit dedicated to protecting Seattle’s unique character through our efforts to educate, advocate, and preserve.

As an organization dedicated to advocacy, we’re concerned about the project’s potential impact as it relates to one of the proposed alternatives, the Ballard Avenue NW alignment, which extends through two historic districts (National Register-listed and City-designated Ballard Avenue Landmark District), and borders the north edge of another National Register district, Hiram M. Chittenden Locks District.

We’re aware that the DEIS does not identify a preferred alternative among the four routes analyzed, which will be reanalyzed and selected in the Final EIS. Cultural resources are addressed in Chapter 10 of the DEIS (10-1 – 10-12), which mentions the three historic districts within the project area.

Two primary goals of the historic district is to protect the historic and architectural values and characteristics, and to maintain the “aesthetic and economic vitality.” Aspects of this include its pedestrian oriented streetscape and self-contained, small town quality.

We contend that this alignment will have a negative impact on business and disrupt the symbiotic business-building-streetscape relationship. Healthy businesses yield sustainable and cared-for historic buildings.

The proposed alignment would adversely impact its streetscape features including the historic brick street pavers (covered by asphalt), remnants of streetcar lines, granite curbs, and hitching rings. The Ballard Avenue NW alignment would result in removal of these important character-defining elements.

Furthermore, it would significantly alter the district’s vibrant pedestrian orientation, which promotes local businesses and its “Main Street” feel. It would also displace the Ballard Farmer’s Market, which is an integral part of the district’s character.
The three main criteria for the BGT’s “Missing Link” are that it’s safe, simple, and connected. The proposed Ballard Avenue NW alignment is:

- **Not safe** – this route would intersect with numerous driveways and load zones that accommodate local businesses, and would cause conflicts between pedestrian and bicycle traffic.
- **Not simple** – this route turns north into Ballard’s core and extends through the heart of the historic district, and requires more turns and jogs than the other three alternatives.
- **Not Connected** – this route is the longest (1.65 miles) and is geographically disconnected from the other segments of the trail that hug the existing or abandoned rail line right-of-way.

There are other more viable alternatives that meet these criteria. Thank you again for this opportunity to weigh in about historic places that matter.

Sincerely,

Kji Kelly
Executive Director

---

04 - 002 Your comment is noted. Please refer to the response to Comment 04-001.
Thank you for your comments.

Safety is a primary consideration throughout the trail design process, including for the preliminary trail alignment layout, sight distance, turning radii, intersection design features, pavement treatments, and signage. Please refer to Section 1.7.1 of the Final EIS for a discussion of Roadway Design and Safety Considerations.

August 1, 2016

Scott Kubly, Director
c/o Mark Mazzola, Environmental Manager
Seattle Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 34996
Seattle, WA 98124-4996

Dear Messrs. Kubly and Mazzola:

The North Seattle Industrial Association strongly recommends that the preferred alternative for the Missing Link of the Burke Gilman Trail should be the Market and Leary corridor. Market and Leary has the least impact on maritime/industrial businesses and is the safest corridor. While that general corridor should be Market and Leary, we recommend that the safest design would be the Ballard Cycle Track, http://www.ballardcycletrails.com.

In regard to the location of the Missing Link of the Burke-Gilman Trail, for Ballard maritime/industrial businesses, safety is our number one concern. Many of our businesses use heavy equipment on site and ship raw materials and finished goods from their Ballard sites on large trucks. These trucks are very large, and it is very hard for the drivers to see relatively small moving bicycles and pedestrians.

The concerns about safety are what drives our opposition to the current City of Seattle proposal for the Missing Link to be along 45th and the south side of Shilshole Ave along the waterfront south of market.

Large vehicles whether trucks or buses have been a major cause of deaths by bicyclists, particular in Seattle. Maritime/industrial businesses do not want their trucks and drivers involved in accidents that will cause deaths and injuries for bicyclists and pedestrians.
When a bicyclist or a pedestrian hits a truck, it is they who suffer, not the truck.

Unfortunately, safety has not driven the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) in developing the four alternatives in the EIS study. The Seattle Department of Transportation has never undertaken a safety study to see what potential routes should be in the EIS. It has not used the over million dollars it spent on this EIS to do a safety study or use it in their analysis.

SDOT's lack of safety analysis is especially troubling since the Mayor has made clear his commitment to traffic safety through his Vision Zero program.

The favorite route for SDOT has been exactly the route that the railroad has used since the rail line was first laid down in Ballard. The route was not chosen because it was safe, just because the railroad tracks were already there. This is how the rest of the Burke-Gilman trail was done.

Much has changed since these initial plans were drawn. The role of bicycle commuting and the substantial increase of Seattle's population are just two. Yet SDOT has made no adjustments in their plans, particularly in regard to safety.

The type of bicycle facility they picked for analysis for the EIS is the same on that they would use if they choose the railroad right of way for the path. This is an outdated, unsafe design, that SDOT does not normally use to develop any of their new bicycle facility in an urban area. Yet it continues to use this unsafe design where it brings children and families into the proximity of heavy trucks and equipment.

The SDOT design mixes pedestrian and bicycles together in a 12-foot-wide path. Modern day design calls for 12-foot-wide cycle tracks for bicycles, and 10-12-foot-wide pedestrian walking path.

The SDOT trail design is not mandated by law or City Council resolution, it was chosen by SDOT staff, which raises serious questions about their concern for and knowledge of bicycle safety.

There are significant deficiencies in the economic analysis of the EIS. The consultants did not list the maritime businesses, nor did they do any analysis of the economic on the impact on the maritime

05 - 003 Please refer to the response to Comment 05-002.

05 - 004 The Preferred Alternative was chosen because it best meets the project’s objectives to complete the Burke-Gilman Trail by creating a safe, direct, and defined multi-use trail for persons of all abilities, for a variety of transportation and recreational activities, and to maintain truck and freight facilities and access that support industrial and water-dependent uses in the area.

Safety and predictability are critical components of the project. SDOT is incorporating City standards and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guidelines for bicycle and trail facilities into the trail design. Roadway modifications, intersection treatments, driveway design, and parking lot changes that could be incorporated in the final design phase of the project to address safety, access, nonmotorized users, and vehicle types are described in Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design Considerations.

05 - 005 The Preferred Alternative's proposed 10- to 12-foot wide multi-use trail meets City standards and the current AASHTO and NACTO guidelines for the design of trail facilities. In several sections the multi-use trail will serve as the sidewalk for pedestrians as well as the path for other users. From NW 54th Street to the intersection of NW Market Street and 24th Ave NW, there would be a 6- to 10-foot sidewalk adjacent to the multi-use trail.

05 - 006 Please refer to the responses to comments 05-002 and 05-004 and to Section 1.4.2 of the FEIS for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative.
businesses of the four alternatives. For a million dollars spent we cannot find any business who they interview on the economic impact of the various alternatives.

The Market/Leary alternatives brings bicycles closer to the Ballard's retail businesses and has the least loss of parking of the four alternatives.

According to the EIS, all four alternatives deliver the same pedestrian and bicycle access. So the City should pick the safest one and one that impacts the Ballard maritime/businesses the least. The Market/Leary corridor.

NSIA agrees with the letter from the Ballard Business Appellants on the legal issues in this situation and need for a supplemental EIS.

Yours sincerely,

Eugene Wasserman
President

NSIA agrees with the letter from the Ballard Business Appellants on the legal issues in this situation and need for a supplemental EIS.

Your comment is noted.

While any of the build alternatives would provide a route for trail users through the Ballard Neighborhood, there are important distinctions between the alternatives in terms of directness of route, number of roadway and driveway intersections, and adjacent land uses. These elements not only factor into the usability of the trail, but also the perceived safety of the trail. SDOT determined that the Leary Alternative did not meet the project objectives as well as the Preferred Alternative. Refer to Section 1.4.2 of the FEIS for a discussion of the process to identify the Preferred Alternative.

Your comment is noted. Please refer to the response to Comment 09-013.
Letter No. 6

From: Board of Directors SFMA <board@sfmamarkets.com>
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2016 3:14 PM
To: BGT_MissingLink_Info
Cc: brian.susatt@seattle.gov
Subject: Ballard Farmers Market Survival

July 29, 2016

Scott Kubly, Director
Seattle Department of Transportation
c/o Mark Mazzola, Environmental Manager
P.O. Box 34966
Seattle, WA 98124-4966

Re: Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link Project

Dear Director Kubly:

The Seattle Farmers Market Association supports completing the Missing Link of the Burke-Gilman Trail in Ballard to improve safety, recreation, and access for all. However, the SFMA opposes the Ballard Avenue Alternative because of the adverse economic impact it would have on retail businesses in Ballard, especially the Ballard Farmers Market.

Loss of Parking: Clearly, the loss of 198 convenient parking spaces would adversely impact 100+ retail businesses located on Ballard Avenue. Most of the spaces are controlled by City-owned pay stations, which encourages turnover and improves public access to businesses. Eliminating the parking and the pay stations on the entire West side of Ballard Avenue represents taking two steps back for businesses on a street that already has insufficient parking to support demand. Also, the removal of 14 designated load/unload spaces would make already existing freight delivery problems on Ballard Avenue worse, which would definitely result in more double parked delivery trucks blocking both lanes of traffic.

Closing the Farmers Market: The Ballard Avenue Alternative would adversely impact approximately 140 vendors who operate every Sunday at the Ballard Farmers Market. Closing the market for several months to install a multi-use trail and divider would harm the Farmers Market and the neighboring businesses who depend on the customer traffic generated by the Market. Many of the vendors rely solely on the Market for their income and could not afford to close for several months. Also, because the usable width of the street for the Market would significantly decrease after construction, the Market would only be able to accommodate about 1/3 of the number of vendors they do now. Moreover, because a 20’ fire lane is required to operate the event, it might be necessary to “move the Market to a new location.” DEIS, 5-18, June 2016. Frankly, this downsizing or temporary closure would be the demise of the market and destabilize the rest of the markets operating in our association.

06 - 001 Thank you for your comments.

06 - 002 The Preferred Alternative for the trail would be located along NW Market St, Shilshole Ave NW, and NW 45th St and would not remove parking from Ballard Ave NW. While some parking will be eliminated along those streets, SDOT would seek to minimize parking loss and implement measures to reduce the impacts as described in Section 8.4.1 of the FEIS.

06 - 003 Your comment is noted. These considerations were taken into account as part of the alternative evaluation process.
This is unprecedented. In fact, no other business mentioned in the DEIS Report would be required to close for several months, dramatically downsized, or forced to relocate somewhere else. Hopefully, you will recall, the City of Seattle invited the Farmers Market to Ballard. Accordingly, I think the City should be celebrating and protecting what they helped create. The Ballard Farmers Market has been a HUGE success for everyone—by creating jobs, improving the local economy, and supporting access to healthy organic food options. Also, it has created a safe community gathering place for residents to greet, interact, and support each other.

Therefore, please carefully consider the adverse impacts that the Ballard Avenue Alternative would have on businesses in Ballard, including the Ballard Farmers Market.

Sincerely,

Jon Hegeman, Director
Ballard Farmers Market
Seattle Farmers Market Association

cc: Brian Surratt, Director, Office of Economic Development
Board of Directors
Seattle Farmers Market Association | SFMA | Est.1990
Board@SFMAmarkets.com | www.SFMAmarkets.com

Proudly Organizing 3 Farmers Markets in the Ballard, Madrona, & Wallingford Districts.
Thank you for your comments. SDOT agrees that the Missing Link would provide numerous benefits. Please see Section 1.6.1 of the FEIS for information on the Preferred Alternative.

The Preferred Alternative’s proposed 10- to 12-foot wide multi-use trail meets the current AASHTO and NACTO guidelines for the design of trail facilities. In several sections the multi-use trail will serve as the sidewalk for pedestrians as well as the path for other users. From NW 54th Street to the intersection of NW Market Street and 24th Ave NW, there would be a 6- to 10-foot sidewalk adjacent to the multi-use trail. Please also refer to comment response 09-012.

Since 2001, Feet First has been advocating for transportation improvements that make traveling safer, accessible, and more inviting for people of all ages and abilities to go by foot throughout Washington. Feet First appreciates the opportunity to provide input on the “Missing Link”, which would connect the Burke-Gilman Trail through Ballard, providing a single, continuous non-motorized path from the north end of Lake Washington all the way to Golden Gardens in the Ballard neighborhood of Seattle.

This path would provide numerous benefits, including access for people on foot to local businesses in Ballard. It would provide easier connections to and from Ballard and surrounding neighborhoods. A properly designed path would also reduce current conflict between people on foot and those on bicycles, who often ride on the sidewalk because of the current lack of a safe space for bikes in the roadway.

The Draft EIS indicates that all four of the build alternatives - Shilshole Avenue South, Shilshole Avenue North, Ballard Avenue, and Leary Avenue NW - consist of a shared use path 10-12 ft. wide. All alternatives other than the Shilshole Avenue South alternative also include separated sidewalks, most often adjacent to the shared use path for most of the length of the project. The widths range from 6.8 ft. wide to 10-12 feet wide, depending on the alternative, and specific segment (widths on Ballard Avenue and Leary Avenue NW vary).

Feet First believes that separated sidewalks provide a much safer environment for people of all ages and abilities to safely and easily walk bike, particularly during the time of year when the weather is more inviting for active transportation, and on the weekends, which substantially increase the use of the trail. The Shilshole Avenue South alternative does not provide the option for separation of people walking from people biking; this is critical to safe and predictable use of limited space by the most vulnerable—a person walking.
Thank you for your comments. SDOT agrees that the Missing Link would provide numerous benefits. Please see Section 1.6.1 of the FEIS for information on the Preferred Alternative.

The Preferred Alternative's proposed 10- to 12-foot wide multi-use trail meets the current AASHTO and NACTO guidelines for the design of trail facilities. In several sections the multi-use trail will serve as the sidewalk for pedestrians as well as the path for other users. From NW 54th Street to the intersection of NW Market Street and 24th Ave NW, there would be a 6- to 10-foot sidewalk adjacent to the multi-use trail. Please also refer to comment response 09-012.

SDOT recognizes the importance of the Missing Link as a transportation facility that supports local businesses in the Ballard area, including access for pedestrians. The Preferred Alternative will increase pedestrian access to businesses by adding intersection improvements along Shilshole Ave NW such as new crosswalks, curb bulbs, and intersection controls. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 of the Final EIS for additional information on how the Preferred Alternative was selected, including integration with existing and planned pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the area.

As noted in Section 1.2, the project is intended to create a safe, direct, and defined multi-use trail for persons of all ages and abilities, for a variety of transportation and recreational activities, and to improve predictability for motorized and nonmotorized users along the alignment. Trail designers will take into account Universal Design principles, among other applicable design guidelines and City standards.
Thank you for your comments. As noted in Section 1.2, the project objectives are to create a safe, direct, and defined multi-use trail for persons of all abilities for a variety of transportation and recreational activities, to improve predictability for motorized and non-motorized users along the project alignment, and to maintain truck and freight facilities and access that support industrial and water-dependent uses in the area. SDOT decided upon the Preferred Alternative because it best met the project objectives out of the alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS.

As reflected in the project objectives, safety and predictability are critical components of the project. Please refer to Section 1.7.1 for a discussion of roadway design and safety considerations.

Your comment noted. SDOT proposes to keep the same look and feel of the Burke-Gilman Trail throughout the Missing Link segment.
Thank you for your comments. As noted in Section 1.2, the project objectives are to create a safe, direct, and defined multi-use trail for persons of all abilities for a variety of transportation and recreational activities, to improve predictability for motorized and non-motorized users along the project alignment, and to maintain truck and freight facilities and access that support industrial and water-dependent uses in the area. SDOT decided upon the Preferred Alternative because it best met the project objectives out of the alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS.

As reflected in the project objectives, safety and predictability are critical components of the project. Please refer to Section 1.7.1 for a discussion of roadway design and safety considerations.

The intent of the No Build Alternative is to establish the baseline against which the anticipated impacts of the build alternatives are measured. However, SDOT agrees that the No Build Alternative does not meet the stated objectives for the project (Section 1.2).

Your comment is noted. The Preferred Alternative includes the trail and improvements along Shilshole Ave NW.

Your comment is noted. SDOT proposes to keep the same look and feel of the Burke-Gilman Trail throughout the Missing Link segment.

Your comment noted.

Your comment is noted.

Your comment is noted.

Your comment is noted.

Your comment is noted.

Your comment is noted.

Your comment is noted.
Thank you for your comments. As noted in Section 1.2, the project objectives are to create a safe, direct, and defined multi-use trail for persons of all abilities for a variety of transportation and recreational activities, to improve predictability for motorized and non-motorized users along the project alignment, and to maintain truck and freight facilities and access that support industrial and water-dependent uses in the area. SDOT decided upon the Preferred Alternative because it best met the project objectives out of the alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS.

As reflected in the project objectives, safety and predictability are critical components of the project. Please refer to Section 1.7.1 for a discussion of roadway design and safety considerations.

The intent of the No Build Alternative is to establish the baseline against which the anticipated impacts of the build alternatives are measured. However, SDOT agrees that the No Build Alternative does not meet the stated objectives for the project (Section 1.2).

Your comment is noted.

Your comment is noted.

Your comment is noted. The Preferred Alternative includes the trail and improvements along Shilshole Ave NW.

Your comment is noted.

Your comment is noted.

Your comment is noted. SDOT proposes to keep the same look and feel of the Burke-Gilman Trail throughout the Missing Link segment.
Your comment is noted. As stated previously the project’s objectives are to complete the Burke-Gilman Trail and maintain truck and freight facilities and access that support industrial and water-dependent uses in the area. While the Shilshole South Alternative wouldn’t displace official on-street loading zones, it would displace unorganized (informal) parking and a loading dock along NW 45th St that currently occurs within the public right-of-way. The Preferred Alternative, however, allows the loading dock to remain.

Thank you for your comments. As noted in Section 1.2, the project objectives are to create a safe, direct, and defined multi-use trail for persons of all abilities for a variety of transportation and recreational activities, to improve predictability for motorized and non-motorized users along the project alignment, and to maintain truck and freight facilities and access that support industrial and water-dependent uses in the area. SDOT decided upon the Preferred Alternative because it best met the project objectives out of the alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS.

As reflected in the project objectives, safety and predictability are critical components of the project. Please refer to Section 1.7.1 for a discussion of roadway design and safety considerations.

The intent of the No Build Alternative is to establish the baseline against which the anticipated impacts of the build alternatives are measured. However, SDOT agrees that the No Build Alternative does not meet the stated objectives for the project (Section 1.2).

Your comment is noted. The Preferred Alternative includes the trail and improvements along Shilshole Ave NW.
Your comment is noted. As stated previously, the project's objectives are to complete the Burke-Gilman Trail and maintain truck and freight facilities and access that support industrial and water-dependent uses in the area. While the Shilshole South Alternative would not displace official on-street loading zones, it would displace unorganized (informal) parking and a loading dock along NW 45th St that currently occurs within the public right-of-way. The Preferred Alternative, however, allows the loading dock to remain.

Your comment is noted. Chapter 7 describes the potential impacts associated with loading zones and potential transit delay associated with the Shilshole North Alternative.

Your comment is noted. Impacts associated with the Farmer's Market are further described in Section 5.3.6 of the FEIS.

Your comment is noted.

SDOT agrees that facilities such as protected bike lanes would not meet the project's objective of completing the Burke-Gilman Trail by creating a safe, direct, and defined multi-use trail for persons of all abilities, for a variety of transportation and recreational activities. Section 1.9 of the FEIS describes in greater detail the project alternatives that were not included because they did not meet the project objectives.
The intent of the No Build Alternative is to establish the baseline against which the anticipated impacts of the build alternatives are measured. However, SDOT agrees that not completing the Missing Link conflicts with several of the City’s transportation goals.

For the purposes of the EIS, SDOT presumed that all potential trail users would shift to the trail corridor proposed under each Build Alternative to have a comparable analysis between alternatives. While a route along Shilshole Ave NW has been selected as the Preferred Alternative, SDOT acknowledges that, if the Ballard or Leary Alternatives would have been chosen, people biking would likely continue to use Shilshole Ave NW. Any subsequent improvement along Shilshole Ave NW would have had to be considered and evaluated as a separate project.

Delays for non-motorized users were not specifically calculated as pedestrians and bicyclists travel at a wide range of speeds. The Preferred Alternative balances the directness of the route with safety and access concerns.

Your comment is noted.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Kiker
Executive Director, Cascade Bicycle Club
CC: Mayor Ed Murray
Scott Kubly, SDOT Director
Members of Seattle City Council
The Draft EIS does not discuss the City’s Race and Social Justice Initiative (RSJI) because it is not within the scope of the State Environmental Policy Act. SDOT applies RSJI to its bicycle planning efforts outside the context of SEPA and has applied, and will continue to apply, the RSJI toolkit to the implementation of the specific Missing Link Project. The “early” application of the RSJI toolkit occurred with the equity analysis included in the Bike Master Plan (BMP) (see the response to comment 18-001). Specific to the Missing Link, the outreach team will develop an Inclusive Outreach and Public Engagement plan for this phase of the project. The plan will include a demographic analysis of the project area as well as an analysis of how racial and economic equity can be improved with the Missing Link Project.

SDOT disagrees with the assertion that the Seattle Bike Master Plan 2016-2020 Implementation Plan (March, 2016) includes only one project in communities of color (for information on how the Seattle Bike Master Plan identifies communities of color, and projects planned for those areas, please see the response to comment 18-001). While the Missing Link project itself is not located in one of the seven census tracts identified, it is one of many projects put forth in the 2016-2020 Implementation Plan.

Further, the project would serve not only the residents of the project study area since the objective of the Missing Link project is to complete the last leg of the Burke-Gilman Trail, a regional trail facility that otherwise runs continuously between Golden Gardens Park and the City of Bothell where it connects with the Sammamish River Trail. The Burke-Gilman Trail currently serves a large portion of Seattle and the region as a highly used nonmotorized transportation and recreational facility.
Please refer to the responses to comment 09-001 and 18-001.

SDOT agrees with NACTO’s assertion that safety gains are important for low-income people and people of color. The Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link project would improve safety for all users traveling through the study area, compared to the existing condition. The project would not serve only the residents of the project study area since the purpose of the Missing Link project is to complete the last leg of the Burke-Gilman Trail, a regional trail facility that otherwise runs continuously between Golden Gardens Park and the City of Bothell where it connects with the Sammamish River Trail. The Burke-Gilman Trail currently serves a large portion of Seattle and the region as a highly used nonmotorized transportation and recreational facility.

Please also refer to the response to Comment 09-005 regarding the project and housing affordability.

SDOT’s failure to apply the RSJI to the Missing Link also runs contrary to national equitable bicycle policy propagated by the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO). In July 2016, NATCO published a report titled “NATCO Bike Share Equity Practitioners’ Paper #3” wherein it stated:

“[S]afety gains are particularly important for low-income people and people of color. These groups make up an increasingly large part of the cycling population but often lack protected bike lanes in their neighborhoods. They disproportionately bear the burden of fatalities and injuries from dangerous drivers and poorly designed streets. An analysis from the League of American Bicyclists found that Black and Hispanic cyclists had a fatality rate 30% and 23% higher than white cyclists. Ensuring that people have transportation options that are efficient, convenient, and safe is fundamental to efforts to reduce income inequality in the United States today.

NATCO Bike Share Equity Practitioners’ Paper #3, page 2. SDOT’s continued preoccupation with completing the Missing Link at the expense of providing equitable bicycle facilities throughout the City—and especially in communities of color—runs contrary to NACTO policy and the City’s RSJI. Also, SDOT’s myopic focus undermines the City’s efforts to address housing affordability in Seattle.

Comments:

1. Please explain how and when SDOT applied the RSJI to the Missing Link Project?
2. If SDOT did not, or has not, please explain why it has not and when SDOT plans to apply the RSJI and Toolkit to the Missing Link?
3. If SDOT plans to do so at a latter date, please explain how the delayed application of RSJI complies with the Racial Equity Toolkit’s requirement it be applied “early” and how it will be reflected in the Final EIS?
4. If SDOT does not plan to apply the RSJI or the Toolkit, please explain in the Final EIS why SDOT is not doing so and how this project is exempt from the RSJI?
5. Please explain how completing the Missing Link will serve communities of color and other traditionally underserved communities in Seattle?
6. Please explain how completing the Missing Link complies with NACTO’s equity policies stated above?
7. Please explain how completing the Missing Link will address bicycle safety in Seattle’s communities of color and other traditionally underserved communities in Seattle?
The purpose of the environmental review process is to evaluate the potential impacts of completing the Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link and not to evaluate whether project funds should be spent elsewhere. The cost to complete the Burke-Gilman Trail has not yet been determined, and is outside the scope of this EIS.

The completion of the Burke-Gilman Trail through Ballard has been a priority for the City since the 1990s. As described in Section 1.2, there are currently a number of barriers for people walking, biking, or rolling between the existing trail ends. The objective of the project is to create a safe, direct, and defined multi-use path for people of all abilities and for a variety of transportation and recreational activities, and to maintain truck and freight facilities and access that support industrial and water-dependent land uses within the shoreline district and BINMIC.

The budget for the EIS and the cost to complete the Final EIS are outside the scope of and not pertinent to the environmental review for completing the Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link. EIS costs have been affected by the requests for additional, detailed information, by the development and evaluation of four alternatives, and by SDOT’s commitment to provide thorough objective responses to comments throughout the process.
The purpose of the environmental review process is to evaluate the potential impacts of completing the Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link and not to evaluate whether project funds should be spent elsewhere.

As provided by SMC 25.05.450, a cost-benefit study is not required by SEPA. SDOT has not prepared a cost-benefit analysis for the BGT Missing Link. For purposes of complying with SEPA, the weighing of the merits and drawbacks of the various alternatives need not be displayed in a monetary cost-benefit analysis and should not be when there are important environmental and community considerations.

SDOT did not develop cost estimates for the build alternatives, which, as previously stated, are outside of the scope of SEPA and not relevant to the evaluation of environmental and community impacts considered in the EIS. Overall project cost will be considered by the City as part of its decision-making process. A baseline cost estimate will be developed for the Preferred Alternative once the project’s design phase is underway.
A. What is the basis for that estimate?
B. What is SDOT’s cost estimate to construct the Leary alternative?
C. What is the basis for that estimate?

In 2013, Mayor McGinn and SDOT promised the Ballard community that the EIS would include both design and locational alternatives, including the Ballard Cycle Track Proposal. SDOT broke its promise by failing to include any design alternatives in the DEIS and spent just two sentences in the DEIS explaining why it did not include protected bicycle facilities—see page 1-28 of the DEIS.

Comments:

22. What is the basis for SDOT’s policy decision to break its promise to the Ballard community and not include design alternative in the DEIS?
23. Since all of SDOT’s Alternatives include a sidewalk next to the recreational trail, how come SDOT would not consider protected bicycle facilities with a similar adjacent sidewalk?
24. Explain how a sidewalk next to a protected bicycle facility would not provide “safe accommodations for pedestrians and other nonmotorized users”?
25. How would using a combination of protected bicycle facilities and adjacent sidewalks to complete the Missing Link be any different—better, worse, more safe, less safe—than the Westlake Cycle Track project?
26. Please explain why SDOT used a combination of a protected bicycle facility next to a sidewalk for other non-motorized users in Westlake but refuses to consider such a combination for the Missing Link?

D. The Draft EIS Does Not Comply With the Hearing Examiner’s 2012 Order and Judge Rogers Order.

The Draft EIS is materially insufficient and fatally flawed because SDOT failed to sufficiently design each alternative route so it could properly assess potential significant adverse environmental impacts as Ordered by the Hearing Examiner in 2012 and Judge Rogers in 2011. In Washington, the adequacy of an EIS is determined under the “rule of reason.” See Weyerhaeuser, 124 Wn.2d 26, 41 (1994), citing Barrie v. Kittap Cy., 93 Wn.2d 943, 894 (1980). “To be adequate, an EIS must present decisionmakers with a ‘reasonably thorough discussion of the significant aspects of the probable environmental consequences’ of the agency’s decision.” See Kiewit Const. Grp. Inc. v. Clark Cty., 83 Wn.App. 123, 140 (1996), citing Klickitat Cty. Citizens Against Imported Waste v. Klickitat Cty., 122 Wn.2d 619, 633 (1993); see also Weyerhaeuser, 124 Wn.2d at 38. Further, an EIS “must provide sufficient information to allow officials to make a reasoned choice among alternatives.” See Kiewit Const. 83 Wn.App. at 140.

09 - 011 When developing an environmental impact statement, SEPA requires that project proponents evaluate alternatives that accomplish the project objectives. The project objective has always been and remains completion of the Burke-Gilman Trail, which is a multi-use trail that accommodates pedestrians, bicycles, skaters, and other non-motorized forms of travel on a single trail.

When deciding upon alternatives to fully evaluate in the Draft EIS, SDOT determined that a cycle track or protected bike lane would not meet the project objectives, as these types of facilities are only meant for bicycles. Although some portions of each alternative may retain a sidewalk parallel to the trail, in order to maintain consistency with other existing portions of the Burke-Gilman Trail, the trail is multi-use throughout in all alternatives considered. Please see Section 1.9 of the FEIS for further discussion about the alternatives that were not carried forward.

09 - 012 As noted in Section 1.2 of the FEIS, the purpose of the project is to complete a multi-use trail. While protected bicycle lanes may fulfill the transportation needs through the area for cyclists, sidewalks do not fulfill the same purpose for pedestrians and other nonmotorized users. Sidewalks do not fulfill the same purpose as a multi-use trail for pedestrians and other nonmotorized users. Sidewalks are intended for entering and exiting businesses, tend to be more of a location for people gathering and mingling, may contain sidewalk seating, signage, and landscaping.

The Missing Link has existing established multi-use trail segments on either end, whereas the Westlake Cycle Track was intended only as a cycle track to facilitate bicycle ingress and egress to and through the Westlake area.
SDOT disagrees with the commenter’s characterization of the prior Hearing Examiner and Court orders, which were made in the context of the adequacy of determinations of non-significance that are no longer valid and are no longer being relied upon. Also, SEPA does not demand a particular substantive result, particularly related to aspects of a project such as general “safety” that are not elements of the environment required to be evaluated. Although SDOT designs all facilities to operate safely and that is a primary goal of the project, SEPA does not demand that result.

The EIS appropriately relies on designs at approximately 10% level of design for each of the build alternatives, which SDOT determined was sufficient to evaluate any potential significant adverse environmental impacts. SEPA requires that “The basic features and analysis of the proposal, alternatives, and impacts shall be discussed in the EIS and shall be generally understood without turning to other documents; however, an EIS is not required to include all information conceivably relevant to a proposal...” (WAC 197-11-402(6)). SEPA encourages EISs to be prepared early in the process (WAC 197-11-406 and WAC 197-11-055). Here, the level of design for alternatives allowed an evaluation of the features of the alternatives, with conservative assumptions to ensure that impacts were adequately identified and fully considered. The level of design was in enough detail for comparative purposes, and to determine whether design features could be employed to mitigate potential impacts. The potential traffic hazard impacts described by the Hearing Examiner were identified and a variety of possible design options were developed and could be employed to create a safely operating trail. Additional discussion of design and safety considerations are included in the FEIS in Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations.


27. **How does SDOT’s level of trail and alternative design comply with the Hearing Examiner’s Order?**
28. **How does SDOT’s level of trail and alternative design comply with Judge Roger’s Order?**
29. **What is the level (percentage) of design for the Shilshole South Alternative?**
30. **What is the basis for that estimate?**
31. **What is the level (percentage) of design for the Shilshole North alternative?**
The EIS identifies potential conflicts between trail users and vehicles, such as at driveways and intersections, which are common to all alternatives. For each alternative evaluated in the DEIS and FEIS, Section 7.3 discusses potential traffic hazards specific to that alternative, under the heading “Safety”. It also identifies means to reduce or eliminate conflicts between modes. The Final EIS includes additional information on design and safety considerations in Section 1.7.1.

