

Seattle Department of Transportation

ACCESSIBLE MT. BAKER PUBLIC OUTREACH REPORT



December 2014 - December 2015
DRAFT

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	3	II. Biking Related Comments	51
Project Overview.....	4	III. Transit Related Comments	52
Outreach Goals.....	6	1. Multi-model Transit Connectivity and Accessibility.....	52
Project Schedule and Major Milestones	7	2. Bus services and bus stop amenities.....	53
Inclusive Outreach	8	3. Bus travel lanes and layover	54
Outreach Methods.....	11	IV. Open Spaces and Green Spaces Related Comments.....	55
Outreach in Numbers.....	15	1. Open Spaces	55
Respondent's Profile.....	16	2. Green Spaces	56
Survey Results	20	V. General Traffic Related Comments	57
I. Baseline Condition Survey	20	VI. Transportation Supportive Land Use (Type of Use) Related Comments	58
1. Overview.....	20	VII. Other Comments	60
2. Travel Behavior	22	1. Crime/Safety.....	60
3. Relationship to the Mt. Baker Neighborhood	24	2. Funding/Project Delivery	61
II. Prioritization Survey	25	3. General reactions to the project.....	61
1. Overview.....	25	4. Community Outreach Process Feedback	62
2. Pedestrian Safety Improvement Strategies.....	27	5. Other Issues and Questions	63
3. Other Improvements	29	Appendix II. Methodology.....	64
4. Type of Uses and Activities.....	31	I. Baseline Condition Evaluation Methodology.....	64
5. Type of Open Spaces.....	33	II. Priority Evaluation Methodology.....	66
Community Comments	34	III. Comment Analysis Methodology.....	73
1. Overview.....	34		
Appendix I. Comment Tables	46		
I. Pedestrian Related Comments.....	46		
1. Safety for walking	46		
2. Safety at crossing.....	48		
3. Pedestrian-oriented Developments	50		

INTRODUCTION

This outreach report summarizes public engagement activities and outcomes for the Accessible Mt. Baker project. It includes detailed information on outreach methods used and the effort to reach historically underrepresented communities, a snapshot of number of

stakeholders reached and a demographic profile of population surveyed, a summary of survey results and comments received, and a discussion of revisions made to the proposal as a result of community feedback.



PROJECT OVERVIEW

Recognizing that the Mt. Baker station area is the gateway to southeast Seattle, the intent of the Accessible Mt. Baker project is to create a place that preserves and enhances the tradition of compact, walkable, and mixed use communities where jobs can be created and retained. The project aims to implement several key transportation safety improvements and incorporate the Mt. Baker Town Center themes in the design concepts throughout. In doing so, Accessible Mt. Baker will help the station area become a safe and accessible “To Place” rather than a “Through Place,” making it a highly desirable regional and neighborhood destination in Seattle.

Rainier Ave S and Martin Luther King Jr Way S (MLK Way S) are key southeast corridors for people driving, taking transit, and moving goods. It’s also an important connector to I-90 and I-5. The existing intersection has been a serious problem for the neighborhood—it causes indirect and unsafe pedestrian conditions, disconnected bike routes, poorly integrated transit operations, as well as congested and confusing traffic movements. The intersection is also a high-crash location, with 76 crashes (including crashes involving people walking and biking) between 2010 and 2013. Recognizing the urgent need for safety and accessibility, Accessible Mt. Baker will identify near-term access and safety improvements for the community near the Link light rail station and the intersection of Martin Luther King Jr Way and Rainier Ave S. The effort will also develop a long-term multimodal plan consistent with the objectives of the Mt. Baker Urban Design Framework and the North Rainier Neighborhood Action Plan.



In December 2014, the project team hosted a five day collaborative planning and design workshop, also called the “Technical Charrette” (referred to as charrette) to develop design concepts and near-term as well as long-term plans for the Accessible Mt. Baker project. As one of the key outcomes identified by SDOT, Accessible Mt. Baker actively engaged and interacted with community stakeholders to better understand how the existing transportation system functions and how it can be improved. During the charrette, 45 community stakeholders¹ participated in an interview and informed the charrette design team about the project, key issues, and outcomes important to them. The final result identified in the charrette report is a

¹A list of stakeholders will be listed in the Charrette report section in the final plan document (currently a working progress)

preliminary integrated Multimodal Plan concept and a series of phased concepts for potential near-term projects.