During the development of the alternatives to be evaluated in the Draft EIS, an AutoTURN analysis was completed for a representative sample of driveways along the alignments. The purpose of the analysis was to determine the appropriate driveway width needed to accommodate the range of vehicles that would use those driveways. Inadequate driveway width could result in temporary restriction of traffic flow as larger vehicles have to swing into opposing traffic lanes, and can result in delays because such movements can require waiting for an opening in traffic in both directions. It should be noted that large trucks regularly block traffic on streets on a temporary basis throughout the study area at present, and these types of interruptions are not considered significant impacts. For the Draft EIS, the types of vehicles that were assumed to use the driveways were consistent with the type of land use in the area. For driveways where an AutoTURN analysis was not completed, widths were assumed to be consistent with those developed for driveways that were analyzed using AutoTURN. This level of analysis is adequate to understand the potential magnitude of impact associated with each of the alignments. Appendix A of the FEIS contains AutoTURN analyses. Additional AutoTURN analyses may be conducted as the project progresses through design, if needed.

SDOT must withdraw the Draft EIS and prepare a Supplement Draft EIS that includes sufficient trail designs for each Alternative so it can properly evaluate potential significant adverse impacts, including, without limit, traffic hazard and land use impacts for each Alternative.

E. Errors and Omissions

SDOT’s Draft EIS contains significant and fatal errors and omissions. It must be withdrawn and a Supplement Draft EIS be prepared and issued. In addition to the items noted in the Comment Matrix below, the Draft EIS contains the following errors and omissions:

Comments:

On Page 1.4 in the Scoping Section, SDOT states:

“Safety is not itself an element of the environment to be reviewed under SEPA. In addition, the analysis in an EIS is conducted at an early stage of project development, such that it is not possible to examine all safety issues that could be resolved through detailed design.”

SDOT’s statement, however, contradicts the Hearing Examiner’s Order, which states:

“…the Examiner concludes that the proposal would have significant adverse impacts in the form of traffic hazards…because of conflicts between truck movements and other vehicle traffic and trail users…”

43. Please explain how the DEIS sufficiently addresses and resolves significant traffic hazards impacts between trucks, vehicles and trail users?
As described in response to prior comments, SDOT disagrees with the commenter’s characterization of the prior Hearing Examiner and Court orders, which were made in the context of the adequacy of determinations of non-significance that are no longer valid and are no longer being relied upon. Also, SEPA does not demand a particular substantive result, particularly related to aspects of a project such as general “safety” that are not elements of the environment required to be evaluated. So although SDOT designs all facilities to operate safely and that is a primary goal of the project, SEPA does not demand that result.

That said, potential traffic hazard impacts, including any potential conflicts between vehicles and trail users, are analyzed and disclosed in FEIS Section 7.3. Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations also lists methods that can and would be employed to reduce the risk of such conflicts. Although the final design has not been determined, the analysis considers the range of potential impacts that could result from the project along each alignment and identifies potential mitigation measures.

These businesses were inadvertently left out of the Land Use Discipline Report as a result of a mapping error. Please see Section 4.3 of the FEIS for corrected tables, and Technical Appendix A (Volume 3) for an Update and Errata of the Land Use Discipline Report. This corrected information was considered as part of the impact evaluation process, however, the omissions did not change the determination of impact significance.

Individual business owners were interviewed as a part of the transportation analysis for the FEIS, and a summary of the interviews is contained in Technical Appendix B. Concerns regarding potential operational impacts were considered and are addressed in Chapter 4, Chapter 7, Chapter 8, and in Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) of the FEIS.

As described in response to prior comments, SEPA encourages the preparation of an EIS at the earliest possible point in the planning and decision-making process, when the principal features of a proposal and its environmental impacts can be reasonably identified. See WAC 197-11-055. Here, the level of design for each alternative is sufficient to evaluate the potential impacts, including traffic hazard and land use impacts. These potential impacts are discussed throughout the EIS. Please see Section 1.8 of the FEIS for further detail regarding potential traffic hazards associated with the alternatives. There is no basis for the preparation of a supplemental EIS. See WAC 197-11-405(4).

Phone interviews were conducted with property owners along the Preferred, Shilshole South, and Shilshole North Alternatives as part of the FEIS. Information about vehicle movements (backing into/out of driveways); busy times of the day, week, and year; and vehicle types was collected during the interviews. Results of the interviews were incorporated into Section 4.2.2.3 of Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) and Section 7.2.3 of the Final EIS. Interview notes are included in Appendix B of the Transportation Discipline Report (Technical Appendix B of the FEIS). Additionally, SDOT will continue to coordinate with adjacent businesses, property owners, and interested stakeholders as the design process continues.
The Land Use Discipline Report is fatally flawed because it failed to include and consider impacts on the following existing businesses and uses:

- Ballard Transfer;
- Leeb Marine;
- Pacific Fisherman;
- Snow and Co.;
- Ballard Oil;
- Gardner Boat Repair;
- Pipes Marine Repair;
- Stabbert Shipyards;
- McGuiness Marine;
- Sher Marine/retail sales;
- Sea and Shore Construction; and
- Jacobsen Marine Terminal.

44. Please explain why the DEIS failed to include a discussion of potential impacts to the numerous business listed above?

45. Please explain why the DEIS failed to consider that many of companies at these locations have to back out of their driveways?

46. Please explain how SDOT can ensure the trail will operate safely with trucks backing across it at these locations?

47. Please provide the detailed traffic hazard analysis—including sight distance analysis—to support SDOT’s conclusions. If SDOT did not prepare a detailed engineering analysis, please explain why not?

48. Please explain why the DEIS did not include a detailed discussion and analysis of potential land use impacts to these businesses?

49. Please provide the detailed land use impact analysis related to these existing businesses SDOT failed to include in the DEIS showing the potential land use impacts to these businesses. If SDOT does not have this information, please explain why it will not revise the EIS to include it?

50. Please explain how these water-dependent businesses can either continue operating at their current location or be “relocated” as SDOT states in the DEIS if there are significant adverse land use impacts from the trail?

51. Please explain how SDOT’s land use analysis is adequate and sufficient for a decisionmaker to make an informed decision if the DEIS failed to include any information about these existing water-dependent businesses?

09 - 019 These businesses were inadvertently left out of the Land Use Discipline Report as a result of a mapping error. Please see Section 4.3 of the FEIS for corrected tables, and Technical Appendix A (Volume 3) for an Update and Errata of the Land Use Discipline Report. This corrected information was considered as part of the impact evaluation process, however, the omissions did not change the determination of impact significance.

Individual business owners were interviewed as a part of the transportation analysis for the FEIS, and a summary of the interviews is contained in Technical Appendix B. Concerns regarding potential operational impacts were considered and are addressed in Chapter 4, Chapter 7, Chapter 8, and in Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) of the FEIS.

09 - 020 Consistent with Seattle’s SEPA policy on Land Use (SMC 25.05.675.1.1.b), impacts relating to transportation and parking are addressed under Transportation and Parking chapters respectively in the FEIS. These impacts are discussed in the Land Use chapter because they were considered in the economic analysis that the Land Use Chapter relies upon. Please see the FEIS Chapter 7 and Technical Appendix B, which have been updated to address the safety of trucks backing across the trail. As in any right-of-way, trucks that are backing must obey the rules of the road, including flaggers, where required, to warn oncoming traffic and direct truck movements. It is noted that illegal movements also cause hazards.

Sight distance concerns are described in Chapter 7 of the Final EIS and Chapter 5 of Technical Appendix B (Transportation Discipline Report); Section 1.7.1 of the FEIS discusses design and safety considerations in further detail.
52. The comparison of the Shilshole North versus the Shilshole South Alternative on Page 5-5 of the Land Use Discipline Report is inaccurate because SDOT ignored and failed to include the above businesses in the EIS. Please correct this error.

53. The pie chart, Figure 5-2 on page 5-8 of the Land Use Discipline Report, is similarly flawed because SDOT failed to include the actual businesses and thus did not accurately calculate square footage based on the correct linear footage of business uses along these routes. Please correct this error.

54. SDOT’s driveway-to-driveway comparisons in the Land Use Discipline Report are incorrect because SDOT failed to understand and account for actual uses of each driveway. For example 56th street and Market street driveway count includes single-family and unused driveways and gives them equal weight to industrial driveways that have for example 300+ heavy truck crossings per day. It is impossible for a reader—much less the decision maker—to make an informed decision based on accurate information because SDOT assigned equal weight for residential driveways with one or two cars to industrial driveways with hundreds of crossings and/or large truck crossings. Please correct this error.

55. Table 4-3 in the Land Use Discipline Report is similarly flawed because SDOT failed to include existing businesses (e.g., Stabbert, etc.) and failed to understand and evaluate that trucks existing these businesses must back across the proposed trail. Please correct or explain this incorrect information?

56. SDOT failed to adequately explain why the large number of vehicles using Shilshole will not create traffic hazards with an increased number of trail users—As the Hearing Examiner and Judge Rogers said—“It is simply not fair to defer decisions and to trust the party making the decisions to reach the right outcome, because this defeats the entire policy of [SEPA] review.” Please provide a detailed traffic hazard and land use analysis to support this statement in the DEIS or explain why it is not necessary?

57. Please explain how trail users will safely cross from Shilshole to Market Street based on the current level of trail design?

58. Please correct the DEIS to accurately reflect the history of the Missing Link. Figure 1-1 on page 1-2 should include a reference to the 1996 “Manning Resolution” No. 29474, which located the Missing Link along Leary Avenue to Market Street as part of the City’s approval of a 30-year franchise for the Ballard Terminal Railroad.

59. Please explain how location and operation of the Missing Link on Shilshole Avenue NW—either south or north—will not adversely impact operation of the Ballard Terminal Railroad pursuant to its 30-year franchise?

09-021 The DEIS listed land uses on the same side of the street as the trail for all alternatives, because these were the most directly affected. Uses along both sides of NW 54th should have been included because that right-of-way is so constricted. The FEIS has been revised with an expanded range of affected properties, including the uses referenced (see Comment 09-019).

A revised Technical Appendix A, Update and Errata to the Land Use Discipline Report, is included in Volume 3 of the FEIS which includes the businesses on both sides of the currently unimproved portion NW 54th St. The Preferred Alternative does not travel along this portion of NW 54th St.

The Draft EIS did not state that the project is expected to cause “relocation” of any uses, because impacts to businesses are not expected to be significant. The Draft EIS referred to businesses needing to relocate loading operations that are occurring in City right-of-way.

The FEIS analysis includes water-dependent and water related uses, and evaluates how businesses would be affected based on loading and driveways operations within the public right-of-way, which SDOT considers adequate for determining the significance of land use impacts. As described in the DEIS, none of the driveways would experience delays significant enough to be likely to cause businesses to substantially change their operations to the point of business failure, and are not expected to result in changes in land use. Instead, these uses are expected to adapt to the changes caused by implementation of the Missing Link. See Section 4.3.2 in the FEIS. As required by SEPA, the EIS describes the potential for significant adverse impacts, and measures that can be employed to reduce or avoid impacts in the design and operation of the trail.
09-023 The driveway analysis includes information about driveways to characterize potential impacts, such as vehicle classification and special vehicle maneuvers. SDOT has updated the Roadway Design and Safety Considerations section included in Section 1.7.1 of the FEIS, which assesses the potential impacts between different types of users, and identifies appropriate mitigation measures. Please see Chapter 7 of the FEIS and Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) for updated information, such as vehicle classification and special vehicle maneuvers at driveways. Please also see response to Comment 09-016.

09-024 SDOT did consider driveways and access to businesses in the Transportation analysis. For the Final EIS, additional information is included regarding vehicle types and movements, including backing across the trail. Backing across the trail is not a land use impact, however. It may require a change in operations such as a flagger to warn oncoming traffic, but this is not expected to affect business viability, as these conditions are regularly dealt with by businesses throughout the region. Please see the updated driveway vehicle operations analysis included in the FEIS Chapter 7 and Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) as well as FEIS Section 1.7.1, for discussion of design and safety considerations.

Please also see response to comment 09-016.

09-025 As described in response to prior comments, SDOT disagrees with the commenter’s characterization of the prior Hearing Examiner and Court orders, which were made in the context of the adequacy of determinations of non-significance that have since been invalidated and are no longer being relied upon. SEPA requires the disclosure of potential impacts, but does not demand a particular substantive result.

Section 7.2 of the FEIS and Chapter 4 of the Technical Appendix B (Transportation Discipline Report) describe that nonmotorized users currently travel along various streets in the study area, including Shilshole Ave NW. As discussed under Potential Impacts in Section 7.3 of the Draft EIS, traffic and nonmotorized volumes in the study area are expected to increase between 2015 and 2040. Section 7.3.1 of the Draft EIS also describes that with anticipated growth in vehicle and nonmotorized volumes, there would be impacts if no dedicated facility were provided in the study area. Generally, dedicated facilities are safer than areas lacking dedicated facilities. Therefore, Burke Gilman Trail users at present are exposed to traffic hazards in the area of the Missing Link. Providing a dedicated facility would improve nonmotorized comfort and safety in the study area, and organize conflict points. The EIS discusses areas such as driveways and intersections where potential conflicts could occur. The final design will include a number of safety considerations to minimize potential conflicts associated with an increase of users. These are described in Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations, of the Final EIS.

09-026 Although the comment is not clear about which alternative this was referring to, in this intersection and all signalized intersections crossed by the trail, trail users will be directed through the intersection on a marked crosswalk. Refer to Section 1.7.1 and Chapter 7 of the FEIS, and Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) for further discussion of potential intersection designs to address the crossing at this intersection.

09-027 Resolution No. 29474 was ultimately rejected by the business and cycling community, prompting Resolution 30408, which directed a new study that led to Resolution No. 30583, which described the Shilshole South route. Figure 1-1 has not been revised.
09 - 028 As described in the Draft EIS, SDOT would need to relocate the tracks between 11th Ave NW and NW Dock St during construction. Track relocation is governed by the operating agreement that the BTR has with the City, and no further mitigation or special compensation is required. SDOT will coordinate closely with representatives from the BTR to minimize any potential impacts during track location.

The Ballard Terminal Railroad (BTR) would be able to continue its operations under any of the alternatives studied in the Draft EIS. Similar to existing conditions, trail users would have to cross the tracks, but this would not hinder operations, given the slow speeds at which the train runs, and the fact that most train activity takes place at night when there are no cars parked on the tracks and few trail users expected. Similarly, the location of the Preferred Alternative along Shilshole Ave NW and NW 45th St would allow continued operation of the BTR.

09 - 029 The purpose of the project is to complete an existing facility, not create a new one. The existing Burke-Gilman Trail is a multi-use regional trail. The primary objective of the Missing Link is consistent with the primary objective of the entire trail, specifically to fill in the missing 1.4-mile section to provide a safe, direct, and defined multi-use trail for persons of all abilities, for a variety of transportation and recreational activities. The Missing Link also strives to maintain truck and freight facilities and access that support industrial and water-dependent land uses within the shoreline district and BINMIC. Additionally, the completion of the Burke Gilman Trail as a multi-use trail is supported by a number of policies and plans: the Seattle Bike Master Plan, PSRC’s Vision 2040, the City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan, the City of Seattle Parks and Recreation 2011 Development Plan, all of which are outlined and discussed in the Land Use Discipline Report and discussed in Chapter 4, Land Use, of the FEIS.
09 - 030 SEPA provides that "The basic features and analysis of the proposal, alternatives, and impacts shall be discussed in the EIS and shall be generally understood without turning to other documents; however, an EIS is not required to include all information conceivably relevant to a proposal..." (WAC 197-11-402(6)). SDOT has disclosed the potential impacts of the alternatives with and without various design elements to mitigate potential impacts in Section 1.8 and Section 7.3 of the FEIS. The EIS used conservative assumptions to ensure that potential impacts were identified and evaluated at the current level of design.

09 - 031 SDOT disagrees with the characterization that the design presented is not sufficiently detailed. SEPA requires analysis and disclosure of potential impacts, which the EIS provides. Virtually every aspect of a trail design has a safety component to it, but that does not make every component a probable significant adverse environmental impact under SEPA. The EIS describes potential traffic hazards, delays that could be caused by trail users and vehicle operators navigating such hazards, and measures that can be used to improve design of the trail, roads, and driveways.

09 - 032 As noted in Section 4.3.2 of the DEIS, the trail infrastructure could support existing and expanding residential and commercial uses near the trail. As discussed in the Economic Considerations Report (Technical Appendix E of the DEIS), Ballard is experiencing service-based and residential growth in the region. The perception of the trail as an increase in competitive pressures, whether founded or not, could affect industrial business decisions regarding expansion or moving into the area. However, because current policies protect industrial zoning in the BINMIC area, such perceptions would be speculative.

09 - 033 Refer to the response to Comment 9-032. It would be speculative to evaluate impacts of the project on uses that are not present or planned. The statement that "improvements may not support and could even discourage new and expanded industrial uses" was intended to acknowledge that perceptions can affect behavior such as where businesses are willing to locate or expand. Significant changes in land use due to such perceptions resulting from completion of the Missing Link are not expected.

Regarding traffic impacts, there is no reason to think that impacts on new or expanded uses would be different than those that would be expected for existing uses as described in the DEIS and this FEIS.

Avoidance, Minimization and Mitigation Measures for Land Use and Transportation Impacts are found in Section 4.4 and Section 7.4, respectively, of the Final EIS. Although significant impacts to land use as a result of the Missing Link project are not expected, maintaining existing policies and regulations regarding non-industrial uses would preserve lands within BINMIC for such uses.
As described in the EIS, the effects on businesses include localized
and intermittent driveway delays, changes to loading access, and
reduced on-street parking availability. While recognized as having
some economic cost and inconvenience, businesses are anticipated
to be able to adapt to these challenges, similar to adapting to
intermittent construction-related delays, increased traffic, and other
factors associated with increased development in the area. Please
see the Economic Considerations Report (Technical Appendix E of
the DEIS).

No interviews were conducted of local businesses for the economic
analysis. The analysis was based on previously collected employment
and operation information, past studies, observations of the effects
of similar trail projects, and consideration of the results of the
driveway analysis prepared for the Draft EIS, and other information.

Although economic considerations are not an element of the
environment required to be evaluated in an EIS under SEPA, City
code does require economic issues to be included in an EIS unless
eliminated in the scoping process. SDOT chose to include additional
analysis of the potential economic impacts of the Project in the EIS to
assist in decision-making, since it was identified as an issue of
concern. SDOT continues to work with adjacent business owners as it
advances the project. SDOT is aware of the concerns businesses have
over the placement of the trail and has committed to work with
individual business and property owners to address them during trail
design.

The total parking supply in the study area is 3,816 spaces. The
Preferred Alternative would remove approximately 344 parking
spaces, about 9% of the total on- and off-street parking supply. On a
weekday, a minimum of 1,009 on-street spaces and 213 off-street
spaces were unused and available in the study area during each time
period inventoried. On a weekday, the highest hourly on-street
utilization was 67% and the highest hourly off-street utilization was
71%. On a weekend, a minimum of 848 on-street spaces and 483
off-street spaces were unused and available in the study area during
each time period inventoried. On a weekend, the highest hourly on-
street utilization was 73% and the highest hourly off-street
utilization was 49%.

The changes in parking may cause employees or customers to park
farther away compared to 2017 existing conditions but is not
anticipated to significantly adversely impact businesses. Parking
removal would be spread out along the Build Alternatives. As
described in Chapter 8 of the FEIS, Policy T42 states that it is the
City’s general policy to replace short-term parking only when the
project results in a concentrated and substantial amount of on-street
parking loss.

The EIS is required to disclose probable adverse significant impacts,
therefore, it does not discuss every minor adaptation that businesses
or others affected by a project might need to make. Adaptations
regarding traffic delays and loading are discussed in the
Transportation Chapter (Chapter 7), and adaptations regarding
parking are addressed in the Parking Chapter (Chapter 8). The
analysis of transportation impacts is contained in FEIS Chapter 7 and
Technical Appendix B (Volume 3), and impacts to land use are
described in FEIS Chapter 4. Parking impacts are described in FEIS
Chapter 8 and Technical Appendix C (Volume 3).
SDOT did consider access to businesses in the Transportation analysis. The updated driveway vehicle operations analysis included in the Final EIS Chapter 7 and Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) includes information on vehicle classification at driveways as well as special vehicle maneuvers, such as vehicles backing into or out of driveways. Please also see response to comment 09-016.

SDOT will continue to coordinate with adjacent businesses, property owners, and interested stakeholders as the design process continues.

Also, please refer to the DEIS Technical Appendix E, Economic Considerations Report, for analysis of impacts to businesses in the study area.

Conclusions regarding the potential economic effects of the project are based on the Economic Considerations Report (Technical Appendix E of the DEIS). That report concluded that no business is likely to fail because the impacts expected, while potentially inconvenient, would not be severe enough to significantly affect the viability of the businesses. Please see the report for information on how the analysis was conducted. Although economic considerations are not an element of the environment required to be evaluated in an EIS under SEPA, City code does require economic issues to be included in an EIS unless eliminated in the scoping process. SDOT chose to include additional analysis of the potential economic impacts of the Project in the EIS to assist in decision-making, since it was identified as an issue of concern.

With regard to contacting individual businesses, please see responses to Comments 09-016 and 09-037.
For the EIS, SDOT relied on the Economic Analysis (DEIS Technical Appendix E) to reach the conclusion that the effects of the project would not be severe enough to cause changes in land use in the project area, and therefore would not be significant adverse land use impacts.

Delays at driveways are not considered to be significant because they would occur sporadically throughout the day and for short periods of time. Drivers may find this inconvenient, but it would not block or substantially alter access. Additionally, there is no City standard for maintaining delay at driveways. Please see Chapter 7 of Final EIS or Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) for updated information on driveway delays for vehicles and the methodology used to measure impacts.

Also, please see the response to Comment 09-016.

Chapter 7 of the DEIS and FEIS describe the potential conflicts between trail users and industrial operations. Section 1.7.1 of the FEIS describes what techniques would be used to address these conflicts. Designs of the major elements of the alternatives are provided in the DEIS and FEIS. Design is ongoing, with current efforts focused on the Preferred Alternative described in the FEIS. The EIS provides analysis of all aspects of the project that could have significant adverse impacts. There will be additional opportunity for public input beyond the SEPA process; see Section 1.11 Next Steps in the FEIS. SDOT will continue to coordinate with adjacent businesses, property owners, and interested stakeholders as the design process continues.

The DEIS does not state that the Missing Link would be exempt from review and permitting under the Shoreline Management Act and the City’s Shoreline Master Program. Page 4-11 of the Draft EIS includes discussion of the Shoreline Management Act and the City of Seattle’s Shoreline Master Program, which states that a permit may be required for land uses that are within 200 feet of the ordinary high water mark. The Seattle Department of Planning and Development (now the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections) previously reviewed the project and determined it to be exempt from the requirement for a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit. Regardless of whether a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit is required, any project within the shoreline area is required to be consistent with the policies of the Shoreline Management Act.

Driveway locations are shown on DEIS Figures 1-3 through 1-6 and on Figure 1-3 in the FEIS. Driveway locations were field reviewed during the design process. A list of driveway locations and owners was not necessary to determine the potential for significant impacts as part of the transportation analysis, so a list of individual driveways was not developed as part of the EIS process. Please see the revised Transportation and Land Use Sections of the FEIS for more information.

Please see responses to Comments 09-037 and 09-039 regarding the information used to develop this analysis. The project is not expected to increase operating costs to the level that it would cause the permanent loss of land uses that are identified as preferred for the project area under adopted land use policies, and it is therefore not expected to have significant adverse impacts on land use.
92. Please explain and provide the basis for any statement that increased costs to businesses adjacent to the Shilshole North Alternative would not cause “significant impacts”?

93. Did SDOT interview any of these businesses to support this conclusion? If not, why not?

94. What information did SDOT rely on to support this conclusion?

95. Please explain and provide the basis for the statement on Page 4-22 that losing approximately 227 parking spaces on Shilshole Avenue will not negatively impact existing land uses in this area?

96. Please provide a list of the “58 loading zones and driveways” along the Shilshole South Alternative listed on Page 4-22.

97. Please explain the basis for any statement that vehicles having to cross the trail in this location would experience delays but they would not be “significant”?

98. What is the basis for this statement and conclusion? Did SDOT interview any business owners to support this statement?

99. Does SDOT have a list of the vehicles that access each of the 58 or more loading areas and driveways along this Alternative?

100. Please explain and provide the basis for the statement on Page 4-22 that there will be “no significant land use impacts” “because no permanent land use changes are anticipated”?

101. Did SDOT interview any of these businesses to support this conclusion? If not, why not?

102. What information did SDOT rely on to support this conclusion?

103. Please explain and provide the basis for the statement on Page 4-22 that losing approximately 227 parking spaces on Shilshole Avenue will not negatively impact existing land uses in this area?

104. Please explain how SDOT intends to make a two-directional multi-user trail on one side of the street safe in light of the statement on Page 7-16 that “many collisions occur[] when a vehicle was traveling in an opposite direction to a cyclist…”?

105. Does SDOT have any published studies, reports or information showing multi-user sidepaths, such as being designed for the Missing Link, are safer compared to protected bicycle facilities? If so, what are they?

09 - 046 The DEIS does not state that 227 spaces would be lost on Shilshole Ave NW, but throughout the entire length of the Shilshole North alignment. As explained in the DEIS, the conclusion that land use would not be adversely affected is based on the Economic Analysis (DEIS Technical Appendix E). The parking analysis is fully described in the Parking Discipline Report (Technical Appendix C, Volume 3). Please also see the response to Comment 09-034 regarding specific parking impacts.

09 - 047 The driveways and loading zones along each of the alignments, including the Shilshole South Alternative, were identified and counted using design drawings and field work. Maps of the loading areas included are shown in the DEIS and FEIS Parking Discipline Reports, Figure 4-4 (Volume 3). A separate list of loading zones and driveways was not necessary to determine potentially significant adverse impacts as part of the transportation or parking analysis, so one was not developed as part of the EIS process.

09 - 048 Please refer to the responses to Comments 09-043 and 09-044.

09 - 049 Please refer to the response to Comment 09-046.

09 - 050 The collisions described on page 7-16 of the DEIS occurred where there were no bicycle facilities, with the exception of an incident along NW 45th. As described, the collisions typically occurred when either the vehicle or the bicyclist was turning. Some steps can be taken to reduce the chance of accidents, such as installing a stoplight as proposed on 17th Ave NW under all alternatives on Shilshole. Even in signalized intersections, bicyclists and motorists can have collisions when their paths cross and one party or both are not paying close attention. As described in the project objective (Section 1.2), the Missing Link would be a dedicated, separated trail facility that would improve safety conditions by providing separation between vehicles and trail users. Potential traffic hazards are identified in Section 1.8 of the FEIS.
SEPA does not require SDOT to establish that one type of facility is safer than another. However, safety is a critical component of the project, and SDOT follows City standards as well as AASHTO and NACTO guidelines for bicycle and trail facilities.

The facility type was chosen because it best meets the project’s objective to complete the Burke-Gilman Trail by creating a safe, direct, and defined multi-use trail for persons of all abilities, for a variety of transportation and recreational activities, and by maintaining truck and freight facilities and access that support industrial and water-dependent land uses within the shoreline district and BINMIC.

In addition to the AASHTO and NACTO guidelines described in comment 09-051 above, please see Chapter 8 References in the Transportation Discipline Report (Technical Appendix B, Volume 3) for a full list of reference materials.

SDOT designs its projects according to the guidelines referenced above, as well as City standards and guidelines, such as the City of Seattle’s Standard Plans for Municipal Construction and Right-of-Way Improvements Manual, which have been developed through research and adaptation of national publications. As a result, SDOT does not prepare any studies or reports specific to individual project design.
As part of design development, every driveway and intersection
design will be detailed. For intersections and driveways that must
accommodate industrial and commercial traffic, SDOT will continue
coordinating with individual property and business owners. Tools
such as AutoTURN will be used as appropriate to determine
driveway width and intersection design.

SDOT has committed to working with adjacent business and property
owners, key stakeholders, and the general public throughout the
design process. SDOT will use professional judgment in the final
design decisions. See response to Comment 09-055 regarding SEPA
review after the FEIS.

To clarify, what the statement meant was that, if vehicle operators
obey the regulation cited (SMC 11.58.230), trail users could cross
driveways and alleys on the Shilshole North Alternative safely,
because the vehicles would have to stop first and observe whether
any trail users were approaching before proceeding. SDOT knows
from experience operating hundreds of miles of roadways for over a
century that not all vehicle operators abide by the laws at all times,
and acknowledges illegal vehicle operation does create a potential
hazard for trail users. There are also measures such as signage and
trail markings that can help make trail users aware of vehicles
emerging from driveways or alleys.

Any alternative that is selected will undergo additional design after
the SEPA process is complete. For example, please see Section 1.6.1
of the FEIS, which describes the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred
Alternative addresses sight distance concerns along the south side of
Shilshole Ave NW by shifting the trail northward as compared to the
Shilshole South Alternative, closer to the roadway and away from
buildings and structures that abut property lines.

Additional safety features to warn trail users of cross traffic could
include pavement markings, pavement type, and other warning
devices such as flashers or even crossing arms, among other things,
as described in Section 1.7.1 of the Final EIS. Safety features are
recommended by AASHTO and NACTO guidelines and will continue
to be assessed through the final design process anticipated to take
place from mid-2017 to early 2018.

SEPA provides the public with the opportunity to provide input on
the impacts associated with each of the Build Alternatives. Once
impacts have been disclosed, SEPA does not require additional
opportunities to review specific design features. However, SDOT has
committed to working with individual property and business owners
and interested stakeholders, including the general public,
throughout the design process.

The comment does not mention which specific sight distance issue it
is addressing. SEPA requires the disclosure of potential impacts, not
the elimination of them. Specific sight distance issues were
acknowledged as a potential impact of the project in the DEIS.
Additional information is provided in Section 7.3 of the FEIS. There
will be opportunity for public input on final design beyond the SEPA
process. Please refer to the response to Comment 09-053.

FEIS Section 1.11 describes the expected process after publication of
the FEIS. SEPA provides for a comment period on the DEIS but does
not require a comment period on the FEIS. SEPA does not require
that additional public review be provided during a project design
process or after a design has been finalized; however, as described in
Section 1.11, SDOT will provide additional opportunities for input to
the process during design.
Loss of parking is discussed in detail in Chapter 8, Parking. The Economic Consideration Report (Technical Appendix E of the DEIS) does not state that loss of parking would not cause economic impacts, it acknowledges that there could be economic costs imposed on nearby businesses. The City employs various methods of regulating parking on city streets in order to support access to adjacent businesses and residents. Restrictions and metered parking could be implemented, if needed, to address parking needs for business customers. In addition, off-street parking spaces are available within the study area. These sorts of adaptations are common in an urban environment that is changing, and businesses typically are able to adjust operations accordingly.

Although some driveways could be eliminated or consolidated, such instances would be rare and no property would lose access altogether.
Attachment A
09 - 059 SDOT disagrees with the commenter’s characterization of the prior Hearing Examiner and Court orders, which were made in the context of the adequacy of determinations of non-significance that are no longer valid and are no longer being relied upon.

The Final EIS includes a number of potential design treatments that could be considered during final design, including barriers, fencing, and additional design options have been developed for driveway and intersection treatments, such as mountable curbs to allow for truck wheel swing. The Draft EIS does not offer any concrete design or planning regarding this Alternative.

The Final EIS appropriately discloses all the relevant demand that result. Moreover, SEPA encourages the preparation of information on driveway widths (see Appendix A of the DEIS). The Final EIS includes a number of potential design treatments that could be considered during final design, including barriers, fencing, and additional design options have been developed for driveway and intersection treatments, such as mountable curbs to allow for truck wheel swing. The Final EIS appropriately discloses all the relevant demand that result. Moreover, SEPA encourages the preparation of information on driveway widths (see Appendix A of the DEIS).

The comments listed do not specify what situations are not adequately addressed in the designs presented in the DEIS so it is not possible to respond with any greater detail.

09 - 060 Please see the responses to comment 09-013.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>EIS Statement</th>
<th>Response to Comment No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09-013</td>
<td>NDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed the Build Alternatives to determine whether there would be impacts in certain situations.</td>
<td>Please see the response to comment 09-013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Draft EIS does not offer any planning regarding the Build Alternatives. No meaningful reference to the Draft EIS are used for reference and not included in an actual design for this segment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The EIS does not address whether SDOT has progressed the level of design detail for each Alternative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-014</td>
<td>Following publication of the FEIS, SDOT will make a final decision regarding the Alternative to be constructed, mitigation measures to be incorporated into the project, and identifying funding sources.</td>
<td>NDOT stated it would take approximately 1 year to design the selected Alternative and another 3 years to construct it. This makes it difficult to determine impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-015</td>
<td>The EIS does not address whether SDOT has progressed the level of design detail for the Alternative.</td>
<td>SDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed the Build Alternatives to determine whether there would be impacts in certain situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-016</td>
<td>The EIS does not address whether SDOT has progressed the level of design detail for the Alternative.</td>
<td>SDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed the Build Alternatives to determine whether there would be impacts in certain situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-017</td>
<td>The EIS does not address whether SDOT has progressed the level of design detail for the Alternative.</td>
<td>SDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed the Build Alternatives to determine whether there would be impacts in certain situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-018</td>
<td>The EIS does not address whether SDOT has progressed the level of design detail for the Alternative.</td>
<td>SDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed the Build Alternatives to determine whether there would be impacts in certain situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-019</td>
<td>The EIS does not address whether SDOT has progressed the level of design detail for the Alternative.</td>
<td>SDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed the Build Alternatives to determine whether there would be impacts in certain situations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Curb Radii**

- **Highway Alternative**: Curb radii may be modified to accommodate the turning requirements for different vehicles. Different intersections may have different types of vehicles that typically use the street, including passenger vehicles, single unit trucks, delivery-style trucks, buses, emergency vehicles, and train vehicles. Appropriate curb radii would be chosen to accommodate the differing vehicle uses and roadway geometries at each location.

- **Build Alternative**: Curb radii may be modified to accommodate the turning requirements for different vehicles. Different intersections may have different types of vehicles that typically use the street, including passenger vehicles, single unit trucks, delivery-style trucks, buses, emergency vehicles, and train vehicles. Appropriate curb radii would be chosen to accommodate the differing vehicle uses and roadway geometries at each location.

**Curb Extensions**

- **Highway Alternative**: Curb extensions or curb bulbs may be used at intersections where parallel parking and bus stops are located along the streets.

**Curb Height**

- **Highway Alternative**: Curb height was chosen by SDOT because of accessibility concerns.

**Curb Radii and Curb Height**

- **Highway Alternative**: Curb radii may be modified to accommodate the turning requirements for different vehicles. Different intersections may have different types of vehicles that typically use the street, including passenger vehicles, single unit trucks, delivery-style trucks, buses, emergency vehicles, and train vehicles. Appropriate curb radii would be chosen to accommodate the differing vehicle uses and roadway geometries at each location.

- **Build Alternative**: Curb radii may be modified to accommodate the turning requirements for different vehicles. Different intersections may have different types of vehicles that typically use the street, including passenger vehicles, single unit trucks, delivery-style trucks, buses, emergency vehicles, and train vehicles. Appropriate curb radii would be chosen to accommodate the differing vehicle uses and roadway geometries at each location.
Alternative Regarding the relevance of the Hearing Examiner decision to the
See Response to Comments 09-017 and 09-063.

EIS Statement

Comment No.
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It appears that this Build Alternative was more planned than it was in the DEIS stage

of the planning process. SDOT has not committed to incorporating any

issues with varying trail width, so it is not possible to respond with

any greater detail.
### Section 9 - 065

The number of driveways and intersections crossed by each alternative has been updated in Chapters 5 and 7 of the EIS. The EIS acknowledges that any driveway or intersection would present potential conflicts between trail users and vehicles. All driveways are depicted. Driveways with uniquely challenging issues, such as unusual geometry, high volume of large trucks, or other features, are listed in Appendix B of the Transportation Discipline Report (Technical Appendix B, Volume 3).

It is not necessary to have final design for all intersections and driveways in order to identify probable significant impacts.

The comment does not identify any specific impacts that were missing from the analysis in the DEIS, so it is not possible to respond in greater detail.

### Section 9 - 066

Regarding the relevance of the Hearing Examiner decision to the scope of this EIS, see response to Comment 9-013.

The DEIS identifies the alignment for all alternatives, including all street intersections. Potential impacts that could occur with or without fences, barriers, or buffers are identified, with additional information provided in the FEIS Section 7.3. Approximate locations and width of buffers are included in all designs in the DEIS, and for the Preferred Alternative in the FEIS. Fences and barriers could be used to reduce potential hazards for trail users and would be avoided in instances where they would pose a conflict or traffic hazard.

The comments do not identify any locations where fencing, barriers, or buffers are likely to cause significant adverse impacts, so it is not clear in what way the DEIS is considered inadequate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>Comment Matrix</th>
<th>pages</th>
<th>Comment Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09-015</td>
<td>The DEIS does not show an actual design of the proposed Alternative showing how it would look after the project is completed. All figures contain the following note in the upper right corner: “Examples shown are concepts that could be implemented. Details for specific locations will be determined during the final design phase.”</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>Please see response to comment 09-015. Section 1.7.1, Roadway Alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-065</td>
<td>The DEIS does not show an actual design of the proposed Alternative showing how it would look after the project is completed. All figures contain the following note in the upper right corner: “Examples shown are concepts that could be implemented. Details for specific locations will be determined during the final design phase.”</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>See Response to Comment 09-065.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The methodology published by Chicagoland Bicycle Federation in 1997 was revised for the Draft EIS and Final EIS to include additional considerations and specific treatments to address driveway crossings with the trail as well as potential site distance design. Also refer to the responses to Comments 09-017 and 09-063.
CM NO. 31:
The proposed Alternative has significant sight distance, hazard, and safety concerns.  It is not practical or safe to build this Alternative because it is not possible to design it to accommodate existing or proposed roadways.

CM NO. 32:
Alternative B is a significant improvement over Alternative A. It provides the fewest driveways with sight distance concerns.

CM NO. 33:
SDOT has not provided sufficient design and mitigation information for Alternative B, and therefore the DEIS is not adequate.

CM NO. 34:
SDOT admits this proposed segment has the most sight distance concerns, yet has not provided sufficient design and mitigation information for this Alternative. The DEIS must provide the information necessary to allow for required sight distances.

CM NO. 35:
SDOT has again failed to provide sufficient design and mitigation information for Alternative B. SDOT cannot rely on conclusory statements that the trail will operate safely. The DEIS is inadequate and must be withdrawn.

CM NO. 36:
SDOT has again failed to provide sufficient design and mitigation information for Alternative B. SDOT cannot rely on conclusory statements that the trail will operate safely. The DEIS is inadequate and must be withdrawn.

CM NO. 37:
SDOT has not provided sufficient design and mitigation information for Alternative B, and therefore the DEIS is not adequate.

CM NO. 38:
SDOT has not provided sufficient design and mitigation information for Alternative B, and therefore the DEIS is not adequate.

CM NO. 39:
SDOT has not provided sufficient design and mitigation information for Alternative B, and therefore the DEIS is not adequate.

CM NO. 40:
SDOT has not provided sufficient design and mitigation information for Alternative B, and therefore the DEIS is not adequate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Matrix</th>
<th>Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link Project – Draft Environmental Impact Statement (June 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Column 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment No.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alternative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EIS Statement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Please see response to comment 09-015. Section 1.7.1, Roadway</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:**

- SDOT has no actual plan or proposed design that is fully sufficient to determine whether the proposed trail segments could accommodate the driveways located adjacent to each Alternative.
- Mr. Rogers did not perform an auto-turn analysis for all driveways which currently access the businesses along the Burke-Gilman Trail.
- The auto-turn analysis SDOT conducted was not included in the Draft EIS and it is unclear whether SDOT conducted the auto-turn analysis for all Alternatives and for all proposed driveways, loading docks, and individual property and business owners throughout the design.

**Additional Information:**

- There is flexibility in the widths of the driveway aprons that can be provided to allow motor vehicles to cross the trail to access businesses and home owners. A sample of driveways provides a range of the alternatives required for SEPA.
- Design and Safety Considerations describes the potential interaction between different types of users and the design process to make sure that industrial and commercial traffic will not require for SEPA.
- Refer to the responses to Comment 09-017, and 09-018.
CM NO. 44: SDOT did not conduct a comprehensive analysis of all driveways along the Build Alternatives to determine whether vehicles that service the businesses located along the Build Alternatives could complete turning movements without violating traffic rules.

CM NO. 45: Mr. Bishop conducted a comprehensive analysis of all driveways along the Build Alternatives to determine whether vehicles that service the businesses located along the Build Alternatives could complete turning movements without violating traffic rules. Mr. Bishop’s analysis showed that turning movements in one or two lanes were needed for adequate turning.

According to Mr. Bishop’s analysis, the driveways that are used by including Hatton Marine and Ballard Oil, Ballard Transfer, Lieb Marine, Pacific Fishermans, Storm and Co., Garden Boat Repair, Open Marine Repair, Stabbert Shipyard, Mclean Marine, Choi Marine, Sun and Shee Construction, and Jacobsen Marine Terminal.

CM NO. 46: Mr. Bishop determined that there are conflicts and hazards located along the driveways of Stimpson Marine, Salmon Bay Sand and Gravel, Cross Marine, Great Cove Marine, Shared Entrance, C, Chair Segal Marine, Shared Entrance, Hatton Marine, Ballard Marine, Ballard Mill Marine, and Off Marine.

A true and correct copy of the tables Mr. Bishop developed detailing these hazards are attached as Exhibit D.

CM NO. 47: Until SDOT determines which vehicles actually use each driveway and conducts an auto-turn analysis with that information, as Mr. Bishop said, the DEIS will remain inadequate.

CM NO. 48: Until SDOT determines which vehicles actually use each driveway and conducts an auto-turn analysis with that information, as Mr. Bishop said, the DEIS will remain inadequate.

CM NO. 49: Although it is not feasible to analyze impacts on operations at all driveways along the Build Alternatives, analysts selected a sampling of driveways in the study area to provide a range of typical impacts that could be experienced by all driveways in the study area.

According to Mr. Bishop’s analysis, the driveways that are used by including Hatton Marine and Ballard Oil, Ballard Transfer, Lieb Marine, Pacific Fishermans, Storm and Co., Garden Boat Repair, Open Marine Repair, Stabbert Shipyard, Mclean Marine, Choi Marine, Sun and Shee Construction, and Jacobsen Marine Terminal.
Phone interviews were conducted with property owners along the preferred Build Alternatives as part of the Final EIS to provide additional information on driveway operations. Information about vehicle movements (backing into/out of driveways) during peak times of the day, week, and year and vehicle types was collected during the interviews. Interview notes are included in Appendix B of the Transportation Discipline Report (Volume 3). Additionally, SDOT will continue to coordinate with the stakeholder group and adjacent property owners as the design process continues.

For information on how the Build Alternatives would impact property access and driveways, see Chapter 5 of Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) and Chapter 7 of the Final EIS.
CM NO. 52:

Shilshole

SDOT did not conduct any interviews with any business owners or operators located adjacent to this proposed Alternative.

Page 7-52 (emph. added):

"Up to six access points to businesses along NW 54th St/Market St NW, Shilshole Ave NW, and NW 48th St could be rearranged to improve safety and operate by moving the Missing Link to reorient their access points to the access driveways or possibly to the ends of the blocks. This could result in different access locations, but overall access to properties would continue to be provided."

SDOT did not conduct any interviews with any business owners or operators located adjacent to this proposed Alternative.

Page 7-56 (emph. added):

"Up to three access points to businesses along NW 54th St/Market St NW, Shilshole Ave NW, and NW 48th St could be rearranged to improve safety and operate by moving the Missing Link to reorient their access points to the access driveways or possibly to the ends of the blocks. This could result in different access locations, but overall access to properties would continue to be provided."

MAY 2017
Please see Chapter 7 of the Final EIS and Chapter 4 of Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) for updated information, including driveway operations and vehicle classification as developed from interviews with businesses and data collection completed in late 2016 and early 2017. A sample of representative driveways provides a range of potential impacts that could occur at driveways. SEPA requires the disclosure of impacts and does not demand a particular result. The Final EIS discloses potential impacts at driveways under each of the Build Alternatives in Chapter 5 of Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) and provides mitigation measures to address impacts. Please also see the responses to comment 09-069.

The Draft EIS and Final EIS, Chapter 7 disclose that some unpermitted operations, such as the use of public right-of-way for loading and unloading activities, would no longer be allowed under any of the Build Alternatives.

The driveways and loading zones along each of the alignments, including the Shilshole South Alternative, were identified and counted using design drawings and field work. The count included on page 7-27 of the Draft EIS only includes driveways and loading docks, and does not include intersections.

SDOT has committed to working with adjacent business and property owners and key stakeholders throughout the design process.
SDOT is aware that some of the large vehicles associated with the businesses located along this proposed segment routinely use movements that are not permitted by the South Rules of the Road, including stopping and waiting or blocking the street while commercial and industrial uses have high truck loading, unloading, and delivery activity at driveway locations. If allowed to block the trail while loading and unloading, required adjustments and delays would cause the businesses to lose valuable time and money that are not expected to be recovered. SDOT needs to provide “accurate” and “truthful” information so decision-makers can understand the probable environmental consequences of this Alternative. Until it does, the DEIS remains inadequate. 

CM NO. 60: SDOT did not interview any property owners located along the proposed segment to determine whether they proposed, associated stockpiling of driveway or on-street parking is even possible.

CM NO. 66: SDOT needs to disclose information, regarding actual business operations so decision-makers can make an informed decision.

CM NO. 65: SDOT did not take the ordinary practices of the businesses into account when determining the potential delay to nonmotorized users, only the operation of the trail. SDOT needs to disclose information, regarding actual business operations so decision-makers can make an informed decision.

CM NO. 64: SDOT needs to disclose information, regarding actual business operations so decision-makers can make an informed decision.

CM NO. 63: SDOT did not determine whether this proposed, uncertain consolidation of driveways or access to the businesses could have their driveways consolidated into a single access point in coordination with SDOT and property owners.

CM NO. 62: SDOT did not consider whether this Alternative, not 41.

CM NO. 61: SDOT needs to provide “accurate” and “truthful” information so decision-makers can understand the probable environmental consequences of this Alternative. Until it does, the DEIS remains inadequate.

CM NO. 60: SDOT did not interview any property owners located along the proposed segment to determine whether they proposed, associated stockpiling of driveway or on-street parking is even possible.

CM NO. 66: SDOT needs to disclose information, regarding actual business operations so decision-makers can make an informed decision.

CM NO. 65: SDOT did not take the ordinary practices of the businesses into account when determining the potential delay to nonmotorized users, only the operation of the trail. SDOT needs to disclose information, regarding actual business operations so decision-makers can make an informed decision.

CM NO. 64: SDOT needs to disclose information, regarding actual business operations so decision-makers can make an informed decision.

CM NO. 63: SDOT did not determine whether this proposed, uncertain consolidation of driveways or access to the businesses could have their driveways consolidated into a single access point in coordination with SDOT and property owners.
The driveways and loading zones along each of the Alternatives were
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Please refer to Chapters 7 of the Final EIS and Chapter 4 of Technical
Appendix B (Volume 3) of the Final EIS, which summarizes the
impacts. Appendix B (Volume 3) of the Final EIS, which
summarizes the impacts of all measures, including the
3.5 pages) has been prepared. The DEIS includes
one page on safety – page 7-16. The DEIS dedicates more pages
than it does to safety. The DEIS needs to include a comprehensive
discussion of traffic hazards, the DEIS is inadequate.

The Driveways and Loading Zones (i.e. ‘shy
distance’) identified in the City’s design manual at Section
4.20.2 is three feet between the closest part of a fixed
object and the roadway, and two feet between the multiuse
trail and the closest part of a fixed object.”

See Exhibit A, HE Order, Page 8.

Comment No. 69:
The HE Order stated:

"…SDOT failed to study traffic hazards.
See Exhibit A, HE Order, Page 6, Item 29.

The ruling, SDOT decided to prepare an EIS for the entire project and to include an evaluation
of alternative routes.”

Page 7-16: The DEIS includes a discussion of the inherent dangers of locating a multi-user
side-path on major truck streets in an industrial area, and in the other Alternative locations. Without this
comprehensive discussion of traffic hazards, the DEIS is incomplete.

The driveways and loading zones along each of the
alignments, including the Shilshole South Alternative, were identified and
counted using the design drawings and field work. The count included
on page 7-27 of the Draft EIS only includes driveways and loading docks,
and does not include intersections.

The driveways and loading zones along each of the
Build Alternatives are described in Chapter 7 of the Final EIS, as well as
Chapter 5 in the Technical Appendix B (Volume 3).

The Draft EIS and Final EIS, Chapter 7 disclose that some
unpermitted operations, such as the use of public right-of-way for
freight, nonmotorized users, and safety. Safety impacts under the
methodology used to summarize impacts to all modes, including
freight, nonmotorized users, and safety, are included under the
Build Alternatives are described in Chapter 7 of the Final EIS, as well as
Chapter 5 in the Technical Appendix B (Volume 3).

The DEIS lacks accurate information for the decision-makers.
See Exhibit A, HE Order, Page 5, Item 22.

CM NO. 69: The DEIS lacks accurate information for the decision-makers.

CM NO. 70: The DEIS includes a discussion of the inherent dangers of locating a multi-user
side-path on major truck streets in an industrial area, and in the other Alternative locations. Without this
comprehensive discussion of traffic hazards, the DEIS is incomplete.

CM NO. 71: SDOT acknowledged the high level of concern about safety expressed in the public comments and that the EIS needs to include an analysis of safety conditions, such as indirect sight

The designs of each of the Build Alternatives have been updated
from the design evaluated by the Hearing Examiner as part of the
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
barriers, buffers, and fences, will be determined during the final
Draft EIS and Final EIS process. Specific safety features, such as
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>EIS Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CM NO. 71 | The Alternative passes 55 industrial driveways and intersections (not 41), putting trail users and heavy industrial traffic in direct conflict. As noted above, Vic Bishop testified in front of the Hearing Examiner that he employed a methodology published by the Chicagoland Bicycle Federation in 1997, which is a numerical system of scoring different types of roadways that integrate the number of driveways and the number of intersections. This methodology has been used in various jurisdictions to assess road safety and has been shown to be effective in identifying areas where road safety improvements are needed. The score of 104 for the Shilshole South Alternative is nearly six times above the Chicagoland “high risk” category. Under SEPA, the level of detail must be commensurate with the importance of the environmental impact posed by the Alternative. 

SDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed this proposed Alternative to determine whether there would be specific impacts in certain situations at certain locations.
| | | |
| CM NO. 72 | “Under SEPA, the level of detail must be commensurate with the importance of the environmental impact posed by the Alternative.” Exhibit C, Transcript of Record, page 17, lines 10 – 21; page 18, lines 15-18. True and correct copies of these pages are attached as Exhibit C.

SDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed this proposed Alternative to determine whether there would be specific impacts in certain situations at certain locations.
| | | |
| CM NO. 73 | SDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed this proposed Alternative to determine whether there would be specific impacts in certain situations at certain locations.

SDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed this proposed Alternative to determine whether there would be specific impacts in certain situations at certain locations.
| | | |
| CM NO. 74 | SDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed this proposed Alternative to determine whether there would be specific impacts in certain situations at certain locations.

SDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed this proposed Alternative to determine whether there would be specific impacts in certain situations at certain locations.
| | | |
| CM NO. 75 | SDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed this proposed Alternative to determine whether there would be specific impacts in certain situations at certain locations.

SDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed this proposed Alternative to determine whether there would be specific impacts in certain situations at certain locations.
| | | |
| CM NO. 76 | SDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed this proposed Alternative to determine whether there would be specific impacts in certain situations at certain locations.

SDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed this proposed Alternative to determine whether there would be specific impacts in certain situations at certain locations.
| | | |
| CM NO. 77 | SDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed this proposed Alternative to determine whether there would be specific impacts in certain situations at certain locations.

SDOT has not sufficiently planned or designed this proposed Alternative to determine whether there would be specific impacts in certain situations at certain locations.
| | | |
The driveways and loading zones along each of the Alternatives were identified and counted using design drawings and field work. The designs of each of the Build Alternatives have been updated to include safety considerations to ensure that the trail operates safely.

Signs of 'safety study' are not required under SEPA. Please see Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design Considerations:

- No ＊ for safety study would be required. However, measures described for the Shilshole South Alternative in Section 1.7.1 could be implemented to address sight distance concerns and improve visibility at key intersections:
  - * at the public meeting on May 30, 2016, SDOT stated it would take approximately 1 year to design the selected Alternative.

It appears SDOT essentially froze the design of this Alternative from the level of detailed design evaluated by the Hearing Examiner as part of the DEIS. The final design of the Shilshole South Alternative and in Section 1.7.1 could be implemented to address sight distance concerns and improve visibility at key intersections:

At the public meeting on July 14, 2016, SDOT stated it would take approximately 1 year to design the selected Alternative.

Please refer to the responses to Comments 09-015 and 09-068.
CM NO. 81

This Alternative is not sufficiently designed to determine whether there are significant adverse traffic hazards. A supplemental DEIS must be prepared. Design elements such as landscaping, pavement variations, and signage and signal improvements were not described in the analysis of the Leary Alternative. This Alternative, as designed, could improve safety compared to the No Build Alternative by providing a dedicated facility for nonmotorized users. The final design would also include safety considerations to ensure that the trail operates safely. Therefore, no mitigation would be required. However, measures described for the Shilshole South Alternative and in Section 1.7.1* could be implemented to address sight distance concerns and improve safety at key intersections in the area.

*Section 1.7.1 describes features common to all Build Alternatives; roadway design, and does not include intersections.

Page 19

Veris Law Group PLLC

Page 4-7

It is anticipated that the trail would improve safety overall for pedestrian and bicycle modes, despite increased conflicts and hazards located along the driveways of Stimpson Marina, Salmon Bay Sand and Gravel, Covich-Williams, Canal Cove Marina, Salmon Bay Café, Sagstad Martine, Hatton Marine, Ballard Mill Marina, and CSR Marine. The proposal would likely have significant adverse impacts on the form of traffic hazards in the area. Activities, construction, and transportation would put users of the trail in direct conflict with heavy industrial traffic, which would not improve safety overall.

Page 4-8

In addition to forcing trucks that service the businesses located along this Alternative to continue to use the driveways safely and legally, SDOT admits this Alternative may result in more hours of operation and higher labor costs for these users. These additional operating challenges would increase risk of accidents. Increases in risk of accidents would add to the risk that the trail would become obsolete. Industrial businesses may adapt to these conflicts and hazards by changing operations. These additional operating challenges are likely to increase costs to consumers due to increased expenditures to employ traffic flaggers to avoid collisions. Industrial businesses may adapt to these conflicts and hazards by changing operations. The cost of these changes would be likely to increase costs of production for these users, and these costs are unlikely to be passed on to consumers due to the high volume of trucking and freight, nonmotorized users, and safety. Safety impacts under the alternative are identified and counted using design drawings and field work. The count included on page ES-11 of the Draft EIS only includes driveways and loading docks, and does not include intersections.

CM NO. 84

A review of the NWPMA report indicates that many trucks are unable to make the illegal turns required by the Hearing Examiner. The operation of the BGT Missing Link may contribute to the increased conflicts between trucks and pedestrians, which may decrease pedestrian safety. The BGT Missing Link is adjacent to industrial uses that depend on freight mobility. The Appellants' auto-turn simulations indicate that conflicts between truck movements and trail users are exacerbating problems with freight movements. The proposal would likely have significant adverse impacts on the form of traffic hazards in the area.

Comment Matrix

Hearing Examiner Order

CM NO. 83

This Alternative crosses 35 driveways, loading docks, and intersections, not 41 and puts users of the trail in direct conflict with heavy industrial traffic, which would not improve safety overall.

CM NO. 82

The proposal would likely have significant adverse impacts on the form of traffic hazards in the area. Activities, construction, and transportation would put users of the trail in direct conflict with heavy industrial traffic, which would not improve safety overall.

CM NO. 80

The Appellants' auto-turn simulations…indicate that conflicts between truck movements and trail users are exacerbating problems with freight movements. The proposal would likely have significant adverse impacts on the form of traffic hazards in the area.

CM NO. 86

Mr. B-M organized through conducting an auto-turn analysis that there are conflicts and hazards along the roadway of Salmons Point, Salmon Bay Sand and Gravel, Covich-Williams, Canal Cove Marina, Salmon Bay Café, Sagstad Martine, Hatton Marine, Ballard Mill Marina, and CSR Marine. These identified conflicts and hazards would put users of the trail in direct conflict with heavy industrial traffic, which would not improve safety overall.

CM NO. 85

In addition to forcing trucks that service the businesses located along this Alternative to continue to use the driveways safely and legally, SDOT admits this Alternative may result in more hours of operation and higher labor costs for these users. These additional operating challenges would increase risk of accidents. Increases in risk of accidents would add to the risk that the trail would become obsolete. Industrial businesses may adapt to these conflicts and hazards by changing operations. The cost of these changes would be likely to increase costs of production for these users, and these costs are unlikely to be passed on to consumers due to the high volume of trucking and freight, nonmotorized users, and safety. Safety impacts under the alternative are identified and counted using design drawings and field work. The count included on page ES-11 of the Draft EIS only includes driveways and loading docks, and does not include intersections.

CM NO. 84

A review of the NWPMA report indicates that many trucks are unable to make the illegal turns required by the Hearing Examiner. The operation of the BGT Missing Link may contribute to the increased conflicts between trucks and pedestrians, which may decrease pedestrian safety. The BGT Missing Link is adjacent to industrial uses that depend on freight mobility.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Matrix: Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link Project – Draft Environmental Impact Statement (June 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page ES-10:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM NO. 91:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page ES-10:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM NO. 92:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table A:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM NO. 93:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page ES-10:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM NO. 94:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page ES-10:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM NO. 95:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page ES-11:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM NO. 96:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table B:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM NO. 87:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page ES-11:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM NO. 86:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please see the responses to Comments 09-015 and 09-068. The design of the alternatives is to a sufficient level to inform decision-makers by describing and identifying locations where there could be impacts to driveways, the types of impacts that could occur, and potential mitigation, primarily in the form of design options, that could minimize any potential impacts. The locations where there could be impacts under any of the Build Alternatives have been identified in the Final EIS Chapter 7 and Chapter 5 of Technical Appendix B (Volume 3). Mitigation strategies to address impacts have also been included in the Final EIS.
Thank you for your comments.

10 - 002 Safety is a critical component of the project. SDOT is designing the trail according to City standards and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guidelines for bicycle and trail facilities. The use of roadway intersection and driveway treatments such as raised crossings, signage, pavement markings, and other warning devices will be evaluated in the final design phase of the project to address safety and access concerns for both nonmotorized and motorized users. Please see Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations in the Final EIS for more detail.

Your comment is noted.

10 - 003 Safety considerations are taken into account throughout the trail design process, including the preliminary trail alignment layout, including sight distance, turning radii, intersection design features, pavement treatments, and signage. Please refer to Section 1.7.1 of the Final EIS for a discussion of Roadway Design and Safety Considerations.

The Preferred Alternative's proposed 10- to 12-foot wide multi-use trail meets the current AASHTO and NACTO guidelines for the design of trail facilities. In several sections the multi-use trail will serve as the sidewalk for pedestrians as well as the path for other users. From NW 54th Street to the intersection of NW Market Street and 24th Ave NW, there would be a 6- to 10-foot sidewalk adjacent to the multi-use trail.
Safety first. To meet the City’s Vision Zero goal, the trail’s design should put safety first by minimizing conflicts between all road and trail users with attention to details such as sightlines, surface durability, lighting and safe crossings.

Separation between people walking and biking. Create separate channels for people walking and biking and consider adding a jogging strip, using the University of Washington’s newest section of the EBT as a guiding example. As trail use increases and congestion occurs, this more separation will prevent collisions, near collisions and general discomfort between people walking and biking.

Maximum width. The trail should be as wide as possible to accommodate our region’s growing population and increasing rates of walking and biking, especially in walkable neighborhoods such as Ballard.

Thank you for the chance to offer input on the EBT Expansion. We applaud the City of Seattle for completing this vibrant trail and safely connecting neighborhoods.

Jamie Cheney
Director of Transportation and Sustainability
Seattle Children’s

CC:
Edna Shim, Seattle Children’s
Thank you for your comments. As noted in Section 1.2, the intent of the project is to create a safe, direct, and defined multi-use trail for persons of all abilities, for a variety of transportation and recreational activities, and to improve predictability for motorized and non-motorized users along the project alignment.

Your comment is noted. The intent of the No Build Alternative is to establish the baseline against which the anticipated impacts of the build alternatives are measures.

Your comment is noted.
Thank you for your comments. As noted in Section 1.2, the intent of the project is to create a safe, direct, and defined multi-use trail for persons of all abilities, for a variety of transportation and recreational activities, and to improve predictability for motorized and non-motorized users along the project alignment.

Your comment is noted. The intent of the No Build Alternative is to establish the baseline against which the anticipated impacts of the build alternatives are measured.

Your comment is noted.

This EIS does not evaluate the impacts of the trail between 3rd Ave NW and 11th Ave NW as it is outside the study area. However, the Chapter 4, Land Use, notes the location of the existing trail and trail terminus within the BINMIC under the description of the No Build Alternative.

Given the uncommon nature and flexibility in schedule of when train deliveries occur, phone interviews were used as a source of data, similar to data collection activities for other variables (e.g., driveway usage by time of year and special vehicle maneuvers). Additional specificity would not likely provide additional accuracy, and an average count provided by the BTR operator was considered adequate for this analysis.

Thank you for considering our comments as you prepare a final EIS for the Missing Link project.

Kevin Corcoran, President
Ben Peterson, Vice-President
Jennifer Mazula, Secretary
Dave Janss, Treasurer

Dorothy Kasperzyk
Thank you for your comments.

As documented in Final EIS Chapter 8 and Appendix C, Parking Discipline Report (Volume 3), the Final EIS analysis relied on three recent parking studies completed in 2014, 2015, and 2017. These studies were used for the 2017 conditions and covered the entire study area. The 2008 and 2011 parking studies referred to in the comment that were used in the previous environmental analyses for the Missing Link were not included in the parking analysis done for the Final EIS.

Your comment is noted. In addition to survey forms collected and turned in by others, SDOT received a significant number of substantive comments that spoke to the validity of the Draft EIS. Please see Volume 2, Comments and Responses for copies of the comments and responses. Also refer to Section 1.4.2 of the FEIS for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative.

During the alternative development process SDOT received a number of suggestions for potential routes and facility types to complete the Missing Link. SDOT developed screening criteria to narrow the possible alternatives, focusing on the development of a safe, multi-use trail that would be similar in design and feel to the rest of the Burke-Gilman Trail system. The Greenway along NW 58th Street did not meet those criteria as it does not serve the same purpose as a multi-use trail and it is not a direct route between the existing termini of the Burke-Gilman Trail. Please see Sections 1.4 and 1.9 in the Final EIS for more detail.
Under any of the Build Alternatives, trail users would not be required to stop at driveway or roadway crossings with the trail. Trail users would only be required to wait if a vehicle was already blocking the trail when the trail user approached the crossing. Therefore, the 15 to 25 second delay would only occur occasionally for trail users.