After identifying preliminary long-term and short-term concepts for the project, the project team conducted the first public open house meeting in March 2015. During this open house meeting, the project team collected feedback on safety and accessibility alternatives as well as the preliminary design concepts. The team also presented the evaluation criteria developed during the Technical Charrette process.

Throughout the fourth quarter of 2014 to September 2015, the project team has

continuously provided opportunities for community input through various channels, including the one-on-one stakeholders meetings, community briefings, public open houses, multicultural focus group workshops, Mt. Baker station tabling events, and an online survey.

From October to December 2015, the project team will continue to engage people who live, work, and travel to and through the area to refine the solutions for enhancing the transportation environment for all. The project and design team will work in parallel with the outreach process to continue updating the project design concepts and implementation plan.



OUTREACH GOALS

The Accessible Mount Baker project outreach aimed to achieve the following outreach goals:


1. **Provide information and project progress early and often to affected residents, transit riders, and businesses:** Ensure that community members understand the existing designs and improvement priorities and are able to state their opinions about the progress and direction of the project.
2. **Solicit broad and diverse community input on prioritizing design improvements:** Get input from a diverse range of stakeholders and community members to help shape project priorities.
3. **Effectively respond to community input:** Respond to community comments and concerns, and incorporate community priorities into the proposed improvements and designs.
4. **Document and share outreach results with the community:** Ensure the outreach process and results are well documented and available to the community.



PROJECT SCHEDULE AND MAJOR MILESTONES

The Accessible Mt. Baker Project is anticipated to last 12 months, beginning in December 2014. The following chart shows the timeline and major milestones, as well as the final plan we will produce.

ACCESSIBLE MT. BAKER PROJECT TIMELINE



INCLUSIVE OUTREACH

Many communities in the Mount Baker neighborhood have barriers to participation not typically experienced by those who frequently engage in the public processes. These barriers include language and mobility issues that may cause them to be either unaware of the information available to them, or simply be unable to participate. The Accessible Mount Baker project team understands that implementing a successful Inclusive Outreach and Public Engagement (IOPE) process is critical to the success of the Accessible Mt. Baker project. To engage underrepresented communities, the outreach team researched community demographics and developed strategies to reduce barriers and encourage participation by everyone in the community. The following section

documents the specific groups and strategies used throughout the public outreach process.

GROUP I: YOUTH

21% of the Mt. Baker neighborhood population are under the age of 18 and are identified as youth. The Mt. Baker neighborhood has a youth ratio that is a higher than Seattle average (15.4%). It has the 19th highest ratio among all other neighborhoods in Seattle. The project and outreach team recognized youth is a segment of the Mt. Baker neighborhood population that will be largely affected by the Accessible Mt. Baker safety improvement project. As well, the Department of Neighborhood's Outreach & Engagement identify youth as one of many historically underrepresented groups. Therefore,




the project outreach team recruited the Department of Neighborhood Public Outreach and Engagement Liaisons (POELs) to engage youth around the Mt. Baker Station area to provide information, forge connections, and facilitate meaningful participation throughout the Accessible Mt. Baker public outreach process.

GROUP II: EAST AFRICAN LANGUAGE SPEAKER

African languages² are spoken by 7.2% of the population in the Mt. Baker neighborhood. According to the 2010 Census and 2009-2013 American Community Survey (ACS) data, percentage of population in the Mt. Baker neighborhood that speaks an African language at home is 5 percentage points higher than the Seattle overall level. Moreover, this portion of the population has a lower ratio of English proficiency compared to other foreign-language speaking communities. As indicated in the data, 65.1% of the African language speakers indicate that they do not speak English “very well.” While the majority of Africans in the Mt. Baker neighborhood are East African, language barrier is especially evident for the East African community groups. Thus, the project outreach team recruited the Department of Neighborhood POELs to reach out to the East African communities around the Mt. Baker Station area, specifically the Amharic, Somali, and Oromo speakers.