Safety is an important component of the project. Applicable design guidance have been consulted during the development of this trail including City of Seattle codes, and AASHTO and NACTO guidelines. Roadway modifications, intersection treatments and driveway design that could be incorporated in the final design phase of the project to provide separation and address safety, access, nonmotorized users, and vehicle types are described in the FEIS Executive Summary and Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations.
7.34 Safety

The Shilshole South Alternative would improve safety for nonmotorized users and motor vehicles in the study area. Under this alternative, a dedicated bicycle facility would improve predictability of conflict points between motor vehicles and bicyclists and reduce the likelihood of collisions. Potential conflict points would be clearly organized and delineated, which would allow motor vehicle drivers and trail users to be aware of where to travel cautiously. A dedicated facility would also reduce the likelihood of nonmotorized safety incidents by providing a facility that safety traverses or avoids obstacles in the study area such as the railroad tracks. The Missing Link would be designed to clearly delineate trail user space from the roadway and would include safety features such as buffers, pavement markings, raised crosswalks, curb treatments, signage, and lighting. Under the Shilshole South Alternative, there would be slight distance concerns for exiting vehicles at up to eight driveways on the north side of Shilshole Ave NW between 20th Ave NW and 11th Ave NW where buildings are constructed up to the property lines.

Buildings and structures adjacent to the trail could reduce visibility for both vehicles and trail users. However, the final trail design would include safety features to reduce conflicts between trail users and vehicles. The placement of the trail could be moved to locations farther from the property lines, but this would require additional relocation of the RTR tracks. The final placement of the trail would be decided during final design. Where possible, signage, pavement markings, and advanced warning systems, among other safety enhancements, would notify trail users and vehicle drivers of the trail crossing. Although a buffer would not be provided between the property line and the trail, these driveways would still operate safely under SMC 11.38.230.

The previous paragraph list promises a lot of changes that the City will do to make a bike trail safe it ignores that most of the changes on Shilshole will be City required changes made at the expense of the affected industrial businesses. The DEIS does not show that the final trail design will include safety features to reduce conflicts between trail users and vehicles. The placement of the trail could also be moved to locations farther from the property lines, but this would require additional relocation of the RTR tracks. The final placement of the trail would be decided during final design. It will be safe or is even possible because there is no final design that deals with the existing driveways or proposed curbs and sidewalks.

The railway would have to move the rail. There is no discussion of the costs to the City to move the owned railway. The businesses would have to move their loading docks and driveways. The City would put paint on the street and install sidewalks that would interfere with truck freight access. The City has promised time and again that it does not understand the turning radius of a semi-truck and trailer.

The DEIS does not say explicitly that there is any danger in any of the alternate routes. The public meetings did not inform the public that any of the alternate routes had hazards and what would be done to mitigate those hazards. As a result, the public does not think there are any safety issues.

The failure of the DEIS to take the Hearing Examiner’s admonishments seriously is deeply disappointing. Safety requires prudent decisions based on the best available engineering practice. The DEIS does not take this into account for the Shilshole alternatives, especially considering cost and disruption to existing businesses and the Maritime/Heavy Industrial complex the Shilshole freight route supports.

Sincerely,

Doug Dixon
General Manager
Pacific Fishermen Shipyard and Electric, LLC

12 - 006 Please refer to Section 1.7.1 of the FEIS for a discussion of roadway design and safety considerations and to Chapter 7 of the FEIS for a discussion of potential transportation-related impacts.

12 - 007 Please see the Final EIS for information on the design for the Build Alternatives, including potential impacts on parking, loading areas, and driveways. Chapter 5 of Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) and Chapter 7 of the Final EIS describes the locations where the rail line could be relocated under the Preferred and Shilshole South Alternatives. However, it is anticipated that rail operations would continue to operate following construction of the trail. An auto-turn analysis was completed for representative driveways along the alignment to ensure that driveway widths can accommodate the range of vehicles accessing a particular driveway. A discussion of design treatments to address separation and safety was prepared and is included in Section 1.7.1 of the Final EIS.

SDOT has committed to working with adjacent businesses, property owners, and interested stakeholders as the design process continues.

12 - 008 Potential hazards have been identified for all the Build Alternatives, including the Preferred Alternative, concerning roadway intersections, driveway crossings, sight distance, and other elements. Please see Table 1-1 for a comparison summary of potential impacts by alternative. Further detail on potential transportation-related impacts is included in Chapter 7 of the FEIS and in Technical Appendix B (Volume 3).

12 - 009 Safety is a critical component of the project. SDOT is designing the trail according to City standards and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guidelines for bicycle and trail facilities. The use of roadway intersection and driveway treatments such as raised crossings, signage, pavement markings, and other warning devices will be evaluated in the final design phase of the project to address safety and access concerns for both nonmotorized and motorized users. Please see Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations in the FEIS for more detail.
City of Seattle

Mike McGinn, Mayor

August 30, 2013

Peter Hahn, Director
Mark Mazzola, Environmental Manager
Seattle Department of Transportation
700 5th Avenue, Suite 3900
Seattle, WA 98104

RE: Scope of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), Burke-Gilman Trail Extension Project

Dear Sirs,

Seattle City Council Resolution #31243 states: “The Seattle Freight Advisory Board shall advise the City Council, the Mayor, and all departments and offices of the City in development of a functional and efficient freight system and on all matters related to freight and the impact that actions by the City may have upon the freight environment.”

Regarding the Scoping of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Burke-Gilman Trail Extension Project, the notice of the opportunity to provide scoping comments was not received by the Seattle Freight Advisory Board (SFAB) until July 17, 2013, one day after our regular meeting, and the comment period was closed on August 16, 2013, three days before our next regular meeting. We wish to thank you for your agreement to extend the comment period so that we can fulfill our obligation of the SFAB.

The Seattle Freight Advisory Board would like to request that the EIS take into account all possible routes and prioritize safety and economic impacts, especially in the interim before a Freight Master Plan is completed. Currently, Shilshole Avenue is the only major truck street west of 15th Avenue NW and it serves the Ballard-Interbay North End Manufacturing Industrial Center, supporting the largest fishing fleet in this nation. We strongly encourage the EIS to take into account the economic impact to this industry if freight traffic along this corridor is disrupted by the addition of a bicycle facility. We would also encourage the consideration of alternative routes for bicycles and additional streets to be designated as truck routes.

Two routes that the SFAB would like to suggest be considered are:
1) From 9th NW to NW Leary and cycle tracks on Leary to NW 46th, continuing on to 28th NW.
2) The second route from 9th NW and NW 45th north to NW 46th, west bound with bike lanes on the north side to 17th NW; north on 17th NW to Ballard Avenue, west on Ballard to 22nd NW, north on 22nd to NW 58th, connecting to the new NW 58th greenway, then west to Seaview; or, west to 28th NW and south on 28th to NW 54th and the Locks. Hopefully with this route, 17th NW will be completed as a north-south greenway from NW 46th to NW 90th, thereby relieving pressure on 15th NW, the only City street designated as a north-south major truck route.

Making NW 45th the major truck street from Shilshole to Leary and making 46th a calm access street, with bike lanes on the north side to 17th NW, will remove the major safety conflicts between bikes and the railroad tracks on NW 45th. This gives the permanent placement of a major truck street to serve the Maritime and other industries located in the Ballard-Interbay North End Manufacturing & Industrial Center.

The proposed Bicycle Master Plan update identifies 584 miles of bike facilities in Seattle. The total major truck street mileage is down to 146 miles, and we are compromising and losing some every year. Until a Freight Master Plan is completed and provides guidance to the multimodal planning process, the board advocates careful consideration to impact to existing freight corridors. We advocate attracting as many bicycle commuters to safe corridors that do not compromise safety or impact the economic base of our city.

The Seattle Freight Advisory Board wishes to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scope of the EIS, and is willing to help the Seattle Department of Transportation design any route which will not adversely impact the major truck streets and the access to freight mobility.

Thank you,

Warren R. Aakervik, Jr.
Chairman, Seattle Freight Advisory Board

Seattle Freight Advisory Board
31243
The Draft EIS and Final EIS contain analysis of impacts related to truck traffic at driveways. Potential traffic hazard impacts, including any potential conflicts between vehicles and trail users, are analyzed and disclosed in FEIS Section 7.3 along with measures to eliminate or reduce those conflicts. Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations also discusses methods that can and would be employed to reduce the risk of such conflicts. Although the final design has not been determined, the analysis considers the range of potential impacts that could result from the project along each alignment and identifies potential mitigation measures.

The Preferred Alternative avoids the maritime and industrial businesses along NW 54th St by following a section of NW Market St. Refer to Section 1.4.2 of the FEIS for a discussion of the selection process, and Section 1.6.1 for a discussion of the Preferred Alternative.

Also, refer to the response to Comment 12-005.
The Draft EIS and Final EIS contain analysis of impacts related to truck traffic at driveways. Potential traffic hazard impacts, including any potential conflicts between vehicles and trail users, are analyzed and disclosed in FEIS Section 7.3 along with measures to eliminate or reduce those conflicts. Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations also discusses methods that can and would be employed to reduce the risk of such conflicts. Although the final design has not been determined, the analysis considers the range of potential impacts that could result from the project along each alignment and identifies potential mitigation measures.

The Preferred Alternative avoids the maritime and industrial businesses along NW 54th St by following a section of NW Market St. Refer to Section 1.4.2 of the FEIS for a discussion of the selection process, and Section 1.6.1 for a discussion of the Preferred Alternative. Also, refer to the response to Comment 12-005.

The eastbound right turn lane from NW Market St to 24th Ave NW is currently marked as a right turn lane. As part of the Preferred Alternative, SDOT will evaluate restrictions for right turns on red and other operational changes during the detailed design of this intersection.

Changes in accessibility and business operability are addressed in detail in Chapters 4 and 5 of the Economic Considerations Report (Technical Appendix E of the DEIS). The report examines business impacts from the perspective of the construction and operation of the BGT Missing Link. Accessibility impacts are assessed by examining traffic delay, loss of parking, and adjacent changes in property accessibility. Changes in these variables are used to discuss ways the various businesses might be impacted.
SEPA contemplates environmental review at an early stage of design, and does not require cost estimates of the proposed alternatives. The FEIS describes a variety of measures that can be applied to reduce conflicts at intersections and driveways and to minimize impacts related to truck movements and conflicts with other traffic and trail users (Section 1.7.1).

13 - 006 The Burke-Gilman Trail is used both as a recreational and commuter facility. Impacts have been identified and discussed throughout the Draft and Final EIS for all the Build Alternatives, including the Preferred Alternative, concerning transportation, parking, land use, and other elements of the environment. Please see Table 1-1 for a comparison summary of potential impacts by alternative. Section 7.3 of the FEIS discusses the safety considerations for each alternative. The costs to complete each alternative is outside the scope of this EIS.

13 - 007 According to Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) 11.44.020, bicycle riding is allowed on city streets. The City of Seattle cannot force people to use the trail, but the trail will be designed in a manner that encourages people to use it over local streets.

The criteria used to screen the alternative alignments are listed in Section 1.4.1, and include directness of route, number and types of trail crossings (driveways and intersections), street and arterial classification, adjacent land uses, and right-of-way width. Bicycle commuting was not a criteria used to screen the alternatives.

13 - 008 The analysis methodology uses a higher use time of year to estimate the worst-case scenario of impacts. The City of Seattle and Seattle Parks and Recreation share maintenance of the trail and will maintain the trail according to applicable facility maintenance standards, including removal of leaves or debris from the right-of-way. Please see Section 1.4.2 of the Final EIS for a summary of how the Preferred Alternative was selected.
The traffic models used by SDOT are based on traditional traffic engineering measures of effectiveness consistent with standard national traffic engineering guidance for quantifying the level of traffic congestion on streets and intersections. Traffic engineering models analyze future conditions based on best available data at the time and nationally accepted methodologies. Please see Chapter 7 of the Final EIS for updated information on the Build Alternatives and the anticipated impacts to traffic.

13 - 009 Please refer to the responses to Comment 12-007 and 13-005.

13 - 011 Hazards have been identified with all Build Alternatives, including roadway intersections, driveway crossings, sight distance, among others. Further discussion of hazard reduction features has been added to Section 1.7.1 of the Final EIS to describe potential safety issues and measures that can be taken to minimize them.

Please also refer to Chapter 7 of the FEIS for a discussion of potential transportation-related impacts.

13 - 012 Please refer to the responses to Comments 13-006 and 12-009.

13 - 013 The 58th Ave Greenway was reviewed as part of the initial alternatives screening. It was eliminated from further consideration due to the increased distance, the indirect route from existing trail ends, the number of intersections that would need to be crossed, and the narrow right-of-way width. The 58th Ave Greenway does not meet the project objective. Please refer to Section 1.9 of the FEIS for further discussion.
Dear Director Kubly,

Seattle Neighborhood Greenways is a coalition of grassroots neighborhood groups whose members have honed the art and science of choosing the most logical routes for all-ages and abilities walking and biking.

Seattle Neighborhood Greenways members identify and advocate for safe walking and biking connections that are:

1) Direct and Intuitive. People tend to walk and bike as directly as possible between locations while avoiding hills.
2) Comfortable and Safe. People are most comfortable when separated from fast traffic and busy intersections with many conflicts. Streets with the least traffic and least speeding are preferred. However, comfort and safety can be provided by physical separation.
3) Useful. Useful routes connect people to useful places like business districts, schools, parks, libraries, and transit hubs.

As a trail facility, the chosen solution must work for people walking, rolling a wheelchair, pushing a stroller, jogging, and biking.

When looking at the four alternative routes, each has a different mix of benefits and drawbacks. After careful consideration we rank the four options as follows:

1. **We recommend the Shilshole South option** because it is the most direct and intuitive route and has the least conflicts in terms of intersections, turning movements and parking cars. Shilshole South also fills a gap in Seattle's sidewalk network. The major downside with this routing is the difficulty in accessing any Ballard Ave businesses. Consideration must be given to creating safe connections to Ballard Ave businesses via safe crossings of Shilshole Ave (especially at NW Dock Pl to connect to the neighborhood greenway). We also recommend expanding on the tradition of traffic calming in the business district along Ballard Ave to help people comfortably get from the trail to their destination. Consideration must also be given to potential for conflicts with large vehicle turning motions - given Shilshole Ave South's designation as a Major Truck Street. One option could be to install railroad style crossing arms.

2. The Shilshole North alternative is a mostly direct route that minimizes conflicts and is closer to Ballard Ave businesses by being on the north-east side of Shilshole Drive. However, depending on the trail design, it may incur more conflicts with parking cars than a Shilshole Ave South route, does not create as seamless of a trail experience as Shilshole Ave S, and does not fill a gap in the sidewalk network.

3. The Ballard Ave alternative could be a workable alternative and provide the best connectivity to where people want to go if, and only if, it were strongly embraced by the local business community, built to a high level of design and placemaking on par with the Indianapolis Cultural Trail (http://indyculturaltrail.org/), and were more naturally routed (the double cross of Market St is unacceptable). However, business support for this routing is not anticipated, funding to create a trail on par with the Indianapolis Cultural Trail is highly unlikely, and the historic designation of the street would add to construction delays. Therefore, given the current circumstances, we...
believe this option would lead to unacceptable delays and the continued endangerment of people walking and biking.

4. The Leary Ave route, which may be useful in its own right, is the least intuitive or direct route and the user experience would not be in keeping with the flowing intent of the Burke Gilman Trail. By being indirect and illogical, utilization by people using the BGT would likely be low. Leary Ave is a high speed, high volume arterial street where people biking with children would feel the least comfortable of all the options. Leary Ave needs safety improvements, but the comfort and safety of one of the best rail-trails in the country ought not to be degraded by routing it on this STROAD.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the options for the Burke Gilman Trail Missing Link alignment. People in Seattle who walk, roll, and ride bicycles have waited a long time for this trail completion and all of us look forward to a fully functional regional trail in the near future.

Bob Edmiston
User Experience Engineer

Gordon Padelford
Policy Director

Your comment is noted.
SDOT considered all possible routes proposed during the July 17 and August 16, 2013 scoping comment period, including those received from the Freight Advisory Board on August 30, 2013. All road sections mentioned in your letter were mapped in the initial screening process and evaluated based on the following screening criteria: directness of route, number and types of trail crossings (driveways and intersections), street and arterial classification, adjacent land uses, and right-of-way width. Portions of both routes suggested by the Freight Advisory Board were evaluated in the Draft EIS.

The objectives of the project are to create a safe, direct, and defined multi-use trail for persons of all abilities, improve predictability for both motorized and nonmotorized users along the project alignment, and to maintain truck and freight facilities and access that support industrial and water-dependent uses in the area. As noted in Section 1.9 of the FEIS, SDOT considered protected bicycle lanes, including cycle tracks; however, these types of facilities do not provide safe accommodations for pedestrians or other nonmotorized users and do not meet the project objectives.
consider alternatives that are not immediately adjacent to industrial land uses, where feasible.”

On the same page, Section 1.4.1 Screening,

“SDOT received a number of suggestions during scoping in 2013 for potential routes to complete the Missing Link. SDOT mapped all possible route segments identified in the public scoping period, along with several additional segments suggested by SDOT staff and consultants.”

I bring to your attention that in the scoping letter of August 30, 2013, from the Seattle Freight Advisory Board, which is to advise the City on matters relative to the operations of freight in the City, that the Seattle Freight Advisory Board ("SFAB") requested it take into account two routes. The first one that SFAB suggested be considered, 9th NW to Leary NW and cycle tracks on Leary to NW Market, is one of the routes that they have identified. The second route was the route from 9th NW and NW 45th, north to NW 46th, along NW 46th west bound with bike lanes on the north side, to 17th NW, north on 17th NW to Ballard Avenue, west on Ballard Avenue to 22nd NW, north on 22nd to NW 58th, connecting the NW 58th greenway, then west to Seaview; or west to 28th NW and south on 28th to NW 54th and the Locks. Therefore, this would make NW 45th the major truck street from Shilshole to Leary, making NW 46th a calm access street with bike lanes on the north side to 17th NW, and remove the major safety conflicts between bikes and the railroad tracks on NW 45th. This gives the permanent placement of a major truck street to serve the maritime and other industries located in the Ballard-Interbay North End Manufacturing & Industrial Center, and safety for the bicyclists so they would not be on 45th. This was not looked at in the Screening and was not developed as one of the possible locations or potential solutions to the Burke Gilman Trail.
I also bring to your attention in the DEIS Statement, Figure 7-2, which defines the Roadway Hierarchy. When you look at the Roadway Hierarchy that it defines, Shilshole is a principal arterial. Shilshole is a major truck street and defined as such, and it is the only major truck street west of 15th NW to serve the entire industrial and marine area in the north end. So therefore it has extreme importance to all industrial users on Shilshole and extends from Shilshole all the way over to the Locks.

Next, I would like to bring to your attention the design areas that they show on the maps on Figure 1-3, Figure 1-4, Figure 1-5 and Figure 1-6. Each of these show proposed routes to complete the missing link; I will just take a couple these places to identify the problem with the south and north side of Shilshole and the other areas. Obviously, from the previous information, 58th as a current greenway should be considered as being useful for bicyclists and pedestrians and keep them away from the major truck street which has a lot of congestion.

On the Figure 1-3, they show Typical Section NW 54th, a 66 foot Right-of-Way. I bring to your attention that in all the information I see, they have not identified the area going west between 24th NW and the Locks as an industrial use area, nor identified its driveways.

Bringing your attention to Land Use Discipline Report, Table A-1, pages A-1 and A-2, specifically the properties which are impacted by the South Trail. In that, there is not one property or driveway that is identified west of 24th NW to the Locks. Therefore, heavy industrial users are Ballard Transfer, Lieb Marine, Pacific Fisherman, Snow & Company (a boat builder), Ballard Oil Company, Gardner Boat Repair, Pipes Marine Repair, Stabbert

15 - 002 This is correct. Shilshole Ave NW is both a principal arterial and a major truck route and SDOT recognizes the importance of the corridor to the uses in the study area.

15 - 003 All of the potential routes that were identified during the scoping process in 2013 were included in the alternative screening process. A graphic showing all 55 possible route segments was presented at the project open house held on June 18, 2015, and can be found at the following link: http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/docs/2015_6_16_BGT_consolidated.pdf. As noted on the graphic, 58th Ave NW was included as a possible route, but was eliminated from further consideration because it is a well-functioning greenway, would not provide a direct route, particularly for pedestrians, and would cross a high number of existing residential driveways. In addition, it would have been difficult to make an acceptable north-south connection to the existing trail.

15 - 004 The Final EIS includes additional information regarding both the land uses along the unimproved NW 54th St right-of-way and the driveways in that area. The Preferred Alternative does not travel along the unimproved NW 54th St right-of-way.

15 - 005 SDOT inadvertently left these properties out of Table A-1 in the Land Use Discipline Report. The FEIS includes additional information regarding the land uses along NW 54th St and potential impacts to them to correct this mistake. FEIS Technical Appendix A contains an Errata and corrected tables for the Land Use Discipline Report (Volume 3 of the FEIS).
The Final EIS includes additional information regarding both the land uses along the unimproved NW 54th St right-of-way and the driveways in that area. The Preferred Alternative does not travel along the unimproved NW 54th St right-of-way. SDOT inadvertently left these properties out of Table A-1 in the Land Use Discipline Report. The FEIS includes additional information regarding the land uses along NW 54th St and potential impacts to them to correct this mistake. FEIS Technical Appendix A contains an Errata and corrected tables for the Land Use Discipline Report (Volume 3 of the FEIS).

The Final EIS includes additional information regarding the land uses along the unimproved NW 54th St right-of-way and the transportation impacts from each alternative on these uses. The Preferred Alternative does not travel along the unimproved NW 54th St right-of-way between 24th and NW and the Ballard Locks, but does use NW Market St.

Your comment noted. The analysis of land uses in this area has been revised for the FEIS. The method for estimating affected impacts used in the DEIS only the parcels immediately adjacent to the trail. This has been modified in the FEIS for the NW 54th St area to include the water-fronting parcels. Additional information on potential significant impacts to streets and driveways is provided in the Transportation section of the FEIS.

The land use analysis has been revised in the FEIS to include affected properties among those described in the comment. Please refer to Chapter 4 of the FEIS.

If you go to page 5-8, you can see that in 5.3.2 Operation, Figure 5-2, they show industrial land uses along Shilshole South Alternative, yet without these [excluded entities] included, it skews the numbers, because 54% does not exist anymore. And then on top of that, further on, I will try to point out in some of the other studies that it is not clear if they consider the water side of industrial properties, which if it is water dependent and/or water related, then the water side is equally important; in fact it is more important than the...
The vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle volumes are based on traffic
Your comment noted. The analysis of land uses in this area has been
SDOT inadvertently left these properties out of Table A-1 in the Land
The Final EIS includes additional information regarding both the land
Please see the Final EIS Chapter 7 and Technical Appendix B,
15 - 009 Please see the Final EIS Chapter 7 and Technical Appendix B,
Transportation Discipline Report (Volume 3), for additional analysis
15 - 010 Please see response to comment 15-009. Table 4-9 of Technical
Appendix B documents the existing conditions for daily bicycle and
estimated pedestrian volumes. The Final EIS includes additional
analysis of vehicle classification at driveways.
Also, please see Final EIS Section 1.8 of the FEIS for a table that
assesses the potential interactions between traffic hazards among
different types of users, including potential sight distance conflicts.
Going further on in the Transportation Discipline Report, we look at conflicts. If you
take Table 4-3 on page 4-11, and add up the Daily Total of Driveway crossings on the
Shilshole route, you will find that there are roughly 4,050 crossings through those very few
businesses that are listed. Again, everything west of 24th NW is not listed as part of those
driveways, so therefore there is a very strong impact on some of these driveways. In fact,
of the only two driveways that come in to Ballard Oil and Stabbert Yacht and Ship, most of
the big trucks have to back in or back out, which would be backing directly across the Trail
in very narrow corridors. Ballard Transfer loads and offloads large pieces of equipment
onto truck and trailers from highway trucks and then loads it into smaller trucks to deliver
into the city. They do a lot of work with hospitals transporting gamma knives, cat-
scanners, and other large medical equipment, as well as large freight for maritime vessels.
So there is a dramatic increase in the amount of crossings in those driveways compared to
the 4,050 total that is listed in Table 4-3 on page 4-11. That is what I would consider a
highly increased north-south movement across what is perceived by the Shilshole South
Alternative.
If you go to Table 4-8 on page 4-20, and look at the daily bicycle counts and
15 - 009 Please see the Final EIS Chapter 7 and Technical Appendix B,
estimated pedestrian volumes on the Burke Gilman Trail at 9th Ave NW on Wednesday
7/22/15, 1720 bicycles and 565 pedestrians is roughly 2400 crossings per day. To me
there is a significant amount of conflict when you have perpendicular crossings with no
sight distances on South Shilshole of 2385 bikes/pedestrians versus 4050 trucks/cars; it is an accident about to happen. When we start talking about safety issues, in particular crossings and driveways, look at the original figures that show driveways: a driveway on 56th NW, which is a private residence and which sometimes may be used and sometimes not, is defined as a driveway with maybe one crossing a day of one vehicle. Shilshole Avenue on the south side, at Salmon Bay Sand and Gravel, with two driveways that go in and out of the concrete mixing section, and that constitutes 325 truck crossings a day, is defined as two driveways. They show each one of them as a driveway, which again, does not give a true picture of what the conflicts really are and the impact the Shilshole South Alternative would have. It would give a truer picture to show type-of-vehicle crossings per driveway for each option.

When you look at the conflicts regarding Shilshole South, Table 4-9 on page 4-23, of the Transportation Discipline Report, they show the peak hours of the amount of bicycles and pedestrians. I note their comment:

“...the counts at 9th Ave NW, the closest location to the study area, also indicate that bicycle volumes are typically higher on weekdays than on weekends (see Table 4-8). This is likely because of the high number of commuters who use the BGT compared to recreational users.”

So during the week they would have the higher numbers and on top of that, most of those people are pairing off; if you look at Figure 4-10 of the Discipline Report, you will find that the counts show that an extreme amount of people are moving north bound, which would require them to leave the Burke Gilman Trail crossing Shilshole, a major truck street and creating more conflicts crossing Shilshole.

15 - 011 Please see the updated project description and analysis for the Build Alternatives in Final EIS Sections 1.6 and 7.3, as well as Technical Appendix B (Volume 3). The final design of the Preferred Alternative includes improvements to intersections to allow crossings of Shilshole Ave NW.
I do not agree with the truck counts that are in the traffic count saying Leary is a heavier used street. I believe Shilshole is a heavier used street. But that is not as important as the fact that you are creating 4850 vehicle and 2400 bike & ped crossings, and now a large portion of those are crossing and going up through Ballard, which is causing a secondary conflict across Shilshole NW. So, again I don’t believe that the conclusions drawn from those two Discipline Reports are effectively what is identified in the DEIS. I think that this is a continuing problem.

I will now address the Economic Considerations Report. In this Report, on page 3-1 of Chapter 3: Affected Environment, Section 3.1 Selected Study Area, they say the study area extends north of Leary Ave and Market Street for 1/2 mile showing that properties north of that will be affected by being of higher value because they are closer to the Burke Gillman Trail. Yet, if you look at the very last sentence, it says “Water areas and rights of way were excluded for purposes of economic analysis.” I know economics is not supposed to be one of the things that are considered. It was going to be looked at in the DEIS. When you actually look at the impact of water areas and rights of way south of Shilshole, it is dramatic in the economic impact. In fact, I find it hard to believe that the maritime industry will survive if the BGT takes the Shilshole South Alternative with its lack of sight distances and dangerous intersections. Lawsuits will be the norm.

Also note in the last sentence of the beginning paragraph on page 4-7 of the Economic Considerations Report, “There has not been previous research examining the economic link between multi-use trail operation and industrial property value or business activity.” I think that in itself speaks to the fact that nobody has really done even a cursory

15 - 012 The vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle volumes are based on traffic data gathered for existing conditions as described in Chapter 4 of Technical Appendix B (FEIS Volume 3). The potential impacts of proposed alternatives are documented in Chapter 5 of Technical Appendix B.

Also, please see Final EIS Section 1.8 of the Economic Considerations Report for a table that identifies potential traffic hazards and assesses the potential interactions among different types of users, including potential sight distance conflicts.

15 - 013 What is meant by stating that the economic analysis excluded water areas and rights-of-way is that the economic analysis focused only on the property parcels within the study area, specifically those parcels identified in the land use analysis. The property-level impact analysis fully assumes that access to things like water and transportation are vitally important to understanding how businesses might be impacted by the construction and operation of the BGT Missing Link.
analysis of what the impacts would be. There are additional operating challenges if you go
to the last sentence of the paragraph under the heading *How Multi-use Trails Negatively
Affect Property Value*.

“These additional operating challenges are likely to increase costs of
production for these users, and these costs are unlikely to be passed on to
consumers due to competition from producers elsewhere in the region.”

The maritime industry region is not as robust as some would like it to be. It is approaching
critical mass. The industry is going to have to go outside the state of Washington if we
compromise the ability of these shipyards and these suppliers to supply the largest
maritime fishing industry in this nation, which is home ported and operating from the
Seattle area. It has a dramatic economic impact.

On page 4-9 of the Economic Considerations Report, in Table 4-1 regarding the
study of intersections, they state that it was only going to be a few seconds delay, in fact
almost no seconds in the Shilshole South Alternative. This represents the largest deduction
in the average delay time. I question the validity of that statement. Driveway delay for
large trucks west bound, for instance, Salmon Bay Sand and Gravel off the major truck
street, which is supposed to be conducive to WB67 trucks, will be dramatically impacted.
They will have to cross an oncoming lane of traffic, they will have to cross where
commuters say they are not going to use the Burke Gilman Trail to commute because it
would be too slow and too highly impacted by giving rights to trucks for getting into
driveways. And then they will have to cross the Trail which will have people and
recreational bikes on it, and if we look at the numbers, we are talking about 2,000 people a
day, whether bikes or pedestrians, and at various speeds. That equates to 2 people every
minute. I agree it will be a larger group and then a smaller group, but big truck’s WB67 is

15 - 014 Your comment is noted. Impacts to specific businesses that threaten
their viability may impact the broader economy if those businesses’
productive value cannot be accommodated elsewhere in the region
by comparable industries. The net impact of these changes would
have to consider the economic value of the type(s) of enterprises
that might replace them on these properties. However, as stated in
the Final EIS, while the Preferred Alternative may negatively impact
adjacent businesses, SDOT does not anticipate it would threaten the
viability of those businesses.

15 - 015 The Economic Consideration Report (Technical Appendix E of the
DEIS) estimates traffic delays based on information in the
Transportation Discipline Report (Technical Appendix B of the DEIS).
The delays reported in Table 4-1 of the Economics report are for
intersections, not driveways. Refer to Chapter 7 of the FEIS and
Technical Appendix B of the FEIS (Volume 3) for further discussion.
literally 75 feet overall which is allowed in the state, and several of those a day go into each
one of those locations to service the maritime and/or the need for concrete in the industrial
areas. Ironically, Salmon Bay Sand and Gravel provides a substantial amount of materials
that go into building bike trails and roads for SDOT.

As it states in the second to the last paragraph on page 4-9,

"However, businesses may reduce exposure to delay costs by adjusting their
delivery and drive schedules to times of day and days of the week with
relatively few pedestrian and bicycle travels on the BGT Missing Link."

As it states in the second to the last paragraph on page 4-9,

"However, businesses may reduce exposure to delay costs by adjusting their
delivery and drive schedules to times of day and days of the week with
relatively few pedestrian and bicycle travels on the BGT Missing Link."

Literally, from all indications in the DEIS, this would be on weekends. The construction and
maritime industries do not have the luxury of choosing their delivery schedules. They
cannot choose when a vessel is arriving at the shipyard, or when it leaves. There is not a lot
of ability to adjust their delivery and/or receipt times.

Note the very last sentence on page 4-9, "However, the full extent of any potential
increases in business costs under the 2040 Shilshole South Alternative and how these costs
compare to the 2040 No Build Alternative are unknown." Many things are unknown and
therefore, I believe, are not reflected properly, or at least in my opinion in the DEIS.

I now want to draw your attention to Operational Impacts and Benefits. These are
presentations that were made to the general public. All the presentations have the same
issue, and that is they again show a very biased analysis of what might happen in the
various alternatives. When they talk about driveway delay, they show all three being about
the same amount with one thumb down and yet all of those, including the Shilshole South,
will have a dramatic driveway delay impact. Parking on all of the Alternatives is extremely

15 - 016 The increase in driveway delays may increase costs of operating
businesses in the study area. To the extent that the businesses and
properties that operate these driveways are dependent upon
drive traffic to maintain a profitable enterprise, these delays
could result in higher costs of production.

15 - 017 The full paragraph from which the statement is quoted refers to the
potential impact from higher volumes of pedestrian and bicycle
traffic near industrial businesses and in loading and unloading zones
that might increase the localized probability of industrial vehicle
involved bicycle and pedestrian conflicts. In this situation, business
operating expenditures could increase due to higher costs of
insurance. While the full extent is hard to pinpoint, higher costs of
insurance have been identified as a potential effect.

15 - 018 The summary of operational impacts and benefits referred to in the
comment were developed solely for the purposes of comparing
alternatives during public presentations and were not meant as a
substitute for the full analysis contained in the EIS. For a full
description of operational impacts for Parking and Transportation,
please see Chapters 7 and 8 of the Final EIS. For analysis of the
impacts to the maritime industry and land uses, please see Chapter 4
of the Final EIS.
In compliance with the State Environmental Review Process (SEPA) (WAC 197-11-510 and 535), SDOT notified the public as to the release of the Draft EIS and invited comment on the document. As noted, two public hearings were held in July 2016 to obtain oral testimony. Court reporters were present to record the testimony. Copies of the transcript, along with responses can be found in Volume 2, Comments and Responses. All comments received on the Draft EIS are included in Volume 2 to the FEIS along with responses to the comments. This process complies with SEPA regulations.

Your comment is noted.

The FEIS and the Errata in Technical Appendix A (Volume 3) include additional information regarding the land uses along NW 54th St. Additional analysis was completed for driveways along all alternatives including the Shilshole South Alternative and driveways along the unimproved NW 54th St right-of-way. In addition, SDOT has prepared a discussion of design and safety features, which is included in Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Features, of the Final EIS.

Your comment is noted.

Impact. Freight mobility is shown as only being impacted by the Leary Alternative. This is really not true because the majority of heavy-duty industrial freight is using Shihole and they show no impact of that. Ironically, they show the impact to the Ballard Farmers Market for Ballard Avenue being one thumb down, but they don’t show how the impact to maritime/industrial is going to be on any of these Alternatives. It is identified as what is going to happen to the community, and this is about the potential of having maritime and industrial business continue to be here, and primarily most of it is maritime.

The last thing I would like to point out on the presentations is the next step. They show that the public hearings took place on July 14th and 16th, in-depth briefings for stakeholders and organizations. Again, I question the validity of those hearings.

They then state they will develop a prudent alternative based on public input. It has been said at many, many, many of these meetings this is not a point of “vote for which one you want,” but this is to look at what information the DEIS is providing. Ironically, they are going to put out an EIS that is to help shape the decision, yet the current DEIS is flawed and the public will never see the final EIS before the preferred Alternative is determined. It appears that the majority of people that responded on this were responding to what their choice was, not necessarily to valid information on the EIS.

Finally, I would like to reiterate the major points that I have tried to make in these comments. We do need to complete the Missing Link. We need to do it safely and we need to do it with the least impact to the economic basis of this community, the diversity of the businesses, and the jobs involved.
The irregularities that stand out are:

- The DEIS did not recognize any industrial uses on NW 54th St between 24th and 28th NW, or even the Locks.
- The industrial driveways are to receive consideration as a safety concern according to the DEIS and the driveways on NW 54th from 24th to 28th Ave NW were not included or analyzed in the DEIS - a serious omission;
- Driveway counts are not differentiated between residential or industrial uses. So a driveway with one car per day is counted the same as a driveway used multiple times by trucks and other commercial vehicles;
- Driveways on both sides of NW 56th were counted, yet only driveways on one side of the street on Shilshole Ave NW were counted, giving the false impression that Shilshole Ave NW has fewer driveways;
- The report states that 4,050 vehicles enter or leave driveways along the impacted segment of Shilshole Ave NW each day. The report also states 1,720 bicycles and 565 pedestrians are estimated to use Shilshole Ave NW daily. This volume of traffic would seem to be a safety concern that deserves more consideration and analysis. Sight distances from driveways and the fact that trucks need to back out of driveways along Shilshole and NW 54th were not examined as significant safety issues;
- Salmon Bay Sand and Gravel deserves special attention; 325 trucks use their south driveway daily. Yet, the PM truck-count shows 5 trucks per hour which would be at the slowest time of their day and not reflective of their

15 - 022 The FEIS and the Errata in Technical Appendix A (Volume 3) include additional information regarding the land uses along NW 54th St.

15 - 023 Additional analysis was completed for driveways along all alternatives including the Shilshole South Alternative and driveways along the unimproved NW 54th St right-of-way. In addition, SDOT has prepared a discussion of design and safety features, which is included in Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Features, of the Final EIS.

15 - 024 Please see Chapter 7 of the Final EIS and Chapter 4 of Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) for additional detail on vehicle classification at driveways and driveway volumes. Additional driveway counts collected for the Final EIS included residential, commercial, and industrial driveways.

15 - 025 Please see Chapter 7 the Final EIS and Chapter 4 of Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) for additional analysis on driveways on both sides of Shilshole Ave NW. Driveways on both sides of NW 56th St were not included in the Draft EIS or Final EIS because the proposed alternative on NW 56th St would only travel along the south side of the street.

15 - 026 Please see Final EIS Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations, for additional analysis of design measures to address safety and sight distance concerns during final design. Also, please see response to comment 15-009.

15 - 027 The analysis methodology assesses impacts during the PM peak hour, when traffic impacts would be greatest for all modes. Please see Chapter 3 of Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) for a description of the analysis methodology.
use. All truck counts should be between 0700 and 1500 hours when trucks are out and operating and freight is moving.

- The impact to parking from completing the Missing Link is listed as follows:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking spaces eliminated:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shilshole North (industrial)</td>
<td>227 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shilshole South (industrial)</td>
<td>261 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballard Ave</td>
<td>193 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leary Way</td>
<td>103 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers speak for themselves and appear to be accurate. The State has asked that this industrial area not be further impacted.

- 54th Ave NW is listed as a 66 foot wide street. What is not included in the report is the bank of the street that makes much of it unusable, shifts the width of available right-of-way dramatically. Normal traffic is already difficult without the addition of a designated, exclusive bike/pedestrian lane on NW 54th Ave.

- Maritime Industrial users are especially vulnerable as they have no option to relocate if the Trail significantly impacts their operation. It is not clear if the DEIS includes all the square footage (water and uplands) and maritime in the analysis of industrial usage.

15 - 028 Seattle Comprehensive Plan Policy T42 states that it is the City’s general policy to replace short-term parking only when the project results in a concentrated and substantial amount of on-street parking loss. This project would not remove parking spaces in a concentrated or substantial manner. Parking removal would be spread out along the alignment. The alternatives evaluated for the Missing Link, including the Preferred Alternative, would eliminate between 82 and 344 on-street parking spaces. The maximum amount of parking in the study area that could be removed is 9% of all on- and off-street parking (under the Preferred Alternative), and there is on-and off-street parking capacity within the study area to absorb the loss of parking. This project is consistent with the City’s policy direction and overall City planning goals to reduce dependency on single-occupancy vehicles. However, SDOT would implement mitigation measures for parking as described in Section 8.4.1 of the Final EIS.

15 - 029 The Final EIS includes additional information regarding both the land uses along NW 54th St and the driveways in the unimproved NW 54th St right-of-way area. The Preferred Alternative does not travel along the unimproved NW 54th St between 24th Ave NW and the Ballard Locks.

15 - 030 Refer to the response to Comment 15-005
We recommend a supplemental DEIS that addresses these irregularities as they relate to safety as the next step in the process. The decision makers and the public have a right to have an accurate and impartial Final EIS.

It would appear that any alternative to Shilshole Ave North or South would be safer for users of the Trail. NW Market St has safety implications on the south side at 24th NW and 26th NW. A route using NW 58th (Greenway) would be the safest for bike and trail users and have the lease impact on the Ballard community.

I believe the final answer will be found by bringing together knowledgeable stakeholders with accurate information to work on a solution that is safe for users but not compromise the Ballard commercial, maritime and industrial community.

Respectfully submitted,

Warren R. Aakervik, Jr.
Past Seattle Freight Advisory Board Member
Past Owner of Ballard Oil Company

15 - 031 Safety considerations were taken into account in all four build alternatives presented in the Draft EIS; however, based on the comments received on the DEIS, Section 1.7.1 of the FEIS has been revised to better describe the possible measures that can be employed to improve safety and reduce hazards associated with the operation of the trail.

15 - 032 The Greenway on NW 58th Street was evaluated during the alternative development process, but was eliminated for inclusion as an alternative for the Missing Link due to the additional length, indirectness of route, narrow right-of-way width on NW 58th Street, and the inability to maintain the consistency and feel of a regional multi-use trail.

15 - 033 SDOT engaged with several stakeholders while deliberating on a solution for the Missing Link, as summarized in Section 1.4.2, Development and Selection of the Preferred Alternative. SDOT will continue to coordinate with adjacent businesses, property owners, and interested stakeholders as the design process continues.
16 - 001 The Executive Summary in the Draft EIS contains several tables that compare impacts between the four build alternatives analyzed. The Executive Summary of the Final EIS focuses on the Preferred Alternative and provides an overview of impacts associated with the Preferred Alternative as compared to the original alternatives.

16 - 002 Your comment is noted.

16 - 003 Shoreline Street Ends are discussed throughout Chapter 5 (Recreation). The fact that the Shilshole South Alternative would increase access to Shoreline Street Ends has been added to Table ES-4.

16 - 004 The use of flaggers was intended only during construction activities, and not during operation of the trail. The text of the Final EIS has been revised to clarify when the use of flaggers is anticipated.

16 - 005 Comment noted. The Preferred Alternative meets the project objectives stated in Section 1.2.

16 - 006 The City of Seattle regulations and policies are in place to protect and manage all types of land uses. Section 4.1 of the FEIS identifies that the potential for an alternative to cause significant adverse impacts was identified if there is a permanent loss of land uses that are preferred under the adopted City of Seattle policies.

16 - 007 Section 4.2.2 describes the use and activities in enough detail to analyze the potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures under SEPA. These are typically minor activities and uses that are not expressly authorized by permit. The comment regarding what constitutes the best use of the right-of-way is acknowledged.

16 - 008 Your comment is noted. Bike racks are available on buses and stationary bike racks at bus stops. The Land Use Discipline report is not being updated as part of the FEIS, and clarification of this point would not change the analysis or conclusions in any way.

16 - 009 The term residential land use area includes the land area (square footage) in the residential use area, not square feet of living space.

---

**Review Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link Project**

**July 28, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>To collect and summarize the pros and cons of the alternatives, include a comparison, for example, the existing table of thumbs-up/thumbs-down symbols shown at the public meeting on 14 July 2016. [<a href="http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/docs/bgt/BGT_Welcome%20Boards_forWebsite.pdf%5C">http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/docs/bgt/BGT_Welcome%20Boards_forWebsite.pdf\</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>The Shilshole South alternative: 1) Is the safest alternative for all, because it has fewer intersections, and the best sightlines for driveways. 2) Has the best directness, best flattened, requires the least roadway reconfiguration, has the least impact on pedestrians and transit, and best maintains the feel of the BGT as a multi-use trail. 3) Allows for future modification to exploit the full right-of-way after the BTR lease expires. The trail could be widened, additional parking could be added, etc., as the Ballard population grows, and demand for trail facilities increases. 4) Doesn’t impact any cultural resources. 5) Improves home values (Appx E pg ES-1) without impacting residential parcels. 6) Reduces the average intersection delay the most; Leary alternative more than doubles existing delays. 7) It crosses 41 driveways, but many are inactive or have low activity, especially during evenings and weekends when trail use is highest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pg ES-10, Table ES-4</td>
<td>The table of Operational Impacts states that Shilshole South provides “similar recreational value to existing BGT”. However, additional recreational advantages such as access to street ends and waterfront need to be added. SDOT website’s Shoreline Street Ends page identifies 149 street ends, and says “These ‘shoreline street ends’ are precious community assets designated by the City of Seattle (City Resolution 29370, adopted in September 1996, followed by Ordinance 119673 in 1999) as special rights-of-way that should be preserved and improved for public use.” There are also mini-parks on street ends, such as Lyne Street Park. [<a href="http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/stuse_stends.htm%5C">http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/stuse_stends.htm\</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp ES-12, ES-13, Appx E, PG A-7; Appx A, page 6-1</td>
<td>In the main Study’s Summary of Mitigation Measures and in the Economic Appendix (Appx E) in a section about impact on property values, remove references to flaggers, or make clear that they are only necessary during construction. The Transportation Appendix (Appx B) mentions flaggers only during construction, which is appropriate. Flaggers are not necessary during operation, due to mitigations mentioned in the study, such as flashing beacons (e.g., page 7-49), signage, improved driveways, mountable curbs, etc. Additional mitigations for a few critical location, if necessary are available, such as audible warnings activated simultaneously with beacons. These mitigations (especially the automated warnings) are fully sufficient to address paragraph 27 of Hearing Examiner’s Decision W-12-002 and eliminate the need for businesses to provide flaggers and eliminate the associated economic impact. These mitigations are easier to incorporate on Shilshole South, due to the large right of way, and fewer number of crossings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Operation analysis under "Effect on Existing Land Uses" in Regional trails, including the BGT, are used for accessing any number of businesses, accessing health care, and all kinds of personal business. Your comment is noted. Refer to Section 1.7.1 of the FEIS for a discussion of Roadway Design Land use regulations vary by zone. All industrial zones allow minor non-industrial uses. Larger retail uses like Fred Meyer are no longer allowed in IG1 and IG2 zones. Restrictions on such uses have been strengthened in recent years, in order to protect Seattle’s manufacturing and industrial base. All alternatives would improve non-motorized access to and within the study area.

- **16 - 010** Land use regulations vary by zone. All industrial zones allow minor non-industrial uses. Larger retail uses like Fred Meyer are no longer allowed in IG1 and IG2 zones. Restrictions on such uses have been strengthened in recent years, in order to protect Seattle’s manufacturing and industrial base. All alternatives would improve non-motorized access to and within the study area.

- **16 - 011** Your comment is noted.

- **16 - 012** The Operation analysis under "Effect on Existing Land Uses" in Chapter 4.3.2 of the DEIS acknowledges the potential for all of the build alternatives to "provide a connection between the existing trail ends, thus providing a dedicated, nonmotorized connection between surrounding neighborhoods, and connecting trail users to parks and open space, businesses within the study area, and employment opportunities." However, the section goes on to describe why completing the Missing Link could have adverse impacts on freight and industrial uses.

- **16 - 013** Regional trails, including the BGT, are used for accessing any number of uses and location types. All possible uses of the BGT are not included in the EIS for ease of review. The lack of inclusion of these uses does not diminish the importance of the regional trail connection.

- **16 - 014** Refer to Section 1.7.1 of the FEIS for a discussion of Roadway Design and Safety considerations that can be employed to improve predictability for trail users and vehicles.

- **16 - 015** Under the significance thresholds identified in the Land Use chapter, a significant impact would occur if it would be likely to cause the permanent loss of land uses that are preferred under adopted City of Seattle policies. The Draft EIS acknowledges that the loss of the use of the right-of-way may impact the access to some businesses. Depending on the severity of the impact, the potential change of access could require mitigation that would improve both safety and operations.
Double- or triple-parking is when cars park parallel to an already parked car, typically blocking the car closest to the business. This type of parking often happens at locations such as construction sites and industrial/manufacturing areas where parking spaces are limited and the group of people have the same shift.

16 - 016 The information displayed at the public open house on July 14, 2016 was from the Draft EIS, specifically the alternative maps with cross-sections presented in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIS. The typical 110-foot right-of-way shown along Shilshole Ave NW on the board at the public meeting is east of 22nd Ave NW. Along Shilshole Ave NW, angled parking would continue to be located on the north side of the street, parking would be removed along the south side of the street.

The sentence on page 5-3 of Draft EIS Appendix C has been revised in the Final EIS to clarify, "The south side of Shilshole Ave NW and NW 45th Street would largely have no parking between 24th Ave NW and 11th Ave NW." Technical Appendix C, Parking Discipline Report, of the Final EIS contains additional details about the parking analysis.

The analysis of parking supply does not assess the value of parking spaces on Ballard Ave or Market St compared to Shilshole Ave NW, as different users have a variety of perspectives on the value of parking spaces in these locations.

16 - 017 Double- or triple-parking is when cars park parallel to an already parked car, typically blocking the car closest to the business. This type of parking often happens at locations such as construction sites and industrial/manufacturing areas where parking spaces are limited and the group of people have the same shift.

As stated in Section 8.2.1 of the Final EIS, unstripped areas of City-owned right-of-way along some blocks of Shilshole Ave NW have historically been used by private businesses for parking and loading, although these areas are not formally organized and have not been expressly approved or permitted by the City. SDOT chose to count all the cars parked—even those double- or triple-parked in order to present a conservative or worst case estimate of the loss of parking.

16 - 020 Additional information on the Sammamish River Trail has been added to Section 5.2.2 in the FEIS.

16 - 021 Information on the Ballard Criterium has been added to Section 5.2.4 in the FEIS.
The Pronto Bike Share Program is outside the scope of the EIS.

Any left-turns required as part of an alternative would be designed using applicable safety standards. The trail would use the crosswalks to guide trail users through left-turn movements. Please see the Final EIS for graphics and a description of the Preferred Alternative, including the proposed alignment.

The text has been revised to clarify that Market St is also a principal arterial east of 15th Ave NW.

Your comment is noted. The Pronto Bike Share Program is outside the scope of the completion of the Missing Link project, and Pronto ceased operations on March 31, 2017.

In 1996, the Ballard Terminal Railroad signed a 30-year operating agreement with the City of Seattle to use the tracks. The Seattle City Council passed Ordinance 118734 to allow the franchise and an operating agreement was signed in September 1997. The percentage of rail trips to Salmon Bay Sand and Gravel is not relevant to the EIS analysis.

The information shown in Figure 7-7 of the Final EIS is reporting collision data for corridors in the study area, not an alternative, between January 2012 and December 2014. This information does not relate to any of the specific alternatives and is provided to give context for the affected environment. The single block segment of Ballard Ave NW between NW Market St and 22nd Ave NW had the highest number of collisions compared to other single block segments in the study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pg 132</td>
<td>typo: &quot;each potential alternative routes&quot; should be &quot;route&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pg 133</td>
<td>typo: &quot;desirably&quot; should be &quot;desirability&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pg 134</td>
<td>&quot;some users may choose not to use this trail segment due to the perception of risk from busy intersections and driveways, and prevalence of industrial traffic.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pg 138</td>
<td>&quot;Some connector segments would require trail users to make left turns at intersections, such as at 14th Ave NW and NW Leary Way, 17th Ave NW and NW Leary Way, 20th Ave NW and Leary Ave NW; and Ballard Ave NW and NW Market St.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pg 145</td>
<td>Designating Market Street as &quot;only&quot; a minor arterial and not a principal arterial doesn’t seem to match traffic conditions. In the map on pg 146 it is color-coded as a principal arterial east of 22nd Ave NW. Due to its use as a principal arterial during rush hour, Market Street doesn’t lend itself as a multi-use trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.2.4.1</td>
<td>AAB Information about the Pronto Bike Share System. Their website indicates numerous requests for stations along Shilshole South. <a href="http://suggest.prontocycleshare.com/page/about">http://suggest.prontocycleshare.com/page/about</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pg 157</td>
<td>State whose responsibility it is to install crossbucks. Explain why the crossbucks are missing, and whether or not the trail project will include them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pg 157</td>
<td>Study states that BTR moves freight &quot;primarily to the Salmon Bay Sand and Gravel Company.&quot; Give the percentage of rail trips that are for Salmon Bay Sand and Gravel. List the other users. Explain the legal basis for the BTR and relationship to the City right of way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7.2.8</td>
<td>Explain how the collision statistics relate to each alternative. Figure 7-7 implies that the largest concentration of collisions occurs on Leary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pg 167, pg 172, pg 178, pg 182, pg 188</td>
<td>Study states that trail users could have to wait for 15 to 25 seconds for a vehicle to clear the trail. Under existing conditions, large numbers of non-motorized users traverse driveways on Shilshole Ave NW. Freight vehicles are already required to stop for pedestrians and bicyclists before entering the roadway. This should not be treated as a new requirement due to the trail. Even though there may be some increase in the number of users, trail design will mitigate delays, so it will be a wash. &quot;Except as directed otherwise by official traffic-control devices, the driver of a vehicle emerging from any alley, driveway, private property, or building shall stop such vehicle immediately prior to driving onto a sidewalk or onto the sidewalk area extending across any alley or driveway, or onto a public path, and shall yield the right-of-way to any pedestrian or bicyclist as may be necessary to avoid collision, and upon entering the roadway of a street shall yield the right-of-way to all vehicles approaching on the roadway.&quot; [SMC 11.58.230] [emphasis added]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pg 168</td>
<td>Curb treatments, driveway cross delineation, etc. make motorists more comfortable too, not just non-motorized users. These mitigations make all parties behave predictably.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16 - 031 Your comment is noted. This information is provided to document any and all potential impacts of the trail by scenario. Currently people biking along Shilshole Ave NW would not be blocked by vehicles waiting for a break in traffic to pull out of a driveway. People travelling along the trail could be blocked, as vehicles would be allowed to cross the trail before waiting to turn into the street. Please see the Final EIS Chapter 7 and Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) for additional analysis regarding driveway operations for the Preferred Alternative.

16 - 032 Comment noted. The design features improve predictability of both motorized and non-motorized users in the project vicinity, thus reducing the potential for conflict.
Section 8.2.1 of the Draft EIS (page 8-3) described the current uses and the safety improvements for the Ballard Avenue Alternative. As noted in response to comment 16-037, the various types of safety improvements that were described for the Shilshole South Alternative could also be used for any of the alternatives, including the Ballard Avenue Alternative. The section states that the Ballard Avenue Alternative has a higher likelihood of conflicts between trail users and pedestrians attending the Farmers Market every Sunday.

16 - 033 The nonmotorized facility described in the Roadway Network section of the Draft EIS is a sidewalk as well as a path for other users. The public meeting display board showed representative cross-sections at three locations for the Shilshole South Alternative. Please see Chapter 1 of the Final EIS for updated cross-sections of the Shilshole South Alternative.

16 - 034 Thank you for your suggestion. Chapter 7, Transportation, of the Final EIS focuses on freight mobility for the project alternatives and includes a new section, Section 7.3.3, that discusses the Preferred Alternative.

16 - 035 Passing rail is another term for sidings. These sections of rail allow train cars to pass one another.

16 - 036 Numerous buildings are built up to the property lines for all the alternatives. The concern of whether these buildings are violating setback requirements is outside of the scope of this EIS.

16 - 037 The various types of safety improvements that were described for the Shilshole South Alternative could also be used for any of the alternatives, including the Ballard Avenue Alternative. The section states that the Ballard Avenue Alternative has a higher likelihood of conflicts between trail users and pedestrians attending the Farmers Market every Sunday.

16 - 038 As noted in response to comment 16-037, the various types of safety improvements that were described for the Shilshole South Alternative could also be used for any of the alternatives, including the Leary Alternative. The section states that the Leary Alternative would reduce the existing sidewalk width on NW Market Street between 24th Ave NW and 22nd Ave NW. This section of sidewalk has heavy pedestrian use, thus increasing the potential for conflicts between pedestrians and trail users.
As noted in response to comment 16-037, the various types of safety improvements that were described for the Shilshole South Alternative could also be used for any of the alternatives, including the Leary Alternative. The section states that the Leary Alternative would reduce the existing sidewalk width on NW Market Street between 24th Ave NW and 22nd Ave NW. This section of sidewalk has heavy pedestrian use, thus increasing the potential for conflicts between pedestrians and trail users.

Section 8.2.1 of the Draft EIS (page 8-3) described the current parking supply, also referred to as the affected environment. The changes to parking that would occur for each of the alternatives was discussed in Section 8.3. Example cross-sections are shown in Section 1.6 of the Draft EIS. Please see the Final EIS Chapter 8 for the parking analysis for the Preferred Alternative. The City considers parking restrictions such as where paid and non-paid parking spaces are located on a regular basis. The City does not have the authority to assess tax increases or credits based on employee use of parking. Parking-related policies, initiatives, and near-term actions related to supporting the City’s overall transportation goals, reducing and managing parking demand are summarized in Chapter 2 of Technical Appendix C (Volume 3).

As stated in Section 8.2.1 of the Final EIS, NW 54th St between 26th Ave NW and 30th Ave NW is not identified as a legal City street or public parking area and was not counted as part of the available public parking supply or impacted spaces.

SDOT’s on-street utilization target for commercial and mixed-use areas is consistent with Seattle Municipal Code requirements to manage paid parking areas. SDOT does not have on-street utilization target for residential and industrial areas, where parking turnover is less important. This project is consistent with the City’s policy direction and overall City planning goals to reduce dependency on single-occupancy vehicles. This project would not remove parking spaces in a concentrated or substantial manner as parking removal would be spread out along the alignment.

Additional data were collected between 6 and 9 pm in February 2017 and have been added to the Final EIS. Although the overnight (10 pm to 8 am) utilization data were not collected, the trends from the late evening data collection (9 pm) can be used to estimate the utilization during the late night/early morning time periods. These counts provide sufficient information for the analysis. Utilization in the middle of the night would not change the results of the analysis or conclusions in the Final EIS.
Additional data were collected between 6 and 9 pm in February 2017.

As shown on Table 9-2 on page 9-4 of the Draft EIS, portions of King County are designated maintenance areas for CO and PM10. While monitoring for particulate matter was stopped in 2006, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) still implements a State Implementation Plan to ensure continued maintenance of the federal PM10 standards, the latest of which was approved by U.S. EPA in August of 2014.

It should be noted that the project site is not located within the Seattle PM10 maintenance area, which is comprised of the Duwamish industrial and commercial area immediately south of the downtown district and includes the Port of Seattle.

Monitoring for PM10 concentrations was discontinued with EPA approval at all three maintenance area monitoring stations in late 2007 because PM10 levels were so low, and continued attainment of the NAAQS could be ensured through correlation with PM2.5 monitoring. PM10 concentrations from 2008 to the present are calculated using a relationship between PM10 and PM2.5. PSCAA will continue to operate ambient PM2.5 monitors in all three maintenance areas. Three year design values from PM10 concentrations for the three maintenance areas will be estimated annually to verify continued attainment of the NAAQS. Direct PM10 monitoring will be reestablished if calculated PM10 design values reach 98 µg/m3.

16 - 043 Businesses and other properties throughout the city use adjacent streets for loading, unloading, short-term parking, and access, and such use of the right-of-way is generally allowed. Not all areas used for loading have signs designating them as such, and the City reserves the right to regulate loading in any case.

Refer also to the response to Comment 16-015.

16 - 044 As shown on Table 9-2 on page 9-4 of the Draft EIS, portions of King County are designated maintenance areas for CO and PM10. While monitoring for particulate matter was stopped in 2006, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) still implements a State Implementation Plan to ensure continued maintenance of the federal PM10 standards, the latest of which was approved by U.S. EPA in August of 2014.

It should be noted that the project site is not located within the Seattle PM10 maintenance area, which is comprised of the Duwamish industrial and commercial area immediately south of the downtown district and includes the Port of Seattle.

Monitoring for PM10 concentrations was discontinued with EPA approval at all three maintenance area monitoring stations in late 2007 because PM10 levels were so low, and continued attainment of the NAAQS could be ensured through correlation with PM2.5 monitoring. PM10 concentrations from 2008 to the present are calculated using a relationship between PM10 and PM2.5. PSCAA will continue to operate ambient PM2.5 monitors in all three maintenance areas. Three year design values from PM10 concentrations for the three maintenance areas will be estimated annually to verify continued attainment of the NAAQS. Direct PM10 monitoring will be reestablished if calculated PM10 design values reach 98 µg/m3.

16 - 045 The analysis of both GHG and air quality emissions did not quantitatively take into account conversion from motorized to non-motorized use, as this conversion was assumed to be negligible in the transportation analysis. Consequently the third bullet on page 9-6 has been deleted and last paragraph on page 9-6 of the Draft EIS has been revised accordingly.

Operations of the Salmon Bay Sand and Gravel facility are existing emissions that would not be affected by the Missing Link project.
The portion of the Missing Link trail that would pass through the gravel parking lot and hence reduce the amount of unpaved area would result in a marginal reduction of particulate emissions from entrained road dust, but this reduction would not be statistically significant with respect to the emissions reported in Table 9-5 and Table 9-6 of the Draft EIS.

The Seattle Lake Shore and Eastern Railroad/Ballard Terminal Railroad has been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Properties (NRHP). Removal of the railroad as a result of this project would require mitigation, which may include documentation of the railroad’s history. The Ballard Terminal Railroad has an operating agreement (Ordinance 118734) that grants it the right, privilege, and authority to construct and operate the railway in the railroad right-of-way until 2026. At that time, BTR may seek another Franchise Agreement.

Technical Appendix D of the Draft EIS provides additional detail of the historic significance of the Seattle Lake Shore and Eastern (SLS&E) Railroad Grade, currently known as the Ballard Terminal Railroad. The rail line is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Refer to the Transportation Section beginning on page 4-19 of Technical Appendix D for the discussion of the SLS&E rail line, which began in 1885.

The Technical Appendix C Parking Discipline Report’s Figure 4-2, Public On-Street Parking Supply, was accidentally inserted into the Technical Appendix B Transportation Discipline Report in the Draft EIS. The correct Figure 4-2, Transportation Discipline Study Area Roadway Hierarchy, has been inserted in the Final EIS Technical Appendix B (Volume 3).

The title for Figure 1-1, Proposed Alternatives, in Appendix B was accidentally missing. The Figure number and title have been added.

The incorrect figures were inserted for Figures 4-2 through 4-4 in Technical Appendix B in the Draft EIS. The Final EIS Technical Appendix B includes the correct figures.

Page numbers are occasionally not included on figures for a variety of reasons, such as the source or page margins.
Your comments are noted. The sections you list contain a general discussion of construction activities and durations. The discussion in the text was intended to give the reader a general idea of the types of activities that would occur during construction of any of the build alternatives. Differences between alternatives are described, where applicable, in the impacts section of the various elements of the FEIS.

16 - 057 Your comments are noted; applicable clarifications are included in the FEIS.

16 - 058 The purpose of the discussions in the Land Use Discipline Report, where Figures 4-2, 5-2, 5-3, 5-4, and 5-5 are displayed, is to discuss potential impacts in the context of existing conditions. Section 11.3.3 of the DEIS provides an analysis of cumulative impacts and includes a discussion of increased residential, employment, recreational, and retail opportunities, consistent with land use plans and policies.

16 - 059 Impacts were identified based on consistency with adopted plans, policies, and codes, including UV24.1. Consistency with adopted plans, policies, and codes is discussed at length in Section 5.2 "Impacts Common to All Build Alternatives" in the Land Use Discipline Report.

16 - 060 The transportation analysis assumed that the number of users would be the same with all alternatives. It is not possible to determine which alternative would be used more based on available data.

16 - 061 The draft "Move Ballard Multimodal Transportation Plan" is discussed in the FEIS.
16 - 063 Your comment noted. The discussion in the Land Use section is about consistency with the adopted City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan, within the context of the proposed project. The overall suitability of the policies is outside the scope of this EIS.

16 - 064 Page 5-6 of Technical Appendix A (Land Use Discipline Report) discusses the consistency of the alternatives with adopted plans, policies, and codes.

Comparisons to other bike routes through industrial areas has not been conducted and is not warranted as part of the land use analysis.

16 - 065 As discussed in the DEIS, a significant impact would occur if an alternative would change existing land uses in a matter that is inconsistent with adopted plans, policies, and codes. The Ballard Avenue Alternative could impact overall parking availability, and require the removal of approximately 14 loading zone spaces for businesses in the area, including the Ballard Farmers Market and other special events. This is identified as an inconvenience, but would not change existing land uses in a manner that would be inconsistent with adopted plans, policies, and codes and therefore is not identified as a significant impact.