GROUP III: E AND SE ASIAN LANGUAGE SPEAKER

The Mt. Baker neighborhood is known to having a large E and SE Asian population. According to the 2010 Census and 2009-2013 ACS data, 12% of the population in the Mt. Baker neighborhood speaks one of these four languages, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Tagalog, or Chinese. As indicated in the data, percentage of population in the Mt. Baker neighborhood that speaks either Vietnamese, Cambodian, or Tagalog exceeds the Seattle average level. When looking at English proficiency of these multilingual groups, 85% of Chinese-speakers, 72% of Vietnamese-



speakers, and 32% of Tagalog-speakers indicated that they do not speak English very well. 92% of Cambodians, also referred to as Khmer-speakers, indicated that they speak English very well. Nonetheless, a largely higher-than-average representation of this group in the Mt. Baker neighborhood makes it worthy of inclusion. The barrier to participation for the E and SE Asian language speaker, represented by the four groups of people mentioned above, is largely made of the language barrier. The project outreach team contracted with Cascadia Consultant Group to conduct specialized outreach to the Vietnamese, Cambodian, Tagalog, and Chinese speaking communities around the Mt. Baker Station.

²Including Amharic, Ibo, Twi, Somali, Yoruba, Bantu, and Swahili

In developing materials and planning public outreach events, the project outreach team also took steps to minimize typical barriers to engagement. These included:

Common Barrier to Participation	Specific outreach methods to lower the barrier
Limited English Proficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Translated the program brochure, and postcard into nine different languages (outside of English): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traditional Chinese - Simplified Chinese - Somali - Vietnamese - Tagalog - Amharic - Spanish - Oromo - Cambodian • Offered and provided interpreters at project-related events such as Public Outreach and Engagement Liaisons (POEL) led outreach workshops, open house, and the Rainier Valley community meeting • Linked translated brochures on the project website • Appointed multilingual community outreach specialists and liaisons to help translate and guide the community to fill out the online survey.
Age Disability/limited mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensured ADA accessibility of public meeting venues • Provided methods for people to engage both in person and online • Ensure that event venues is easily accessible by walking, transit and driving • Reached out to community groups that contains people of various ages, make sure that there is fair amount of youth and seniors participating in the outreach process • Provided interpreters and tactile maps to the people who are blind/deaf/mute during community briefings at the Lighthouse to the Blind.
Culture differences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaged with a number of ethnic groups and organizations through Department of Neighborhood Public Outreach and Engagement Liaisons (POEL) as well as the Cascadia multicultural community outreach specialists and their conducted workshops and meetings. • Made the multicultural outreach specialists and community POELs are available at community events and the populated area such as the Mt. Baker light rail station.
Low literacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used integrated informative graphics to present information to the community • Ensured that staffs are available to assist any need during public outreach events
Low income	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offered a wide range of events with different formats and held at times of the day which can accommodate different needs and work schedules • Provided methods for people to engage both in person during the events and online in their own time • Hosted Mt. Baker station tabling event to capture a population with diverse income • Ensure that event venues is easily accessible by walking, transit and driving

OUTREACH METHODS

WEBSITE

The SDOT Accessible Mt. Baker website located at www.seattle.gov/transportation/accessibleMtBaker.htm contains program materials, meeting notices, and project contacts. Detailed information available on the website includes:

- **Meeting notices:** Includes English and translated flyers of the most recent public meeting
- **Project updates:** Includes all published project materials
- **Project overview**
- **Project outcomes:** identified the three outcomes of the projects
- **Related projects, plans and studies:** provide project background information
- **Project schedule**
- **Project contacts:** Including a sign up box for subscribing to project E-mail Alerts
- A link to the **online survey** (no longer available)

PUBLIC OPEN HOUSES

Since the beginning of the Accessible Mt. Baker's outreach effort in December 2014, the project team has hosted two open houses on:

- March 26th, 2015 6-8PM at Kings Hall
- November 12th, 2015 6-8PM at Kings Hall

These open house meetings allow time for presentations about the Accessible Mt Baker project and community feedback to the project teams. Project display boards were positioned around the room and staffed by project team



members. In total, roughly 200 people attended the two meetings. Various comments were verbally communicated to staffs or written in the comment sheets that were collected during the meetings. These comments have been incorporated into the Community Comments section of this report.