16 - 066 Your comment is noted. Technical Appendix A is not being republished as part of the FEIS. Correction of this error would not change the analysis or conclusions in any way.
16 - 067 A definition of "neighborhood greenway" is provided in the Glossary section of the FEIS.

16 - 068 The cited policy refers to retaining and expanding industrial uses. The project does not do either of these. It is acknowledged that employees in the industrial area could use the trail, but the trail is not primarily intended for nor would it be primarily used by industrial and manufacturing uses.

16 - 069 As noted in the transportation analysis, even with the features mentioned, trucks would encounter increased delays where the trail crosses driveways.

16 - 070 The "O" indicator for the Shilshole South Alternative was because of a few buildings that are next to the property lines where the trail would cross a driveway. The Preferred Alternative would address areas with limited sight lines, but in some cases sight lines could still be limited by buildings.

16 - 071 Your comment noted. The full text of Technical Appendix A is not being republished as part of the FEIS. Correction of this error would not change the analysis or conclusions in any way.

16 - 072 BI-P16 also refers to locating the trail away from industrial areas. The Shilshole South Alternative goes through an industrial area for the majority of its length.

16 - 073 Yes, "land assembly" in this context means combining multiple lots into one. The Table on pg E-10 indicates that the Shilshole South Alternative is consistent with this policy.

16 - 074 Although the Preferred Alternative does not pass through the core as policy CH/B-G4 calls for, improvements at roadway intersections will create better connections into the Ballard Urban Hub neighborhood.

16 - 075 The cited policy is intended to encourage tourism in the urban village as a way to support business vitality, not along the industrial waterfront. Because the trail would likely generate tourists that would leave the trail, it was considered somewhat compatible.

16 - 076 As stated previously, the alternative is considered somewhat consistent.

16 - 077 While the Shilshole South Alternative does not directly preclude improving the pedestrian environment along NW Market Street, it does not explicitly encourage it, which is the objective of the goal/policy. The Preferred Alternative will improve the pedestrian environment along NW Market Street between 24th Ave NW and NW 54th Street.
Weekend parking counts were conducted in February 2017 and have been incorporated in the Final EIS.

Weekend parking and evening counts have been added as described in Chapter 3 of the Final EIS Technical Appendix C (Volume 3). Utilization in the middle of the night is not necessary to consider as the difference in parking utilization between residential and industrial areas is captured through the early morning parking counts.

Comparison of parking impacts for the Missing Link with parking impacts from other projects is outside the scope of this EIS.

The figure numbers in Appendix C of the Final EIS have been corrected to Figures 4-5 through 4-10.

The sentence has been updated.

Please see the Final EIS Chapter 7 for updated information on the impacts anticipated during construction of the Build Alternatives.

Section 7.1.3 has been updated to reflect that the Sound Transit 3 ballot measure has passed.

SDOT will continue to coordinate with other projects in the area such as the projects under Move Seattle.

The graphics in the appendices of the Parking Discipline Report were formatted to print on 11x17 paper. The extra blank pages were included to allow for the correct printing of the document, should someone choose to print a hard copy.

The purpose on an EIS is to disclose potential impacts so that SDOT can compare between all alternatives. The EIS does disclose that a certificate of approval would be required from the Ballard Historical District Board.

All build alternatives have the potential for ground disturbance associated with utility improvements, such as relocation or installation of fire hydrants, storm drains, water, and sewer lines, and light poles, which could result in excavations up to 10 feet deep. Therefore, all build alternatives have the potential to impact cultural resources if cultural resources are present. Refer to Chapter 6, Utilities, for information about relocation of utilities; however, details regarding the extent of excavation have not yet been determined.
16 - 089 All build alternatives have the potential for ground disturbance associated with utility improvements. Please see response to 16-088 above.

16 - 090 Deposition varies by location, and the depth of cultural resources at one location does not necessarily correlate with the depth of potential cultural resources at other locations. All build alternatives have the potential for ground disturbance associated with utility improvements. Please see response to 16-088 above.

16 - 091 Your comment is noted; however, Technical Appendix D is not being reprinted as part of the FEIS. Clarification of this point would not change the analysis or conclusions of the document.

16 - 092 All build alternatives have the potential for ground disturbance. The current status of Ballard Blocks is unknown, but would presumably be developed at some future time.

16 - 093 All build alternatives have the potential for ground disturbance associated with utility improvements. Please see response to 16-088 above.

16 - 094 Your comment is noted. Technical Appendix D is not being reprinted as part of the FEIS. Clarification of this point would not change the analysis or conclusions of the document.

16 - 095 Your comment is noted. Technical Appendix D is not being reprinted as part of the FEIS. Clarification of this point would not change the analysis or conclusions of the document.

16 - 096 Your comment is noted. The correct statement should read: The NRHP-listed 15th Ave Bridge/Ballard Bridge (ID No. 113) crosses "over" a segment of the Shilshole South Alternative at NW 46th St. The text of the Final EIS has been revised in response to your comment.

16 - 097 Your comment is noted. The Shilshole South Alternative is anticipated to have the greatest depth of fill beneath the alignment. However, as stated in previous responses to comments, depth of excavation can reach up to 10 feet below the surface.
Material transport for any of the potential projects in the area, including the C.D. Stimson Development project, is not completely certain. Material transport may occur via truck, rail, or barge. The sentence incorrectly assumes that the Ship Canal Water Quality Project "will" use rail. However, the analysis is correct that if these projects all result in the removal or relocation of rail lines, they would contribute to a cumulative impact for the built environment.

16 - 103 Your comment is noted.

16 - 104 Material transport for any of the potential projects in the area, including the Ship Canal Water Quality Project, the Missing Link, and the C.D. Stimson Development project, is not completely certain. Transport may occur via truck, rail, or barge. The sentence incorrectly assumes that the Ship Canal Water Quality Project "will" use rail. However, the analysis is correct that if these projects all result in the removal or relocation of rail lines, they would contribute to a cumulative impact for the built environment.

16 - 105 Trucks represent the most likely means of transporting materials to and from the construction areas. The use of barges to transport construction materials would be evaluated prior to construction.

16 - 106 The Economic Considerations Report (Technical Appendix E of the DEIS) examines potential changes to business operating conditions as a result of alternative BGT routes. While understanding the broader personal health and/or health cost impacts resulting from any mode shift is an interesting question, they are beyond the scope required for an EIS and this economic considerations analysis.

Reference | Comment
--- | ---
Appx D, Figures 4-7 through 4-10 | The abbreviation "NR" is used on Figures 4-7 through 4-10. If NR means the same as NRHP (National Register of Historic Places), then change the Figures; if not (or alternatively), add NR to the list of abbreviations.
Appx D, page 4-44 | The Shilshole South alternative does not impact the Ballard Bridge, it merely passes under it. The Ballard Ave alternative impacts the west on-ramp.
Appx D, page 4-46 | Study indicates that the depths of interest for the Holocene are over 6 feet below the surface, and the thickest fill along Shilshole, with the thinnest on Ballard Ave and Leary. Shilshole South will not require any significant excavation.
Appx D, Table 4-9, section 5.2.1 | Please revisit the sensitivity ratings given the fact that there will be no significant excavation on the Shilshole South alternative.
Appx D, throughout Chapter 5 | Impacts to the SLS&E RR could be completely mitigated by thorough documentation.
Appendix D, chapters 5, 6, and 7 | Consider changing "sleeper" to "tie".
Appendix D, section 5.1.2, section 6.1 | Study states that there are no operational impacts unique to the Ballard Avenue Alternative. Faster-moving trail users would detract from the historical character of the historic district. Keep it for pedestrians!
Appx D, Chapter 6 | Mitigation applicable to all alternatives: Appendix D itself acts as a mitigation, because it prevents loss of history of the study area.
Appx D, Chapter 6 | Mitigation applicable to all alternatives: Include informational signs or historic markers at points along the trail, to educate trail users about cultural resources in the vicinity, for example, the place names of Table 4-4. Shilshole South has the best opportunity to commemorate Native American place names. Ballard Ave and Leary are already cluttered with signs.
Appx D, Section 7.3 | Study states that the "West Ship Canal Water Quality Project would upgrade the existing railroad tracks". Seattle Public Utilities' website for the West Ship Canal Water Quality Project identifies "potential" use of rail transport, not necessarily certain use, and not necessarily any upgrade of railroad facilities. Such rail transport would involve transferring material from BTR to BNSF. SPU should use barges instead of using taxpayer / ratepayer money to benefit a private company with a pattern of suing municipalities and interfering with the Missing Link.
Appx E, Section 1.4.4 | Study states that "Trucks would transport construction material." Shilshole South has barge access, which may prove to be most viable means of transport.
16 - 107 DEIS Technical Appendix E, the Economics Considerations Report, is not being reprinted as part of the Final EIS. The addition of this information would not change the discussion of impacts or conclusions of the report.

16 - 108 Refer to the response to Comment 16-107.

16 - 109 Paid parking subareas include both on-street and off-street parking.

16 - 110 Construction impacts would vary by alternative. Construction on Shilshole Ave NW would impact more industrial businesses, while construction of the Ballard Avenue Alternative would impact more retail businesses.

16 - 111 Your comment is noted.

16 - 112 Your comment is noted.

16 - 113 Restoration of street end parks along NW 54th Street is not part of the proposed Missing Link Trail project.

16 - 114 Your comment is noted. Technical Appendix E is not being reprinted as part of the Final EIS. Clarification of this point would not change the analysis or conclusions of the document.

16 - 115 Your comment is noted.

16 - 116 The Economic Considerations Report (Technical Appendix E of the DEIS) does not conclude that there would be a negative impact on Swedish. The report does not examine impacts to Swedish Ballard Medical Plaza directly from any of the BGT alternatives because it is not adjacent to any of the routes. The medical facility is a major employer and destination in the study area, and it is difficult to say how Swedish would be affected from any general increase in pedestrian or bicycle traffic from the alternatives that might spill over and/or be enhanced from trail connectivity.

16 - 117 Your comment is noted. The Economic Considerations Report (Technical Appendix E of the DEIS) does not examine any potential mitigation measure and whether those measures would be necessary or sufficient for affected properties and businesses.
16 - 118 The first figure (i.e., single-family homes increase in value by approximately 0.5%) is an estimate of the impact that the average King County home increases in value based on proximity to a multi-use trail. The second figure (i.e., single family residential property values would only increase by 0.4%) takes the above finding, applies it to the land use context around the Shilshole South Alternative, and reports the degree that total home prices would rise based on their proximity to the trail.

16 - 119 Your comment is noted. DEIS Technical Appendix E, the Economics Considerations Report, is not being reprinted as part of the Final EIS. Clarification of this point would not change the analysis or conclusions of the document.

16 - 120 The Economic Considerations Report (Technical Appendix E of the DEIS) examines potential changes to business operating conditions as a result of alternative BGT alternatives. While understanding the economic impacts on bus riders is an interesting question, they are beyond the scope required for an EIS and this economic analysis.

16 - 121 The land use analysis in the Economic Considerations Report (Technical Appendix E of the DEIS) considers how multi-use trails (like the Sammamish River Trail) impact property values. From this analysis, commercial properties are likely to experience different benefits depending on the primary use of the parcel. For instance, commercial office buildings would likely benefit from increased accessibility provided by the BGT Missing Link to the employees using these facilities. Restaurants and retail establishments would likely benefit due to increased business from bicycle and pedestrian customers. It would be too speculative to estimate the benefits to one type of retail business.
Letter No. 17

7/31/16

Scott Kubly, Director
Seattle Department of Transportation
c/o Mark Mazzola, Environmental Manager
P.O. Box 34996
Seattle, WA, 98124-4996

Subject: Revised comments on Missing Link

I would like to amend my comments made at the Missing Link EIS public comment meeting in Ballard on 7-16-16 as follows:

1. Safety data collisions vs incident reporting

Upon closer review of the DEIS, it does address safety using both collision data reported by Seattle Police and incident data from the Seattle Fire department. DEIS Chapter 7 pg. 7-16 states over 338 collisions occurred during the 3-year period 2012-2014 and 45 incidents were reported as well. From the DEIS:

“Nonmotorized safety in the study area is also affected by roadway conditions, including the presence of railroad tracks and other obstacles. Incident response data provided by the Seattle Fire Department indicate locations in the study area where roadway conditions could create unsafe passage for bicyclists and pedestrians (Seattle Fire Department, 2015). Table 4-13 and Figure 4-15 summarize the incident response data in the study area from January 2012 through December 2014. As shown on Figure 4-15, incident responses have been concentrated along NW 45th St and Shilshole Ave NW, and at the intersections of NW 45th St/14th Ave NW and under the Ballard Bridge. The presence of railroad tracks in these locations could influence safety conditions for nonmotorized users, particularly cyclists. Incidents near railroad tracks typically occur when bicycle tires become trapped between the railroad tracks and the street. Between January 2012 and December 2014, there were 45 incidents in the study area. However, it is likely that additional incidents caused by roadway conditions occurred but were not recorded.”

Comments:

1a. The reported number of incidents mentioned above significantly understates the amount of bicycle crashes in the study area. My son bikes through that area every weekday, specifically where the railroad tracks curve under the Ballard bridge, and frequently sees people biking who have gone down crossing those tracks often needing some form of medical attention. The reported data would suggest that this happens only 1.25 times each month during the 3-year period of 2012-2014. The final EIS should have stronger language to support the fact that the reporting of collisions and incidents significantly under report bicycle crashes in the study area.

2a. To say that “The presence of railroad tracks in these locations could influence safety conditions for non-motorized users, particularly cyclists” is counter to the growing amount of evidence that railroad and street car tracks in the roadway in many Seattle locations are a known safety hazard to people biking. The final EIS should acknowledge this fact and not use the word “could” when referring to their causal link to roadway safety conditions.
2. The DEIS statement “Bicycle volumes in the study area are projected to increase by 5% each year between 2015 and 2040 based on recent studies and counts on the BGT, expected land use changes and growth in the Ballard area, and input from SDOT (SDOT, 2015c, 2015d; Fehr & Peers and SvR Design Company, 2011; PSRC, 2015).

Comment:
Numerous national studies of protected bike lane use in the U.S. have demonstrated that the installation of safe bike infrastructure significantly increases ridership. For example, a 2014 review of 5 U.S. cities with protected bike lanes found, “A measured increase was observed in ridership on all facilities after the installation of the protected cycling facilities, ranging from +21% to +171%". Accordingly, the DEIS likely understates increases in bicycle volumes, especially during the first year or two after installation. I suggest SDOT revise its estimate of bicycle volumes in the early years to be consistent with national studies demonstrating increased bicycle use when protected bike lanes are installed.

3. In SDOT’s slide deck presenting the EIS Summary (used for public hearings) Slide 11 showing the “Operational Impacts and Benefits” of the 4 main Missing Link alternatives is extremely misleading in terms of the pedestrian and bicycle mobility variable (see next page). To suggest that all 4 alternative receive a 2 thumbs up is quite frankly, simply absurd. As I said in my remarks on 7/16, the many benefits of the Shilshole South route far outweigh the other alternatives. This is the most direct route with the fewest turns and involves crossing only 4 intersections. It has the best sightlines for driveways and is the shortest distance. None of the other three alternative even come close to providing the mobility for bicyclists compared to the Shilshole South alternative. I suggest SDOT revise this slide to more accurately reflect the alternatives relative to pedestrian and bicycle mobility.


17 - 003 The background growth rates used in the methodology provide an estimated volume of use based on actual historical counts over time along the same facility type and within the same region as the Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link.

17 - 004 Your comment is noted. All four of the build alternatives are viewed as an improvement for safety and mobility over existing conditions. Throughout the Draft EIS, all build alternatives are compared to the No Build Alternative (existing condition). The impacts were categorized on the slides solely for the purposes of comparing alternatives at the public hearings, and were not meant as a substitute for the full analysis contained in the EIS. Completion of a trail through the corridor, regardless of location, will improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety.
Comments on DEIS at public hearing 7/16/16:

I’m Brian Estes, a downtown resident who bikes throughout Seattle. My son lives in Ballard and bikes from his apartment three blocks from here to the U-District every weekday, riding on Shilshole and under the Ballard bridge. He has seen numerous crashes by people who bike across the tracks under the Ballard Bridge, some of whom appeared to be serious injuries.

The South Shilshole route for the missing link is the only alternative that is head and shoulders above the other 3 alternatives in terms of safety. It is a continuous route that completes the regional trail system through Ballard to Golden Gardens. Safety for those biking, walking or skating should be our primary concern and the South Shilshole route provides that. Achieving the goals of reducing serious injuries and death through Seattle’s Vision Zero program is an important objectives and the South Shilshole routes seems to make the most sense in achieving these goals.

The many benefits of the South Shilshole route far outweigh the other alternatives. This is the most direct route with the fewest turns and involves crossing only 4 intersections. It has the best sightlines for driveways and is the shortest distance.

Completing the missing link along South Shilshole will also be good for retail and other businesses in Ballard. Several national studies have documented that people who arrive by bike tend to stay longer and spend more money per person that those who arrive by car. As the Pronto bike share system expands, it will likely include bike stations supporting biking from the cruise ship terminals in Magnolia to Ballard to the Locks and Golden Gardens and we want a bike route and biking experience for them that is a safe as possible.

One concern I have with the methodology of the EIS concerns safety as mentioned in DEIS Chapter 7 on Transportation. I believe it may seriously undercount injuries to people walking and especially biking because it relies only on collision data, I presume collected by the Seattle Police Department. SDOT also has access to data on injuries including serious injuries from Seattle Fire’s EMS program and these typically include incidents not considered collisions and hence do not require an SPD response. I suggest the final EIS incorporate data from Seattle’s EMS program related to EMS calls in the study area. This will provide a more comprehensive picture of injuries in the study area and highlight the need for selecting the safest route for those walking and biking through the area.

In closing, taxpayers have spent far too much money studying and responding to litigation on this issue. The South Shilshole route is the clear alternative which would benefit all of Seattle and all those throughout the region using our great regional trail system. Enough talk, let’s just finish it!
The Seattle Bicycle Master Plan (BMP) implements an equity analysis that used factors including age, race and ethnicity, poverty level, and automobile access as indicators to assign equity scores to different parts of the city. These equity scores were then used to help determine where to construct new infrastructure that could provide access to underserved populations. This analysis identified seven census tracts with a high concentration of indicator demographics that also had low bicycle service. As a result, the BMP recommends projects in both southeast and southwest Seattle, including cycle tracks and greenways.

SDOT’s goal is to achieve zero areas lacking bicycle facilities by 2030. For further information on planned bicycle infrastructure in Seattle and on how the City uses equity as a factor in its bike planning efforts, please refer to the Seattle Bicycle Master Plan and Seattle Bike Master Plan Implementation Plan:

The objective of the Missing Link project is to complete the last leg of the Burke-Gilman Trail, a regional trail facility that otherwise runs continuously between Golden Gardens Park and the city of Bothell, where it connects with the Sammamish River Trail. The Burke-Gilman Trail currently serves a large portion of Seattle and the region as a highly used nonmotorized transportation and recreational facility.

Further, the Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link Project has a long history, dating back to 1996, and does not represent a new development or investment on the city’s behalf. Please refer to SDOT’s Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link project site to learn more about the history and development of this project:
18 - 002 SDOT disagrees that the project would benefit a small number of cyclists, as the objective of the Missing Link project is to complete the Burke-Gilman Trail, a regional trail facility that otherwise runs continuously between Golden Gardens Park and the city of Bothell, where it connects with the Sammamish River Trail. The Burke-Gilman Trail currently serves a large portion of Seattle and the region as a highly used nonmotorized transportation and recreational facility.

Further, SDOT does not agree that bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure within the Missing Link study area is adequate; there are currently a number of barriers for trail users between the existing ends of the Burke-Gilman Trail, as some streets lack sidewalks or other demarcated areas for pedestrians, and many intersection and railroad crossings are substandard. Safety is a real concern for people walking and biking through the neighborhood and there is a clear need to improve conditions for all users.

A cycle track option was considered but determined not to meet the

18 - 003 Construction impacts are a concern for any enterprise whose operating margins and reserves might not be able to withstand extended disruptions to their business. The Economic Considerations Report (Technical Appendix E) has no existing data source, nor conducted any census of “family-owned” businesses, and could not differentiate any meaningful differences between the alternatives in terms of construction impacts. As noted in the report, some parcels may experience significant disruption from construction of the BGT Missing Link. Significant disruptions are defined as impacts that are likely to affect business operations due to the construction of the BGT Missing Link and for which mitigation measures are likely to be prohibitively costly or not completely effective. However, SDOT will coordinate closely with adjacent properties and businesses prior to and during construction in order to minimize those impacts.

18 - 004 The No Build option is not considered an acceptable alternative because there are currently a number of barriers for trail users between the existing ends of the Burke-Gilman Trail, as some streets lack sidewalks or other demarcated areas for pedestrians, and many intersection and railroad crossings are substandard.

Please refer to the response to comment 18-001 regarding investment in bicycle infrastructure in south and southeast Seattle.
Thank you for your comments about how each alternative satisfies the project objective.

The Freight Master Plan (October 2016) is discussed in the FEIS (Section 7.2.4).

As stated in Section 8.2.1 of the Final EIS, in the study area, on-street parking varies from short-term metered parking with 2-hour limits to unmetered spaces with no time limits. All on-street parking spaces in the study area, whether paid or unpaid, were included in the parking analysis. Unstriped areas of City-owned right-of-way along some blocks of Shilshole Ave NW have historically been used by private businesses for parking and loading, although these areas are not formally organized and have not been expressly approved or permitted by the City. The occupancy of parked vehicles depends on the efficiency of the drivers parking on a particular day. In some areas along Shilshole Ave NW, vehicles could be perpendicularly parked on one day and aligned in a parallel manner the next. In order to provide a conservative or worst case scenario in terms of lost parking, these unpermitted spaces were counted as they are currently used, whether it is parallel, multiple parallel rows, perpendicular, or angled parking.

Section 8.3.4 of the Final EIS acknowledges that approximately 68 of the 261 spaces to be removed could remain as unregulated, parallel spaces depending upon the final design so the actual loss of parking could range between 193 and 261 spaces for this alternative.

Cumulative impacts from the C.D. Stimson Development were included in Section 11.2 of the FEIS.
We have identified impacts along Ballard Ave throughout the document, through discussion of the Ballard Avenue Alternative.

A portion of the Seattle Lake Shore and Eastern Railroad Grade/Ballard Terminal Railroad (ID No. 6) has been determined eligible for the NRHP. Other portions of this resource (ID No. 310) were identified as the same railroad with similar integrity as ID No. 6; therefore, a recommendation of eligibility was made for ID No. 310.

The recommended off-street facility across the Ballard Bridge is listed in Section 5.2.5.

Driveway and intersection crossings were described in Chapter 5, Chapter 7, and Appendix B of the Draft EIS. Please see the Final EIS Chapter 7 and Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) for updated information on the Build Alternatives. SDOT has also prepared an analysis of design measures to address separation and safety, which is included in Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations, of the Final EIS.

Your comments are noted, and review of other multi-use trails through industrial corridors has occurred throughout the design and decision-making process.
Letter No. 20

To Scott Kubly, Director Seattle Department of Transportation
C/o Mark Mazzola
P.O. Box 34996
Seattle, WA 34996

July 8, 2016
Comments about Draft Environment Impact Statement for the Missing Link of the Burke Gilman Trail

I am a Ballard resident and use the Burke Gilman Trail 5 days a week. I have commuted to and from work using the trail for part of that commute, year-round at least 4 days a week for 28 years. One day a week, I use the trail through Fremont and Ballard for a long recreational run.

I was saddened by the seeming absence of, or at best down-playing, throughout the document of cycling as a form of transportation. Cycling should be recognized as an important transportation option. The Burke Gilman Trail is a major bicycling commuter route to and from Ballard to the University, to downtown, and beyond. Additionally, more people are also using their bicycles to get places other than work; yet the DEIS focuses primarily on the recreational aspect of cycling for the Trail. The executive summary does not even mention bicycling as a form of transportation.

Completion of the Trail would be among the most important infrastructure projects for the city and region and would get a great deal of use. The route selected to complete the trail needs to be both safe and usable. The current situation is still quite dangerous, though improved for one leg of the route a couple years ago with the safety lanes on 45th. I have personally assisted many new and experienced cyclists who have fallen due to the railroad tracks in the study area and each case is heartbreaking and frustrating.

As far as my opinion on alternative routes - Would I want the trail to be completed anywhere other than the Southside of Shilshole Avenue? No. It is the straightest path to link to the two ends. It has the best grade, the fewest intersections. It is the simplest, most comprehensible route. It will be the one that the most users, be they cyclists, runners, skateboarders, walkers will use.

Specific comments on volume 1 of the draft EIS
The Land-Use chapter states
The Puget Sound Regional Council has called for the completion of the Missing Link.
The original Ballard Neighborhood plan prioritized completion of the Missing Link on Shilshole as the #1 or #2 priority for the neighborhood

I disagree that the comment on 4-15 stating that the alternatives that minimize the trail length in BIMTC are the most consistent with adopted policies. I believe that what is most consistent with the Comprehensive plan is to build that trail that most users will use. I would argue that cyclists are most likely to favor and use the South Shilshole route. I don’t think that bringing the trail into the commercial and retail part of the Hub Urban village would be desirable from a user or business standpoint. There are no other sections of the trail that wind through the commercial core of a neighborhood (Not through U-village, not through downtown Fremont, not through U-District, not through Ballard Legend). The statement on page 4-15 includes a discussion of the alternatives and their consistency within the context of the adopted policies of the Comprehensive Plan. While there is no adopted policy that prescribes trail facilities should go where most people would use them, several policies support the expansion and encouragement of opportunities for non-motorized transportation.

20 - 001 Thank you for your comments.

20 - 002 SDOT does consider cycling as a form of transportation for people getting to work or other places as well as a recreational activity. The Executive Summary is meant to provide a quick overview of the project and impacts associated with the alternatives. Chapter 7, Transportation, notes that bicycling is a form of transportation.

20 - 003 Your comments are noted. Directness of route, safety, and usability are several factors that have been taken into account during selection of the Preferred Alternative.

20 - 004 Your comment is noted.

20 - 005 The objective of the Missing Link project is to complete the Burke Gilman Trail. Trail access to the Ballard Bridge is outside the scope of the project and therefore not included in the DEIS.
through the U district). In all those neighborhood cases, the trail passes conveniently close to, but not through the core. The Shilshole alternatives in the EIS would provide this consistent experience. Greenways are designed to bring users at a leisurely pace through neighborhoods. Have trail users pass the through the area on either the Leary or Market street alternative would have them pass through too many intersections, past too many distracted pedestrians and cars, and completely change the trail user experience for 3 mile.

Page 4-16 has the first mention of the Trail as a commuter route (i.e., the first mention of bicycling - and, in many cases that I am aware, of walking as well - as a transportation option)

Page 4-17 acknowledges that the freight vehicles occupy more right-of-way to conduct business activities. These businesses have a lot of valuable land and have organized their business to use the public right-of-way for their convenience. The trail might require that, in some cases, the businesses can no longer pretend the public right-of-way is their own property.

Page 4-18 If indeed the unregulated parking along Shilshole is primarily for employee use as stated, I wonder ...aren't the marine and industrial businesses required to decrease employee driving as are other businesses throughout the city. Employee parking should not be seen as a priority land use.

Page 4-19 The Comprehensive plan supports locating the trail in the Ballard Hub Urban Village. The Ballard neighborhood plan called for the Trail to be completed on Shilshole, not through the retail core. So I disagree that the "trail users could need to leave the trail and specifically seek out goods and services, and entertainment in other areas of Ballard" is a negative statement. I believe that is how it should be.

The Bike and Pedestrian master plans are not addressed in this chapter. I am not sure whether that is because they are not considered land use, but I think they would add to the discussion since freight mobility is included in the chapter

The Bike Master plan is discussed in the Recreation chapter.

On page 5-9, the plan's goals are stated. The most important goals related to the completion of the trail, in my mind, being those of increasing ridership for all trip purposes, increasing safety, and increasing connectivity. Completion of the Missing Link on Shilshole would increase ridership by building the simplest, most straightforward, and safest trail.

On page 5-15, Trail User conflicts are addressed. I believe conflicts will be lowest on the Shilshole South side alternative and the highest on the Ballard Avenue alternative. By sending the trail through a retail and commercial area, such as Ballard Avenue and its current undisciplined use of the street, more distractions will result for the trails users increases the possible conflicts. This is in addition to the decreased safety due to also passing through more busy congested intersections. Trucks need to load and unload in front of the businesses and are frequently double-parked on this street in order to do that.

In the Transportation chapter, I did not see the counts for trucks or cars. I think it would be important to present the vehicle counts and distinguish between the larger and smaller trucks and cars. This information about the number of vehicles as it is for bicyclists and pedestrians. Vehicles volume seems to be thought of and presented as minutes of delay at an intersection. This is not the same.

20 - 006 Chapter 4 of the Final EIS contains the land use analysis. Please see Chapter 7, Transportation of the Final EIS, for information about nonmotorized users in the corridor. Additional text has been added to the Executive Summary and the Transportation Chapter of the Final EIS.

20 - 007 Section 7.3.2 discusses the availability of the City right-of-way within the context of the proposed project, including a detailed discussion of the potential changes to how private property owners would have to use the space between their buildings and the City's right-of-way.

20 - 008 Parking requirements are regulated by SMC 23.54. Parking-related policies, initiatives, and near-term actions related to supporting the City's overall transportation goals, reducing and managing parking demand are summarized in Chapter 2 of Technical Appendix C (Volume 3 of the FEIS). The City considers parking restrictions such as where paid and non-paid parking spaces are located on a regular basis. Property owners may incentivize employees to use other modes of transportation other than drive alone. However, the City does not have requirements that force industrial employers to provide these incentives.

20 - 009 The EIS evaluates adopted City policies only, and there is no adopted policy in the Comprehensive Plan that states the trail should go on Shilshole Ave NW. The statement "trail users could need to leave the trail and specifically seek out goods and services, and entertainment in other areas of Ballard" is meant to be neutral, and is simply pointing out the fact of the difference between locating the trail in the hub as opposed to the Shilshole South Alternative, an industrial area that is lacking commercial opportunities for trail users.

20 - 010 The Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans are referenced in the Land Use chapter in relation to consistency with adopted plans, policies, and codes that apply to the project in the context of land use. Freight mobility is discussed for the same reason.

20 - 011 Your comment is noted.

20 - 012 The reduction of potential conflict points has been taken into account in the design of all of the build alternatives.

20 - 013 Please see Section 4.2.2 of Technical Appendix B of the Final EIS (Volume 3). Several tables in this section contain the daily traffic volumes, driveway traffic volumes, and freight volumes. This information has been updated from that included in Section 4.2.2 of Technical Appendix B of the Final EIS.
Leary and NW Market are important transit corridors. I think it is important to expect an ever-increasing need for Leary as a transit corridor, making it a poor choice for the trail location. I think putting the trail on Leary in the area from Fremont up to the Ballard Bridge and beyond up to Market St would be a disaster. The volume and speed of cars would be uncomfortable and the safety hazards under the Bridge at Leary and 15th would be troubling. There are too many cars and trucks, and turning site lines would be challenging, especially in the dark and rain. Behavior of all users is too unpredictable at that location.

Page 7-15 I am surprised that the source of information about the numbers of train movements is personal communication with the train operator. I hope that was validated. The weeds and dirt around the tracks would lead me to believe otherwise. Three trains a week are far more than I ever would have suspected.

Parking
I do not understand the difference between parking along Shilshole and unregulated spaces for parking. I see an unregulated free-for-all on the south side of Shilshole and businesses claiming the space on the public right of way and pretending it is their property on the north side of Shilshole. Perhaps that is difference between the parking and unregulated spaces. I may be wrong, but I was told the public right of way extends into the areas where businesses have put up their no parking signs.

General comment about Construction Impacts
Given the disruption of all modes of transportation and decreased quality of life throughout this city due to construction during the last decade, I find it laughable that so much energy is spent analyzing the construction impacts in every chapter. In the parking chapter, I don’t even think this should be discussed.

Mitigation
A light and 17th at Shilshole will be the best thing that ever happened to that route for all modes of transportation. So many studies have called for it. It needs to happen.

In Summary
Please address cycling as a serious mode of transportation. Make it clear that the width of the trail must handle all users of the trail. Unlike streets with vehicle traffic speed being regulated and ideally consistent, multi-use trails must handle users of inconsistent speeds and abilities. Bicyclists travel at widely varying speeds and share the space with walkers, runners, skaters, etc. who also are traveling at widely varying speeds. The route with the fewest intersections and distractions the better and I believe that is the South Shilshole alternative route.

20 - 014 Your comment is noted. The Leary Alternative has not been selected as the Preferred Alternative.

20 - 015 Given the uncommon nature and flexibility in schedule of when train deliveries occur, phone interviews were used as a source of data, similar to other data collection activities for some variables (e.g., driveway usage by time of year and special vehicle maneuvers). Additional specificity would not likely provide additional accuracy, and an average count provided by the BTR operator was considered adequate for this analysis.

20 - 016 The public right-of-way along Shilshole Ave NW includes undeveloped areas, particularly along the south side, that have historically been used by private businesses for parking and loading, although these areas are not formally organized and have not been expressly approved or permitted by the City. The occupancy of parked vehicles depends on the efficiency of the drivers parking on a particular day. In some areas along Shilshole Ave NW, vehicles could be perpendicularly parked on one day and aligned in a parallel manner the next. These unpermitted spaces were counted as they are currently used, whether it is parallel, multiple parallel rows, perpendicular, or angled parking.

20 - 017 The discussion of impacts is a requirement of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). Chapter 197-11-060(4)(c) WAC states that agencies shall carefully consider the range of probable impacts, including short-term and long-term effects. In this case, short-term impacts are construction-related impacts.

20 - 018 A signal is part of the proposal for both the Shilshole South and Shilshole North Alternatives, and is included in the Preferred Alternative.

20 - 019 Your comment is noted.
The location and extent of your business on Shilshole Ave NW are noted.

Your comment is noted.

Safety features are an integral part of every trail alignment alternative. Section 1.7.1 of the DEIS describes design features that can be used to reduce potential conflict points between non-motorized trail users and motor vehicles. Sight distance and driveway/intersection crossings are features that will be reviewed during final design to minimize the potential for conflicts. Under the Preferred Alternative, for example, the railroad tracks are proposed for relocation to provide a greater separation between vehicles and trail users and provide improved sight distance. Refer to Chapter 7, Transportation, for additional discussion.

SDOT identified this location as having sight distance concerns for the Shilshole South Alternative. As a result, SDOT adjusted the design of the Preferred Alternative northward to provide for improved sight distance in this location. Please refer to Section 5.3 of Technical Appendix B (Transportation Discipline Report).

The Ballard Terminal Railroad has a 30-year operating agreement with the City of Seattle that grants operation of the rail line through September 29, 2026 (Ordinance 118734).

Scott Kubly, Director
Seattle Department of Transportation
c/o Mark Mazzola, Environmental Manager
P.O. Box 34996
Seattle, WA, 98124-4996

Re: Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link

Dear Director Kubly:

Our company owns property adjacent to Shilshole Avenue from 15th Avenue NW to 20th Avenue NW, along the path of the proposed Shilshole South Alternative. We have numerous buildings adjacent to the proposed trail, and nine road crossings to our property. This property has been in family ownership since 1889, so we are deeply committed to Seattle. We support completion of the Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link, but have grave concerns about its location.

We strongly support removal of the Ballard Terminal Railroad tracks in order to locate the bike trail along Shilshole Avenue. If the railroad tracks cannot be removed at this time, we support former Mayor Nickels proposed Ballard Avenue Alternative as an interim method of completing the Missing Link.

Because safety is not reviewed under SEPA (Seattle Municipal Code 25.05), we feel the Department should independently pay particular attention to safety issues in its review of alternative locations. Our primary concern is the proposed location of the trail on the south side of Shilshole Avenue next to three buildings on our property, which creates a limited sight distance at three of our nine crossings (see attached). The trail is proposed to be located immediately next to these buildings solely to accommodate the existing railroad tracks.

We are particularly concerned about the trail crossing located at the “X” on the attached City Engineering drawing (east of 17th Avenue NW at the northeast corner of the very large building located on our property). The crossing at this location serves five acres of property and is used by a large number of vehicles, including semi-trucks. Drivers will not be able to see oncoming cyclists without the vehicle crossing onto the bike trail because the building is located on the property line (see attached photo). The situation is aggravated because the crossing is uphill from our property, which tilts tractor trailer cabs further back from the bike path. IF THE TRAIL IS BUILT IN THIS LOCATION, SOMEONE WILL...
EVENTUALLY BE KILLED BY A TRUCK CROSSING THE BIKE TRAIL. The City of Seattle should not willingly create this danger and liability.

SMC 11.88.230 states that a vehicle emerging from private property “shall stop such vehicle immediately prior to driving ... across a public path, and shall yield the right-of-way.” This requirement is meaningless if the vehicle cannot see oncoming bicycles without crossing onto the path. It is unreasonable to expect a driver to get out of his or her truck, walk to the path to check for oncoming bicycles, return to the truck, and then proceed blindly hoping a bike does not appear.

In addition to increasing safety, removal of the railroad would allow continued vehicle parking along the bike trail route, which is essential to the operation of businesses and major employers on our property. A bike trail, local access, and parking solution such as was implemented on Westlake Avenue after removal of the railroad is an excellent template.

The Ballard Terminal Railroad was formerly used by businesses on our property, but it is no longer used by them. In addition, there are two tracks in the problem area – one for a siding that we no longer use, and that we do not want. It is my understanding that Salmon Bay Sand and Gravel is the only business currently using the railroad. Alternative truck and water access exists for this user. The relative value to the City of Seattle of a level and directly routed Burke-Gilman Trail far outweighs continued operation of the Ballard Terminal Railroad.

Although the Operating Agreement between the City and Ballard Terminal Railroad does not expire until 2026, under section 10(e) of the Agreement, the City has the right to require relocation of the tracks in order to accommodate trail construction. In addition, section 18 of the Operating Agreement allows termination of the Agreement if freight rail usage decreases below 30 carloads per year.

If the railroad cannot be removed until 2026, the Ballard Avenue Alternative should be used until then. This was the temporary measure proposed by former Mayor Greg Nickels after his thorough review of the alternatives. At a minimum, relocation of the railroad tracks to accommodate a bike trail located a safe distance from the three buildings shown on the attached drawing is essential to creating a safe bike trail.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Thank you for your comments and for your study of daily work activities, which is very informative. Under the Preferred Alternative, the trail along NW 45th Street will be shifted north to allow a 12- to 14-foot shoulder to improve sightlines and allow room for loading and unloading activities.

Your comments are noted.

Your comment is noted. The Ballard Avenue Alternative has not been selected as the Preferred Alternative.

Attached you will find a study of our daily work activities based on our 2015 fiscal year to help illustrate our street usage.
Thank you for your comments and for your study of daily work activities, which is very informative. Under the Preferred Alternative, the trail along NW 45th Street will be shifted north to allow a 12- to 14-foot shoulder to improve sightlines and allow room for loading and unloading activities.

Your comments are noted.

Your comments are noted. The Ballard Avenue Alternative has not been selected as the Preferred Alternative.

Your comment is noted.
### WORK ACTIVITY, AT GRADE DOOR ON NW 45TH STREET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELIVERIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY / LOAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UPS Delivery</td>
<td>35 packages daily average, 10 to 60 boxes each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeDEX Ground</td>
<td>Four packages daily, 28 to 60 boxes each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeDEX Air</td>
<td>Six packages daily, 15 to 30 boxes each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; M Fabricators</td>
<td>Truck backed up to door, boxes loaded onto hand cart or hand truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Mfg.</td>
<td>Truck backed up to door, unloaded with forklift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Sheet Metal</td>
<td>Truck backed up to door, unloaded with fork lift/pallet jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Industries</td>
<td>One to twice a week, 1 to 3 pallets, 4 to 45 boxes each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schnepel and Crew</td>
<td>Truck backed up to door, unloaded with fork lift/pallet jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Foam</td>
<td>One to twice a week, 1 to 3 large boxes, 0 to 600 boxes each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foremost Fabrications</td>
<td>Truck backed up to door, boxes loaded onto hand cart or hand truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.T. Mfg.</td>
<td>One to twice a week, 1.5 boxes, 12 to 24 boxes each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firings Inc.</td>
<td>Truck backed up to door, boxes loaded onto hand cart or hand truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont Carquest</td>
<td>Three times a week, several small boxes, 10 to 25 boxes each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Molds</td>
<td>One to twice a week, several small boxes, 10 to 25 boxes each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Plywood</td>
<td>One to twice a week, several rolls of paper and boxes of fillings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleachers Electric</td>
<td>Truck backed up to door, boxes loaded onto hand cart or hand truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastland Inc.</td>
<td>Truck backed up to door, boxes loaded onto hand cart or hand truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pott Electric</td>
<td>One to twice a week, several small boxes, 10 to 25 boxes each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballard Electric</td>
<td>One to twice a week, 1 to 5 boxes, 25 to 50 boxes each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenson Instrument Co.</td>
<td>Truck backed up to door, boxes loaded onto hand cart or hand truck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SHIPMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY / LOAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UPS Shipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeDEX Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Air Forwarding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the event we can not park trucks at or adjacent to our at grade door on 45th Street NW, we would have to park the trucks in the middle of proposed striped area in the center of 45th Street NW and cross both vehicular as well as bicycle traffic to get in and out of our building with hand carts, rolling carts and forklifts.

We could also load and unload the trucks in our loading dock parking area to the east of our main building. The trucks now loaded and unloaded at the 45th Street NW door are not at loading dock height, so we would have to go outside with a forklift to perform this work.

Loading and unloading in the loading dock parking area is not always feasible because of the activity at the other businesses located in the same area. The east parking lot is usually filled to capacity and has car and truck traffic in and out all day. In addition, if the bike trail is constructed as currently proposed Northern Lights loses fourteen parking spaces on 45th Street NW further adding to already over crowded parking areas. We could not perform loading and unloading activities without blocking either traffic or fire lanes.

If we choose to use the east parking area for tasks noted above we would also add additional labor hours to each department, in addition to warehouse and shop areas, decrease our productivity due to increased congestion, and increase safety hazards due to increased forklift traffic through production areas.
FORKLIFT USAGE, AT GRADE DOOR ON 45TH STREET NW

Approximately fifteen times daily, (Thirty times in and out)
To and from yard area with pallets, cranes, engine forms, sound enclosures, engines, etc.
To and from other warehouse area with sound enclosures, 1111 43rd Street NW,
To and from Service Shop, engines and generator sets, 1119 45th Street NW,
To and from Sub-Assembly & warehouse area, pallets of castings & parts,
1141 45th Street NW

DELIVERIES TO LOADING DOCK AREA, EAST SIDE OF BUILDING

Trucks are from local delivery 28' vans to line haul trucks with 53' trailers.
Approximately 514 yearly (average ten weekly)

SHIPMENTS FROM LOADING DOCK

Trucks are from local delivery 28' vans to line haul trucks with 53' trailers.
Approximately 817 yearly (average seventeen weekly)

(All these figures are based on our 2015 fiscal year)
Burke Gilman Trail Missing Link team members:

Groundswell NW has been advocating for completion of the Burke Gilman Trail along the Ballard spur railroad corridor for over 20 years. We see the completion of the trail as a vital connection, both within our NW Seattle community and linking us to the region. It is time to complete the Missing Link along the Shilshole alternative, and we offer the following comments on the Draft EIS.

1. South Shilshole is the only alternative that will truly create a similar experience to the rest of the Burke Gilman Trail. Table ES-4 on page ES-10 identifies both Shilshole South and Shilshole North as providing “similar recreational experience to existing BGT,” but Shilshole North crosses 14 intersections, compared to 4 for Shilshole South. The main positive characteristic of the BGT, not only for recreation but also for commuting and other transportation purposes, is its separation from the street grid and lack of crossings.

2. That same table’s assessment of recreation aspects notes that South Shilshole is the “most disconnected from commercial areas of Ballard,” ignoring the commercial areas to the south of that route that it is best connected to, and the fact that a South Shilshole alignment would be a catalyst for developing better connections between Ballard’s retail core to its maritime commercial area and significant employment center along Salmon Bay. It would also provide the best connection to the shoreline street end parks at 14th, 20th, 24th and 28th Avenues NW, improving Ballard’s links to its maritime heritage.

3. That same table’s assessment of parking impacts overstates the parking impact of the South Shilshole route, stating that 261 on-street parking spaces would be removed, while pages 8-14 of the report states that 68 of these could remain. The DEIS should also address the quality of the parking spaces that would be removed. The spaces displaced on the South Shilshole route are informal spaces that create traffic back-ups and are removed from the businesses that most of them support, causing many pedestrians to cross a busy Shilshole Ave. mid-block, as there are no pedestrian facilities leading to the few crosswalks. Those spaces have far less value than those on the other alternatives that are directly in front of businesses, do not cause as many traffic disruptions or pedestrian safety issues, and in some cases are paid parking spaces generating revenue.

4. A picture is worth a thousand words (or numbers) and the DEIS should include a graphic representation of the traffic in the area, with wider lines proportional to the volume of traffic. That would clearly show that the Shilshole South alternative not only crosses 69-75% fewer intersections, it crosses the least volume of traffic by an even greater percentage.

5. Although the DEIS alludes to potential impacts on freight mobility for water-related and water-dependent industrial uses along Shilshole, it should emphasize that locating a multi-use trail along Shilshole South is not inconsistent or detrimental to ongoing industrial uses. In fact, the DEIS reflects that traffic flow would be improved at some intersections, “reestablishing NW 45th St as a two-way street open to trucks, thus improving traffic flow and connections in that portion of the study area and continuing to support industrial land uses” and adding a “new
signal at 17th Ave NW and Shilshole Ave NW could improve traffic flow, which could benefit both freight and non-freight traffic.” See Land Use Discipline Report, at 5-10, 5-11. As reflected in the Parametrix study, the Shilshole South route would be expected to maintain or improve traffic flow along this trail alignment. Impacts are likely to be “minor delays” for “short periods” of time.

6. The DEIS also minimizes the significance of the level of existing bike use along the South Shilshole route as it is the shortest, flattest, fastest route.

7. The EIS will be a grand waste of time and money if it doesn’t adequately address all alternate proposals put forward, including the elevated route along Shilshole and the cycletrack along Leary and Market. Please make sure these proposals, however flawed, are fully addressed, leaving no room for further litigation. An argument could be made that the Leary route wastefully duplicates pedestrian capacity along the sidewalk with a multi-use trail immediately adjacent, increasing the impact and cost unnecessarily. Please show clearly that even if the “trail” portion was reduced to the minimum necessary for wheeled users, leaving pedestrians to use the sidewalk, the cost and impacts to parking, traffic and transit would not be appreciably different than the studied alternative.

Even without addressing these issues, the DEIS clearly shows what we’ve held for years, that the South Shilshole route is far superior to any of the alternates. Fully addressing these issues will make that even clearer and we trust will move us closer to finally building the Missing Link.

Sincerely,

Groundswell NW Board Members:
Dave Boyd, Dawn Hemminger, Frana Milan, Jan Satterthwaite, David Folweiler, Renee Dagseth, Dennis Galvin, and Devon Shannon

---

23 - 006 Nonmotorized use on the existing BGT near the project area is described in Section 7.2.5 of the FEIS. Pedestrian and bicycle use associated with the Shilshole South Alternative is described in the Impacts Section 7.3.4 of the FEIS.

23 - 007 During the alternative development process the City received a number of suggestions for potential routes and facility types to complete the Missing Link, including an elevated route and a cycle track along Leary Avenue NW and NW Market Street. We developed screening criteria to narrow the possible alternatives, focusing on the development of a safe, multi-use trail that would be similar in design and feel to the rest of the Burke-Gilman Trail system. We did not carry forward those ideas that did not serve the same purpose as a multi-use trail, such as the cycle track, or that were deemed infeasible due to cost, complexity, or impact, such as the elevated bikeway. Please see Section 1.9 for further discussion on the ideas for completing the Missing Link that were not carried forward.
25 - 001 Thank you for your comments.

25 - 002 Your comment is noted. Under the Preferred Alternative, the trail along NW 45th Street will be shifted north to allow a 12- to 14-foot shoulder to improve sightlines and allow room for loading and unloading activities, including keeping the loading dock at Ballard Insulation.

25 - 003 Your comments are noted. A description of the Preferred Alternative is included in Section 1.6.1 of the FEIS. SDOT is proposing to return NW 45th St to a two-way street.
Thank you for your comments.

Under the Preferred Alternative, the trail along NW 45th Street will be shifted north to allow a 12- to 14-foot shoulder to improve sightlines and allow room for loading and unloading activities, including keeping the loading dock at Ballard Insulation.

Your comment is noted.

SDOT will continue to coordinate with other projects in the area. Chapter 11, Cumulative Impacts, in the Draft and Final EIS includes the Ship Canal Water Quality (CSO) project and C.D. Stimson development.

Your comment is noted. Please refer to the response to Comment 26-002.
Thank you for your comment. SDOT has considered route length in determining a Preferred Alternative, which travels along NW Market St west of 24th Ave NW. Additionally, the trail would be a multi-use trail for pedestrian and bicycle use as well as other non-motorized uses.
Letter No. 28

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Public Hearings:
July 14 and 16, 2016

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

I am a daily bicycle commuter (green road, blue on bike). My route takes
me right through the missing link area and then on to the BGT heading
cast. By far, the most dangerous and risky part of my commute is the
missing link. I am out a number of close calls and one crash while
riding this section. I urge the city to make this route as safe as the
rest of the BGT.

I have used all of the four options and the best one overall is sidewalk
option (blue). The most important reason is that it is most
isolated from vehicle traffic and has the fewest street crossings.

Commenter information

Name: Alan Wierwille
Address: 2029A NW 60th street
Email: alanwenhorn1@hotmail.com

Do you wish to be added to the project's email list? Check box: ☑

Email: BGT_MissingLink.Info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kuby, SDOT Director, PO Box 3496, Seattle, WA 98124-3496.

Thank you for your comments.
Thank you for your comments.

Commenter information
Name: Andrew Danenberg
Address: 2810 NE 56th Street, Seattle 98105
Email: ALD2810@AOL.COM

Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box ☑️

Email: BGT_MissingLink_INFO@Seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SODT Director, PO Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-4996
Thank you for your comment. The graphics used during the public meetings were solely for the purpose of quickly comparing relative impacts, and were not part of the Draft EIS. The DEIS and FEIS describe short-term construction impacts for each alternative on each element of the environment.

Safety is a critical component of the project. SDOT is following the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guidelines, which recommend a 10- to 12-foot wide path for multi-use facilities. In several sections, the multi-use trail would serve as the sidewalk for pedestrians as well as the path for other users. From NW 54th Street to the intersection of NW Market Street and 24th Ave NW, there would be a 6- to 10-foot sidewalk adjacent to the multi-use trail.
Thank you for your comments. Implementation of the Preferred Alternative will not disrupt the Farmer’s Market.

The Leary Avenue Alternative would change Leary Ave NW and NW Leary Way to a two lane road (one travel lane in each direction) with a center turn lane. However, the Preferred Alternative would not implement this change. You may send concerns about pedestrian safety on Leary Ave to SDOT at 684-Road@seattle.gov.

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

ShiShiShi, South looks like the clearest, least direct option and least disruption to remediate the Ballard Market and small shops as well as Bus Route 36.

The Ballard Market being held in its current location carries the retail shops with the market and is a well-liked Sunday experience as well as important livelihood for small shops and farmers. As an aside — anything can be done to slow traffic on Leary and keep it safe for pedestrians would be welcome. ShiShiShi has very little foot traffic anyway.

Commenter Information
Name: Ann Holstrom
Address: 8233 NW 58th St. #304
Email: AHHolstrom@hotmail.com
Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box.

Email: BGT_MissingLink_info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, PO Box 34916, Seattle, WA 98124-4916
32 - 001  Thank you for your comment.

Letter No. 32

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Public Hearings:
July 14 and 16, 2015

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

As a biker in Seattle, I prefer the

Commenter Information
Name: Bjorn Davidson
Address: Bjorn.davidson@oubrit.com
Email: 7314 15th Ave NW Seattle WA 98117

Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box: ☐

Email: DOT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, PO Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-4996
Thank you for your comment.

I think the Shilshole South alternative looks like the best choice. Fewest driveways, lowest loss of existing zone, most direct and safest route for cyclists, no need to cross or ride on busy main commerce thoroughfares like Market or Ballard. Let’s get going, it will be great!

Commenter information
Name: Bruce Sanchez
Address: 4180 42nd Ave NE, Seattle 98105
Email: bruce@bruce Sanchez .com
Do you want to be added to the project’s email list? Check box ☑️

Mailing Scott Kuby, SDOT Director, PO Box 34994, Seattle, WA 98124-4996
34 - 001 Thank you for your comment.

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT

I feel that the Southlake Avenue South Alternative is the only and best choice. It is the safest for trail users and would only minimally affect other transportation in the area. It was always the choice for the trail completion and should finally move forward.

Commenter information
Name: Carolyn McGivern
Address: 4301 4th Avenue NW 98107
Email: CarolynM@gmail.com
Do you wish to be added to the project's email list? Check box: □

Email: BGT_MissingLink.info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, 803 3rd Ave 3400E, Seattle, WA 98124-4906
Thank you for your comments. Your preference for an alignment along Leary Way is noted; however, SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

Safety is a critical component of this project and the Preferred Alternative best meets the project objectives for a safe, direct, and defined multi-use trail, which will also improve predictability for both people driving and people using the trail. Please refer to Section 1.7.1 for a discussion of design features that can be employed to reduce potential hazards.

The DEIS notes that, over the medium to long term, the study area will likely experience significant socioeconomic and industry changes, regardless of whether or not the BGT Missing Link is constructed. The operation of the BGT Missing Link may add to the competitive pressures facing industrial users. However, given the economic trajectory of the study area, SDOT expects that the incremental impact of any of the Build Alternatives for the BGT Missing Link would be small by comparison.

Your comments are noted.
Thank you for your comments. The DEIS noted that restaurants and retail establishments would likely benefit due to increased business from bicycle and pedestrian customers. A formal evaluation of the health benefits of the trail is outside the scope of the Economic Considerations Report and the EIS.

36 - 002 Your comment is noted.
It would not be possible to create a frontage road alongside the trail along Shilshole Ave NW without adversely affecting the way the adjacent businesses conduct their operations. The road would need to be immediately adjacent to loading bays and docks, which would cause conflicts with vehicles travelling along the frontage and necessitate turning movements that are too tight for large freight trucks to make. In addition, a frontage road would cause a greater loss of parking and may result in additional railroad track relocation or removal.

Comment Form

Letter No. 37

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

Would it be possible to create a "frontage road" with fewer driveways crossing the trail?

That would make it safer for the industrial drivers and also allow them to use that road to move quickly out to Shilshole.

Commenter information

Name: __________________________

Address: __________________________

Email: __________________________

Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box: □

Email: DOT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov

Mail: Scott Kudly, SDOT Director, PO Box 35996, Seattle, WA 98124-3996
Thank you for your comment.

Commenter information

Name:

Address:

Email:

Do you wish to be added to the project's email list? Check box: ☐

Email: BCT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, PO Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-4996
Thank you for your comment.

THE BEST ROUTE IS SHILSHOLE SOUTH
FORCING TRAIL USERS ON TO STREETS
IS UNSAFE BALLARD BLVD AND SALMON
BAY SAND & GRAVEL WILL JUST KIT
HAVE TO DEAL WITH IT

Commenter information
Name: _____________________________
Address: ___________________________
Email: _____________________________

Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box: ☐
17th Ave NW was considered as part of the initial alternatives selection process. It was identified as a possible connector route and was generally evaluated as part of the EIS process. However, 17th Ave NW has not been selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. Refer to Section 1.4.2 of the FEIS for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative.

The objective of the project is to complete the approximately 1.4-mile missing link of the Burke-Gilman Trail. The trail will serve non-motorized users of all types, not just bicycles.

The Preferred Alternative does not travel along Ballard Avenue. Refer to Section 1.4.2 of the FEIS for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative.
Thank you for your comment. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

Safety is an important component of the project. SDOT is following City standards and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guidelines throughout the trail design process. Roadway modifications, intersection treatments, driveway design, and parking lot changes that could be incorporated in the final design phase of the project to address safety, access, nonmotorized users, and vehicle types are described in Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations.
Thank you for your comments. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

The objective of the project is to construct a multi-use trail for pedestrian and bicycle use, as well as other non-motorized uses, for both recreation and transportation purposes.

The Preferred Alternative’s proposed 10- to 12-foot wide multi-use trail meets City standards and the current American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guidelines for the design of bicycle facilities. In several sections, the multi-use trail will serve as the sidewalk for pedestrians as well as the path for other users. From NW 54th Street to the intersection of NW Market Street and 24th Ave NW, there would be a 6- to 10-foot sidewalk adjacent to the multi-use trail.
Thank you for your comments. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

The objective of the project is to construct a multi-use trail for pedestrian and bicycle use, as well as other non-motorized uses, for both recreation and transportation purposes.

The Preferred Alternative's proposed 10- to 12-foot wide multi-use trail meets City standards and the current American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guidelines for the design of bicycle facilities. In several sections, the multi-use trail will serve as the sidewalk for pedestrians as well as the path for other users. From NW 54th Street to the intersection of NW Market Street and 24th Ave NW, there would be a 6- to 10-foot sidewalk adjacent to the multi-use trail.

Safety is an important component of the project. The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guidelines for the design of bicycle facilities are being consulted throughout the trail design process. The trail design, including the use of pavement markings and different pavement types on the trail, will be considered during final design.

A split pedestrian/bicycle trail system, similar to that currently present through University of Washington campus, is not necessary for the Missing Link section because the complexity of user movements and trail user volumes are much greater at the UW than are anticipated for the Missing Link section.

Thank you for your comment. Roadway modifications, intersection treatments, driveway design, and parking lot changes that could be incorporated in the final design phase of the project to address safety, access, and nonmotorized users are described in Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations.
Thank you for your comment. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

Refer to Section 1.7.1 of the FEIS for a discussion of the roadway design and safety considerations associated with intersections and driveways.

Your comment is noted.
Thank you for your comment. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.
Your comment is noted.
Thank you for your comment.

SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

Your comment is noted.
47 - 001  Thank you for your comment.

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Public Hearings:
July 14 and 16, 2016

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

Prela South Shilshole

Commenter information
Name: [Signature]
Address: 8450 60th Ave N W # 356
Email: [Email Address]

Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box ☐

Email: DOT MissingLink Info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, PO Box 3496, Seattle, WA 98124-4996
Thank you for your comment. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.
Thank you for your comment.

Letter No. 49

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Public Hearings:
July 14 and 16, 2016

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

---

I really hope the software Seattle center is chosen. It will keep me the safest as a bicyclist. It would keep us "clutter" of the Burke-Gilman Trail so it would be away from the traffic and chaos of downtown Ballard.

Commenter information
Name: Elizabeth Alexander
Address: 6316 30th Ave NW
Email: [email protected]

Do you wish to be added to the project’s e-mail list? Check box: [ ]

---

Email: BGT_MissingLink.info@Seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kudla, SDOT 6Flrce, P.O. Box 34946, Seattle, WA 98124-4946
5001 Thank you for your comment.

Given that the railshole South five alternative keeps best to the character of the Burke-Gilman trail and is the most historical direct route and does not require acquiring and private property, it is the best choice. It has been nearly 20 years that we've been trying to get this missing link completed. Let's start the build in 2017!
Thank you for your comment.

BUILD THE BLUE ROUTE ON SHILSHLE.
52 - 001 Thank you for your comment.

52 - 002 Your comment is noted.
Thank you for your comment.

53-002 Your comments are noted. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.
Thank you for your comments. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

Your comment is noted.
Thank you for your comments.

Commenter information
Name: Jennifer Warwick
Address: 2834 NW 60th St, Seattle 98107
Email: Jennifer.Warwick@seattle.gov

Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box: ☑
Thank you for your comments. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

56 - 002  Your comment is noted.
Thank you for your comment.

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT

Commenter information
Name: John Gillespie
Address: 4307 4th Avenue NW, Seattle 98107
Email: gillespie.jb@gmail.com

Do you wish to be added to the project's email list? Check box: ☑️
Thank you for your comment.

Your comment is noted.
SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

Your comment is noted.

Ballard is growing up. Let’s plan for it. Let’s make Vision Zero a reality in Ballard. Support Shilshole South.

Email: DOT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov
Main: ScottKubly, DOT Director, PO Box 35996, Seattle, WA 98124-5996.
Thank you for your comment.

I have lived in Seattle all my life and will be a proud Seattleite 'til the day I die. I enjoy and rely on biking all over our city for commuting to work and as well as recreation. The Shilshole South proposed alternative is my strong preference for its ease, safety, and sensible routing to connect the missing link of the Burke-Gilman Trail. This project and the Shilshole South alternative in particular is very imperative to protect and enhance the treasure that is the Burke Gilman Trail and help continue to make Seattle a place that I want and am proud to live.

Commenter information

Name: Jonathan Leffler
Address: 7338 24th Ave. NE
Email: alpinejl@gmail.com

Do you wish to be added to the project's email list? Check box □
Thank you for your comments.

Ballard Ave has not been selected as the Preferred Alternative. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.
Thank you for your comments. During the development of the Draft EIS, the Missing Link project team coordinated with staff from SDOT and the Seattle Office of Planning and Community Development (formerly Seattle Department of Planning and Development) involved in the Ballard Urban Design and Transportation Framework, and Move Ballard planning processes. The Ballard Avenue Alternative was developed based on the known existing condition of Ballard Avenue and not a potential future condition.

Your comments are noted. The Preferred Alternative does not travel along Ballard Avenue.
Thank you for your comment.
Thank you for your comment.

The Shilshole South Alternative is the only real trail option that yields an appropriate connection for the Burke-Gilman Trail. The other options may be more appropriate for future consideration as a part of an inter-connected network of protected bike lanes, but are not an appropriate option for a multi-use trail connection. Build this connection, enough is enough.

Commenter Information

Name:  
Address: 7771 57th NE, Seattle, WA 98115
Email: maqen8309@comcast.net

Do you wish to be added to the project's email list? Check box: [ ] already on it.
Thank you for your comment. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

Your comment is noted. The Preferred Alternative does not travel along Ballard Avenue NW.
to buy produce. It is a place to stroll down a historic
street blocked off to traffic. It is a place to people
watch and go into and out of the stores and
restaurants that line the avenue. It is a unique
"European" experience in Ballard - where it
off the historic neighborhood would severely
impact its appeal.

And as several speakers mentioned, closure
of the Ballard Farmers Market during construction
would likely result in the demise
of the market. Please don't mess with our
Crown Jewel.

Thank you.

Email: BDOT_MissingLink_Infob@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, P.O. Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-6996
Thank you for your comment.

Letter No. 65

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

[Comment]


Commenter Information
Name: Matt Stevenson
Address: 355 NW 47th St, 98107
Email: MATTSTEVENS4.WARDS@YAHOO.COM

Do you wish to be added to the project's email list? Check box.

Email: DOT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov
May: Scott Kuby, SDOT Director, PO Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-4996
66-001  Thank you for your comment.
Thank you for your comments. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.
Thank you for your comments. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along Shilshole Ave South as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

Your comment is noted.

Your comment is noted.

Your comment is noted.
Thank you for your comments. As described in Section 1.9 of the FEIS, an elevated trail was considered, but was eliminated from further consideration because of space limitations of constructing a facility that would meet fire code and ADA requirements due to existing development. The ramps to access an elevated trail would be a minimum of 75 feet long and would require the acquisition of additional right-of-way. Finally, the cost of an elevated trail would be 400 to 500% higher than an at-grade trail.

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Public Hearings:
July 14 and 16, 2016

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

I prefer the blue line route. However, I would like to see consideration for an elevated 10-12 feet wide trail especially in feet of the industrial areas.

An elevated trail would minimize track-bypasses conflict at crossings and provide bypasses of pedestrians with a view of Salmon Bay.

A limited number of on-off ramps from elevated trail to belted rail district is suggested.

Name: Raymond Pyke
Address: 6400 54th Ave NW
Email: ray.pyke@gmail.com

Do you wish to be added to the project's email list? Check box √

Email: BGT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, PO Box 34916, Seattle, WA 98124-4996
Thank you for your comments. As described in Section 1.9 of the FEIS, an elevated trail was considered, but was eliminated from further consideration because of space limitations of constructing a facility that would meet fire code and ADA requirements due to existing development. The ramps to access an elevated trail would be a minimum of 75 feet long and would require the acquisition of additional right-of-way. Finally, the cost of an elevated trail would be 400 to 500% higher than an at-grade trail.

Please refer to the response to Comment 1. Long-term cost averaging of an elevated trail was not conducted because an elevated trail was deemed infeasible as previously described.
Thank you for your comment. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

Your comments are noted.
Thank you for your comment. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

Your comments are noted.

Your comment is noted. The Preferred Alternative will not have a sidewalk immediately adjacent to the multi-use trail for the majority of its length. Please refer to Figure 1-3.
The DEIS summarizes the economic conditions with regard to current uses, employment, and land use in the existing conditions section of the Economic Considerations Report. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the factors considered in identifying a Preferred Alternative. Impacts to the Ballard Farmers Market were considered, as well as impacts to other businesses in the area.

Your comments are noted. Bicycle license plates and helmet laws are outside the scope of this project.
Your comment is noted. The trail alignments for all build alternatives are located within existing City right-of-way. Acquisition of additional private property or easements, including within the C.D.Stimson Property, were not considered as part of this project.
Thank you for your comment. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

72 - 002 Your comments are noted.

72 - 003 Your comments are noted.

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

From your presentation, it is clear that safety is the #1 concern of the public. The selected route would be Shilshole South. As a business manager on Ballard Ave., a route on our street would have a tremendous negative impact on our business. However, because of the first traffic to billed, which increases tremendously during the summer months and on Sundays, would be terrible for our business. Also, the parking on Ballard would be detrimental. I am not sure why the trail has a missing link in the first place, but it seems to make the route seem to continue it to Shilshole South, which most bike riders already use. The completion would just make it safer. This is what the police want and so it is public property (or at the public) then the city should employ.

Commenter Information
Name: Sarah Callen
Address: 2124 N. 52nd St, Seattle, WA 98103
Email: Sarah@Fortaleza.com

Do you wish to be added to the project's email list? Check box: ☑
Thank you for your comments.

Your comments are noted. The design includes several features to reduce the potential for impacts. Please refer to Section 1.7.1 for a discussion of possible design features that could be used to reduce potential conflicts.
Thank you for your comments.

Your comments are noted. The design includes several features to reduce the potential for impacts. Please refer to Section 1.7.1 for a discussion of possible design features that could be used to reduce potential conflicts.

Please refer to the response to Comment 73-002.

3) SAFETY SAFETY SAFETY

of all users of roadway -
- bikes, peds & vehicles

should be [ ] design

consideration - not "convenience"
or what is estimated to
be most frequently used
route.
Thank you for your comment.

74 - 001

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

Please complete the missing link along the “Saltstake South” alternative as quickly as possible. This is an important link in our multi-modal transportation system and this alternative is the safest, most direct, most logical and transitally consistent with the smallest impact on the existing businesses and culture of Ballard. Too many people have been and continue to be seriously injured as a result of accidents. The saltstake south alternative does not harm the existing street pattern of Ballard and has the fewest intersection crossings for truck safety and does not route people on busy leary way and at a detour across market road keeping people

Name: Sally Schramm-Leonard

Address: 608 24 A Ave E Seattle 98112

Email:

Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box:

Email: DOT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov

Mark: Scott Kirk, SDOT Director, P.O. Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-4996
Thank you for your comment.

Safety is an important component of the project. In addition to City standards, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guidelines for the design of bicycle facilities are being consulted throughout the trail design process. Roadway modifications, intersection treatments, driveway design, and parking lot changes that could be incorporated in the final design phase of the project to address safety, access, and nonmotorized users are described in Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations.

Ballard Avenue NW was not selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.
Thank you for your comment.

Safety is an important component of the project. In addition to City standards, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guidelines for the design of bicycle facilities are being consulted throughout the trail design process. Roadway modifications, intersection treatments, driveway design, and parking lot changes that could be incorporated in the final design phase of the project to address safety, access, and nonmotorized users are described in Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations.

SDOT recognizes the importance of accommodating all roadway users, and the trail will provide a dedicated facility for cyclists and other nonmotorized users.

Ballard Avenue NW was not selected as part of the Preferred Alternative. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.
Thank you for your comment.

Comment Form

SDOT
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Public Hearings:
July 14 and 16, 2016

Letter No. 76

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

I prefer the Shipshale North option. Getting to Shipshale from the North is manageable and it creates the smallest connection to the Burke-Gilman on both sides.

Commenter Information

Name: Shikhi Shetigar
Address: 1760 NW 56th St, #601, Seattle, WA 98107
Email: shikhi.75@gmail.com

Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box.

Email: BGT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, PO Box 34916, Seattle, WA 98124-4916
77 - 001  Thank you for your comment.

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

Build the South Side only. We cannot continue holding up this project because of a few squeaky wheels.

Commenter Information

Name: Tammy Kollaway

Address: 3424 NW 62nd Street 98107

Email: tammyw@gmail.com

Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box: }

Email: DOT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov
Mall: Scott Kiely, SDOT Director, PB Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-4996
The initial screening process included both 17th Ave NW and NW 58th St as possible alignments. As noted on Figure 1.2, 17th Ave NW was included and evaluated as a potential Connector Segment. NW 58th St was evaluated during the initial screening, but was eliminated from further consideration due to the indirectness of the route, additional intersection crossings, and the narrow width of the right-of-way. Refer to Section 1.4.1 of the FEIS for a discussion of the alternative screening process.
Thank you for your comments. The proposed trail width is between 10 and 12 feet for all alternatives, with the exception of a small segment on the Shilshole South Alternative. This segment narrows to 8 feet to accommodate a loading dock.
Thank you for your comment. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.
Thank you for your comment. The purpose of the EIS under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) is to objectively identify the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts of a project action. While there are several anticipated benefits of the project it is beyond the scope of the EIS to quantify them.
Your comment is noted. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.
Thank you for your comments. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.
Thank you for your comments.

SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.
Please see the FEIS for updated information on the Preferred Alternative, which locates the trail along the south side of Shilshole Ave NW. Roadway modifications, intersection treatments, driveway design, and parking lot changes that could be incorporated in the final design phase of the project to provide separation and address safety, access, nonmotorized users, and vehicle types are described in the FEIS Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations.
Thanks you for your comments. This letter is similar to your comment letter No. 17. Please refer to the responses to Letter No. 17.

86 - 002  Your comment is noted.

86 - 003  Your comment is noted.

86 - 004  Your comment is noted.

I'm Brian Estes, a downtown resident who bikes throughout Seattle. My son lives in Ballard and bikes from his apartment three blocks from here to the U-District every weekday, riding on Shilshole and under the Ballard bridge. He has seen numerous crashes by people who bike across the tracks under the Ballard Bridge, some of whom appeared to be serious injuries.

The South Shilshole route for the missing link is the only alternative that is head and shoulders above the other 3 alternatives in terms of safety. It is a continuous route that completes the regional trail system through Ballard to Golden Gardens. Safety for those biking, walking or skating should be our primary concern and the South Shilshole route provides that. Achieving the goals of reducing serious injuries and death through Seattle’s Vision Zero program is an important objective; and the South Shilshole route seems to make the most sense in achieving these goals.

The many benefits of the South Shilshole route far outweigh the other alternatives. This is the most direct route with the fewest turns and involves crossing only 4 intersections. It has the best sightlines for driveways and is the shortest distance.

Completing the missing link along South Shilshole will also be good for retail and other businesses in Ballard. Several national studies have documented that people who arrive by bike tend to stay longer and spend more money per person than those who arrive by car. As the Pronto bike share system expands, it will likely include bike stations supporting biking from the cruise ship terminals in Magnolia to Ballard to the Licks and Golden Gardens and we want a bike route and biking experience for them that is a safe as possible.
Thanks you for your comments. This letter is similar to your comment letter No. 17. Please refer to the responses to Letter No. 17.

Your comment is noted.

Incident response data from Seattle Fire Department was collected and incorporated into the analysis presented in Chapter 7 of the FEIS. However, as noted, it is likely that additional incidents caused by roadway conditions have occurred but were not recorded.

Your comment is noted.

One concern I have with the methodology of the EIS concerns safety as mentioned in DEIS Chapter 7 on Transportation. I believe it may seriously undercount injuries to people walking and especially biking because it relies only on collision data, I presume collected by the Seattle Police Department. SDOT also has access to data on injuries including serious injuries from Seattle Fire's EMS program and these typically include incidents not considered collisions and hence do not require an SPD response. I suggest the final EIS incorporate data from Seattle’s EMS program related to EMS calls in the study area. This will provide a more comprehensive picture of injuries in the study area and highlight the need for selecting the safest route for those walking and biking through the area.

In closing, taxpayers have spent far too much money studying and responding to litigation on this issue. The South Shilshole route is the clear alternative which would benefit all of Seattle and all those throughout the region using our great regional trail system. Enough talk; let's just finish it!
Thank you for your comment.
Thank you for your comments. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Roadway modifications, intersection treatments, driveway design, and parking lot changes that could be incorporated in the final design phase of the project to provide separation and address safety, access, nonmotorized users, and vehicle types are described in the FEIS Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations.
89 - 001 Thank you for your comments.

89 - 002 Your comment is noted.

89 - 003 Your comments are noted. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.
Disruptive to be clear I prefer using the yellow route to 22nd then connecting to any which seems like a perfect wide roadway with the least parking commercial impact. The safety and security concerns on Surface road. To be huge obstacles for a recreational trail and please to appeal only to the serious like commuters who I realize are a huge voice. Can’t imagine 1000’s along that route. Not for me.

Good luck!
Thank you for your comments. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.
My top choice is the Berry attractive:
- Preserve Ballard Locks District
- Least dangerous of the many alternatives due to the lower number of major intersection crossings
- But near right then heart of Ballard business district - so less preferred.

Please select Stella Sharya.
Thank you.

Email: BCT_MissingLink_info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kelly, SDOT Director, PO Box 340996, Seattle, WA 98124-4996
Thank you for your comments. Bicycle licensing is not required in the State of Washington.
Thank you for your comments. Intersections are one factor of many that were considered in the selection of the Preferred Alternative.

The Preferred Alternative for the trail would remove parking in select areas along NW Market Street and Shilshole Avenue NW, and would not remove parking on Leary, Market, or Ballard Avenues. And while this project is consistent with the City's policy direction and overall City planning goals to reduce dependency on single-occupancy vehicles, SDOT would implement measures to reduce parking impacts as described in Section 8.4.1 of the FEIS.
Thank you for your comment.

Comment Form

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

I prefer the Shilshole South alternative.

Commenter information

Name: David Kilmer
Address: 1725 NW Curry St
Email: david@kilmer.com

Do you wish to be added to the project's email list? Check box.

Email: RET_MissingLvlk_info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, PO Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-3496
Thank you for your comment. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

Your comment is noted.
Thank you for your comment.

95 - 001 The location of the tracks and adequate sight distance are two important factors being considered as part of the Preferred Alignment. The Preferred Alternative locates the trail on the north side of the tracks, farther from the buildings, and proposes relocation of the tracks near 17th Ave NW. Refer to Section 1.7.1 of the Final EIS for a discussion of features that can be employed along the trail to reduce hazards and improve safety.
Thank you for your comment.

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Public Hearings:
July 14 and 16, 2016

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

As an avid cyclist new to the Seattle area, I have ridden along the "missing link" section of the Burke Gilman Trail and support the possible Build Alternatives explained in the Draft EIS wholeheartedly. The South Shore alternative will be the best option for all forms of pedestrian traffic and to provide for a smooth transition between the two disconnected trail ends of the Burke Gilman as it is currently coming to this public hearing today. I ride back and forth on Market Street and feel vulnerable by bike. If there was an alternative route provided by a continuous trail network through the Burke Gilman currently unlimited,

Commenter information
Name: Emily Katz
Address:
Email: ekatz92@gmail.com

Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box:

Email: BGT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, PO Box 34976, Seattle, WA 98124-4976
more people could have access to the trail, pedestrian network, and bicycle network and feel safer, more connected to their neighborhoods and communities. Please consider the Simon Shidleski alternative as a front-most option to complete this missing link for all people to use.

Thank you!
Thank you for your comment.

I have been a Farmers Market Manager for the SFGA for many years and I am opposed to the Ballard Ave Route based on the fact that as an organization we want to protect the hundreds of small independent businesses that would be negatively affected by the decision to choose that route. It would not only hurt the surrounding community that we are a part of but also harm a historic street and neighborhood in the process. I urge you to choose an alternative route for sake and well being of the many businesses that would be destroyed in the process. Thank you for your consideration.

Commenter information

Name: Gil Vanmerw
Address: 6214 9Th Ave NE
Email: Gilmerwem@farmersmarkets.com

Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box: [ ]

Email: BDT_MissingLink_institute@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, PO Box 3496, Seattle, WA 98124-4996
Thank you for your comments. All of the multi-use trail alternatives include separation between the trail and motor vehicle traffic.

Roadway modifications, intersection treatments, driveway design, and parking lot changes that could be incorporated in the final design phase of the project to provide separation and address safety, access, nonmotorized users, and vehicle types are described in Section 1.7.1, Roadway Design and Safety Considerations.

Please refer to Section 1.9 of the FEIS for a discussion of alternatives that were considered but are not being carried forward. Constructing an overpass or underpass to avoid truck traffic would not be feasible due to the lack of available space and cost of such an alternative.

Your comment is noted. The project objective is to create a multi-use trail for persons of all abilities. The trail will comply with ADA requirements.
External missing link
Direct
Recent conflicts
Business access

Email: BGT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kudly, SDOT Director, PO Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-6996
Thank you for your comments.

100-001 Thank you for your comments.

Comment Form

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

For since my daughter learned how to ride a bike, she has been asking to ride her bike to Golden Gardens. Unfortunately, after miles of safe trail, built for and use by riders of all ages and abilities, the trail disappears and families are dumped into an industrial area. This dangerous situation needs to be rectified, and with all the speed that we deal with other threats to human life in our society, it is appalling that my child cannot safely pass through — nor any adults or bikes — yet a solution has been available.

Commenter Information

Name: Jennifer Goldman
Address: 3808 NE 55th St, Seattle 98105
Email: jengoldman@uwmail.edu

Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box.

Email: BGT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, PO Box 3496, Seattle, WA 98112-3496
Thank you for your comments.

100 - 002 A No Build Alternative is included in the EIS as required by SEPA. As noted in Section 1.5 of the FEIS, the No Build Alternative serves as the baseline condition through the 2040 design year. Over this time period, population and employment growth is expected to continue, leading to an increase in traffic congestion, parking demand, and the number of people walking and biking in the Ballard area.

100 - 003 SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

100 - 004 Your comment is noted.
Thank you for your comment.

I prefer the Shilshole South alternative. I ride a tricycle, sometimes pull a trailer, and am 66 yrs old. I also walk with a cart between the Ballard Library and Shilshole Marina. I sure hope a safer alternative is chosen and implemented while I am still young enough to make use of it. Thanks!

John D. Foster

Commenter Information
Name: John D. Foster
Address: 2442 W. Market St. NW, Seattle, WA 98107
Email: snailboatworks@hotmail.com
Do you wish to be added to the project's email list? Check box ☑️

Email: 801_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, PO Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-4996
Thank you for your comment.

Your comment is noted.
Actually, among car/truck, cyclists are somewhat culled into not stopping.
I'm not sure that makes sense & still one - 206.491.3334 - my name is Judy

Thanks for all your work in this regard.

Email: BGT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, PO Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-4996.
103 - 001  Please see the Chapter 7 of FEIS and Technical Appendix B (Volume 3) for updated traffic information and transportation analysis for the Preferred Alternative.

103 - 002  Your comment is noted.
104 - 001  Thank you for your comment.

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Public Hearings:
July 14 and 16, 2016

The South Ship Canal is the obvious choice for continuity of this trail. Right now, parking on the south side is filled with near accidents (cars parking + exiting). Parking happened there no matter what and is not safe. Don't disrupt Ballard Ave businesses or disrupt busy heavy traffic.

Commenter information
Name: Laura Keff
Address: 
Email: 
Do you wish to be added to the project's email list? Check box: 

Email: BGT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubby, SDOT Director, PO Box 34976, Seattle, WA 98124-4976
Thank you for your comment.

Your comments are noted. The project proposes to construct a designated multi-use trail, not a bike lane on an existing street.

Your comments are noted.
Thank you for your comments.

Traffic impacts are discussed for all alternatives in Chapter 7. The Preferred Alternative travels along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW. However, it would not change the existing lane configuration along NW Market St east of 24th Ave NW.
Thank you for your comments.

Your comments are noted. The project would improve travel for trail users on existing roadways along the Preferred Alternative alignment.
Thank you for your comments.

Your comment is noted. The project would improve travel for trail users on existing roadways along the Preferred Alternative alignment.

Your comments are noted. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.

Your comment is noted.

Your comment is noted.

Your comments are noted.

Your comments are noted.
Thank you for your comments. SDOT is proceeding with the project as expeditiously as possible. Project design and construction will follow completion of the SEPA process.

Your comment is noted.

Your comments are noted.
Right now there is no way I can bike with my son (6yo) from Wallingford to Ballard and this needs to be fixed.

Email: BGT_MissingLink_Info@Seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, PO Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-3996
Thank you for your comment. Please refer to Section 1.7.1 of the FEIS for a discussion of possible design features to reduce potential hazards along the trail.
Thank you for your comments.

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Public Hearings:
July 14 and 16, 2016

the Shilshole South Alternative should be chosen as the preferred alternative. It has the most direct connection between the two existing pieces of the Burke Gilman Trail and is the least electrical change of any of the other proposed alternatives. The fact that this design doesn’t require turns is considered too one corner would encourage multimodal accessibility and would give both drivers and bicyclists better sightlines. All of the other

Operates present operational challenges for transit drivers and bicyclists that are more pronounced than with the Shilshole South Alternative.

Commenter Information
Name: Melissa Craig
Email: melissa.craig@gmail.com

Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box. ☐
Thank you for your comments. The project will be designed to comply with ADA requirements.

Your comments are noted.
Thank you for your comments. The project will be designed to comply with ADA requirements.

Your comments are noted.
Thank you for your comment.

Your comments are noted.
Thank you for your comment.

### Comment Form

**BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT**  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Public Hearings:  
July 14 and 16, 2016

**Commenter information**

- **Name:** Morgan Houglund
- **Address:** 3061 18th Ave S, Seattle WA 98144
- **Email:** morgan.houglund@yahoo.com

- Do you wish to be added to the project's email list? Check box.

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

As a user of the Burke-Gilman Trail, for the past 15 years as both a commuter bicyclist, recreational rider, runner, and walker I wish to support the South Hill-Stole Route for completing the missing link—It is the only alternative that make sense for a true separated "multi use path" in line with the rest of the existing Burke-Gilman Trail. The BGT already passes successfully through industrial/commercial areas in Tukwila, Fremont, and Wallingford without any...
Thank you for your comment.

Your comments are noted.

It is unbelievable how long Shilshole Ave has remained an informalized degraded roadway in our city. Formalizing Shilshole Ave will benefit industry, commuters, recreationists, Ballard businesses, and the safety of everyone.

Build the South Shilshole Route!
Thank you for your comment.

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT

BUILD THE SHILSHOLE SOUTH ALTERNATIVE
IT IS THE MOST DIRECT AND USEABLE
ROUTE. I USE THE TRAIL FOR BOTH RECREATION AND TRANSPORTATION

Commenter Information
Name: NORM TJADER
Address: 7020 65TH AVE NE
Email: NELUDDO@GMAIL.COM

Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box: ☐

Email: BGT_MissingLink_info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, PO Box 34976, Seattle, WA 98124-4976
Thank you for your comment.

I prefer the alignments described as Shilshole North and Shilshole South to the one currently planned to be on Shilshole Ave. I generally do not use bike lanes that are not directly routed and do not see the proposed alternatives that I would use. Ideally, there will be separation between bike path and sidewalk and few or no stop signs for trail users at driveways.

Commenter information
Name: Ross Fleming
Address:
Email: ross@rencon.net
Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box: [ ]

Email: BDT_MissingLink InkWell@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, P.O. Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-4996
Thank you for your comment.

Measures to reduce impacts to business and freight, during construction and operation of the trail, are described in the mitigation sections of each element of the environment. Chapter 4, Land Use, and Chapter 7, Transportation, describe the mitigation measures for impacts to businesses and freight.
117 - 001 Thank you for your comments and suggested route alignment. SDOT chose the Preferred Alternative along NW Market St and the south side of Shilshole Ave NW as it best meets the project objectives. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative and why it was chosen.
Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

July 2016

Project Description
The Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link Project would complete the Burke-Gilman Trail through the Ballard neighborhood, thereby completing the regional facility that otherwise runs continuously from Golden Gardens to Bothell. Of the trail’s route from Shilshole Bay to the City of Bothell, this approximately 1.2-mile portion is the only section that has not been built.

The Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) has prepared an EIS to evaluate alternatives and select a preferred route to connect the two existing segments. The project’s purpose is to create a safe, direct, and defined multi-use trail for people of all ages and abilities to enjoy and to improve predictability for all motorized and non-motorized users along the project alignment.

Draft EIS Alternatives
There are four Build Alternatives being analyzed against the No Build Alternative in the DEIS (see the map on the back side of this sheet):
• Shilshole South
• Shilshole North
• Ballard Avenue
• Leary

The DEIS looks at potential impacts to geology and soils, fish and wildlife, utilities, transportation and parking, air quality and greenhouse gas, cultural resources, and recreation. It also looks at the trail’s consistency with current land uses along each of the alignments.

All of the alternatives have both benefits and impacts. The goal of the DEIS is to compare those side by side to help develop a preferred alternative that best balances the factors that must be taken into consideration.

Important dates
- DEIS Comment Period: June 16 - August 1, 2016
- Comments due: August 1, 2016
- Final EIS Published: Early 2017 [estimated]

Draft EIS Available Now!

Please provide us with your comments on the DEIS by Aug 1, 2016.

Send your written comments to:
Email: BGT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, Director
City of Seattle, Department of Transportation
c/o Mark Mazzola, Environmental Manager
Seattle Municipal Tower
P.O. Box 34996
Seattle, WA 98124

Following the DEIS comment period, SDOT will review and evaluate comments. Your comments will help the project team decide on a preferred alternative, scheduled for early 2017.
118 - 001  Thank you for your comment.

Letter No. 118

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

I favor the 6th Avenue South option. It seems to have the least impact on other traffic and commercial use of the options. The potential impacts on trucks, like Ballard Bridge, that would require signage or signage as well as sharing use of vehicles and bikes. But then traffic could be removed, this is the most direct route and to connect with the design of the rest of the B.G. Trail.

Commenter information
Name: Tom Friedman
Address: 7307 33rd Ave NW, 98117
Email: ToOrem@comcast.net

Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box: [ ] already on it.

Email: BGT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, PO Box 34916, Seattle, WA 98124-4916.
119 - 001  Thank you for your comment.

119 - 002  Your comment is noted.
Thank you for your comment.

Your comments are noted.

The project involves construction to complete the missing section of an existing multi-use trail. Numerous data have been collected to ensure that the design team has adequate information to design the trail to minimize potential hazards for both trail users and vehicles.
Thank you for your comment. Selection of the Preferred Alternative was not a vote. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection of the Preferred Alternative.

Your comments are noted.

Land use considerations, including impacts to the Farmer's Market and local industry and businesses, were considered when analyzing alternatives. Refer to Section 1.4.2 of the FEIS for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative.
Thank you for your comment. Selection of the Preferred Alternative was not a vote. Please refer to Section 1.4.2 for a discussion of the selection of the Preferred Alternative.

Your comments are noted.

Land use considerations, including impacts to the Farmer's Market and local industry and businesses, were considered when analyzing alternatives. Refer to Section 1.4.2 of the FEIS for a discussion of the selection process for the Preferred Alternative.

As described in Section 1.4.2 of the FEIS, SDOT had several discussions with stakeholders representing the maritime, industrial, and business community in Ballard before selecting the Preferred Alternative. Land use impacts, including impacts to commercial, industrial, and residential land uses are discussed in Chapter 4 of the EIS.

Your comments are noted.

Email: BGT_MissingLink_info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, P.O. Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-4996
Thank you for your comment.

Your comment is noted.

Your comment is noted.

Comment Form
BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Public Hearings:
July 14 and 16, 2016

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

1. Please put in The Real Trail
2. Any other option will result in Death or Injury to Bikers, Loss of Business and you would be mixing Bikes and Trucks. Ballard Ave is a Terrible option Bikers would have to cross a fuel hose when we are unloading Trucks. The Shilshole N.W. Trail (green) would create Salmon Bay Sand Gravel, Fossill would cross The Trail every 10 seconds. Be Smart keep everyone safe Real Trail Only

Commenter information
Name: Bob Williams
Address: 5219 Shilshole Ave NW
Email: Bob@CouchWilliams.com

Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box:

Email: BDT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, PO Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-4996
Thank you for your comment.

Comment Form

BURKE-GILMAN TRAIL MISSING LINK PROJECT
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Public Hearings:
July 14 and 16, 2016

Please share your comments on the Draft EIS. Use back page if needed.

THE RED TRAIL IS THE ONLY ONE THAT MAKES SENSE FOR ME: I WORK ON SHILOH AND DRIVE A LARGE TRUCK. IT IS A CONSTANT CHALLENGE WITH THE BICYCLES TO AVOID HITTING THEM. THE ONLY RULE THEY FOLLOW IS KEEP PROGRESS. I WISH SPD WOULD ENFORCE TRAFFIC LAWS ON THE BICYCLES FOR THEIR OWN SAFETY.

Commenter Information

Name: Tim Connors
Address: 3442 NW Market St, Seattle WA 98107
Email: banowalow40@yahoo.com

Do you wish to be added to the project’s email list? Check box: X

Email: BGT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, P.O. Box 34976; Seattle, WA 98124-4976
Thank you for your comment.

RED TRAIL IS THE ONLY VIABLE OPTION IN BALLARD. LEARY AVE IS WIDE ENOUGH TO HANDLE A BIKE TRAIL AND STILL HAVE CAR TRAFFIC. SHILSHOLE ROUTES ARE TOO DANGEROUS FOR BIKES TO BE INTERACTING WITH TRUCKS & VANS. COMMERCIAL BUSINESS ON SHILSHOLE HAVE HAD NEGATIVE EXPERIENCES WITH BIKES. I DO NOT WANT THEM ON SHILSHOLE WHICH IS THE HEAVIEST TRUCK ROUTE IN BALLARD.

Commenter Information
Name: Marshall Williams
Address: 2341 21st St
Email: marsh@costchicago.com

Do you wish to be added to the project's email list? Check box: 

Email: DOT_MissingLink_Info@cityofseattle.gov
Mail: Scott Kubly, SDOT Director, PO Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-4996
Thank you for your comment.

From: Aaron Piper <aron0piper@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 10, 2016 4:00 PM
To: BGT_MissingLink_Info
Subject: Burke Missing Link

To Whom It Concerns,

I just wanted to add my support for building the missing link as soon as possible using the South Shilshole option. It is the only option that makes sense. You can build bike lanes on Market, and that would be great too, but people will still prefer to bike on Shilshole since it is the flattest and most direct connection from Fred Meyer to the locks.

Thanks for your time and please stop wasting tax money on more studies. Build it already! Before more people get hurt due to insufficient infrastructure.

Aaron Piper
Ballard Resident for 7 years.
Letter No. 125

From: Ada Hamilton <ada.f.hamilton@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 9:51 PM
To: BGT_MissingLink_Info
Subject: BGT Missing Link

Please don't choose Ballard Ave as the path for the Missing Link. It would disrupt the Ballard Farmers Market, a vital part of our community, as well as change the character of Ballard Ave, which is the real heart of Ballard. The farmers market allows us to support farmers and sustainable agriculture, and fosters a wonderful sense of community that is priceless and irreplaceable.

It is already not easy to park on Ballard Ave, and there are so many restaurants and small businesses that rely on that parking.

I am all for completing the missing link, and safety for cyclists. I think the North Shilshole would be safest for cycling, but it is most important to not choose Ballard Ave as the route.

- Cyclist, Ballard Market shopper, Ballardite,
  Ada Hamilton

Sent from my iPhone

125 - 001 Thank you for your comment.
125 - 002 Your comments are noted.
Hello,

As a Ballard resident, long-time bike commuter into downtown, recreational and competitive cyclist, I have followed the long and difficult debate over completion of the Burke-Gilman trail's missing link. I ride this stretch several times each week.

That is often enough to see numerous accidents and near misses. I have been forced off the road by an angry truck driver who insisted I should only ride on designated trails. Another time, I assisted a bloodied and injured woman who crashed on the rail tracks beneath the Ballard Bridge as a medical team arrived. Several weeks later, I watched another young cyclist crash in the same location. Again, an ambulance was called. For a time, I decided Shilshole was too dangerous and began to ride side streets through historic Ballard. The number of cars, intersections, loading zones, delivery trucks, and pedestrians presented a whole different hazard.

What will it take for the city to push through a safe solution? The death of a cyclist?

I hope the city can finally finish this stretch of the trail. I have reviewed the options and Shilshole North and South options seem to be the safest and most desirable options.

Thanks,
Alex Morrow

On Fri, Jun 17, 2016 at 3:37 PM, BGT_MissingLink_Info <BGT_MissingLink_Info@seattle.gov> wrote:

The Seattle Department of Transportation published the SEPA Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link Project yesterday, starting a 45-day comment period that ends August 1. We believe you may have an interest in this matter and we want to ensure you are well informed about the study and the comment process.

The DEIS and technical appendices are available to download from the project website: www.seattle.gov/transportation/BGT_Ballard.htm. Hard copies of the DEIS and appendices are also available to review at no cost at several branch libraries.

Four alternatives are addressed in the study, as well as some connecting segments that would make it possible to mix alternatives. The Draft EIS does not identify a preferred alternative between the four routes analyzed; the preferred alternative will be identified in the Final EIS, planned for publication in early 2017.

SDOT is hosting two open houses on July 14, from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., and July 16 from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. at the Leif Erikson Hall, 2245 NW 57th Street in Ballard. These meetings will be opportunities for the public to provide written and verbal comments.
We want to hear from people and this comment period is your opportunity to provide us with your thoughts on the environmental analysis and the merits of the alternative alignments. The attached Notice of Availability provides additional detail on how to review or obtain copies of the DEIS and how to submit comments.

Art Brochet
Communications Lead
City of Seattle Department of Transportation
O: 206.615.0786 | M: 206.852.8848 | art.brochet@seattle.gov

Alex Morrow
Ph.D. | Lecturer | History and Ethnic, Gender, Labor Studies
Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
University of Washington | Tacoma
From: Alex Watts <4alexwatts@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2016 8:30 PM
To: BGT_MissingLink_Info
Subject: Blue line

I support the blue line link.

127 - 001 Thank you for your comment.
Dear Mr. [Name],

Thank you for your comment.

From: Allen Wycoff <allen.wycoff@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2016 7:44 AM
To: BGT_MissingLink_Info
Subject: Ballard Missing Link

Hello,

I am an avid bicyclist and live in Lake Forest Park. When I ride with friends on the weekend the gap in Ballard XXX. My preference is the Shilshoe South alternative.

Cheers,

Allen Wycoff