COMMUNITY BRIEFINGS

Throughout the project timeline, the Accessible Mt. Baker project team attended 19 community briefings to share the project concepts and encourage feedback from attendees of the meeting. Briefings generally included a PowerPoint presentation followed by question and answer session. At each briefing, staff provided information regarding backgrounds, concepts and outcomes of the project, and informed the audience with ways to get involved. Below chart shows a schedule of briefings:

Date	Organization
3/3/2015	Seattle School District
3/3/2015	North Beacon Hill Council
3/16/2015	Lighthouse for the Blind
3/17/2015	Seattle School District
3/20/2015	Forterra
3/26/2015	Accessible Mt. Baker Open House
4/13/2015	King County Metro
5/6/2015	Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board
5/14/2015	Mt. Baker Business District Stakeholder Group
6/1/2015	Mt Baker Community Club
6/15/2015	Rainier Court Senior Housing Assistance Group
6/24/2015	SE District Community Council
6/30/2015	PSRC transit access working group
6/30/2015	Feet First community walk
7/9/2015	Mt. Baker Business District Stakeholder Group
7/24/2015	King County Metro
7/24/2015	Sound Transit
7/28/2015	Mt. Baker Business walk with the Major
7/30/2015	Rainier Ave S Public Meeting
11/12/2015	Accessible Mt. Baker Open House (Round two)
11/17/2015	Lighthouse for the Blind meeting (Round two)
1/5/2016	North Beacon Hill Council Meeting

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT TABLING EVENT

The Cascadia outreach team conducted the two tabling events at the Mt Baker light rail station from 7:30 AM to 11 AM on February 27, 2014, and 2:30 PM to 6:30 PM on March 19, 2014. During these time frames, Cascadia distributed project factsheets and book marks with Mount Baker Open House invitation to people who passed by the light rail station, and solicited several responds to the online survey questionnaires on site using the Cascadia’s iPads. Many people told

the tabling staff that they would be interested in answering the questionnaire online later when they had more time after picking up the project information. The survey responses solicited during the tabling events and from those who later answered online entered into the “General public” result, presented later in the report.

DOOR-TO-DOOR BUSINESS OUTREACH

To reach the community stakeholders identified in the stakeholder list developed by SDOT, Department of Neighborhoods, and Cascadia, the Cascadia outreach team conducted two door-to-door business outreach events on two days, February 27 and March 11, 2014.

On February 27, 2014, the Cascadia outreach team directly talked to businesses located within a 3-block radius from the light rail station during 1:30 PM to 4 PM. A list of businesses that were visited on this day includes:

1. Metro PCS
2. Cash America
3. O’Riley
4. Salon 206
5. Rite Aid
6. QFC
7. Thai Recipe
8. The Original Philly’s
9. Starbucks
10. US Bank
11. Wells Fargo Bank
12. Rainier Laundromat
13. National Pride Car Wash

Cascadia estimates that 70% of these businesses answered the questionnaire on site, 20% asked the outreach team to email the questionnaire to them, and 10% asked the outreach team to revisit another time. All visited businesses accepted the project factsheet and book mark. Overall, almost all businesses surveyed on this day were supportive of the project goals.

On March 11, 2014, Cascadia conducted direct outreach to 25 additional businesses located within a 3-block radius from the light rail station

during 1:30 PM to 4PM. A list of additional businesses that were visited on this day includes:

1. Vieng Thong Lao and Thai Restaurant
2. Seattle Hair Salon & Beauty Supply
3. 76 Gas Station
4. Chevron Gas Station
5. Rainier Hair Salon
6. SENI CNA School
7. Teriyaki
8. Van Loi Noodles
9. TBS Book Keeping & Income Tax
10. Alpine Real Estate LLC
11. Columbia Physical Therapy Services Inc.
12. Farmers Insurance
13. Pho Bac
14. Café Ibex
15. Mt Baker Dry Cleaners
16. Borracchini Bakery
17. Work Source
18. UHaul
19. Mutual Fish
20. City Café & Restaurant
21. Affordable Tires & Brakes
22. Saigon Printing
23. Bartell Drugs
24. El Mexicano Express
25. East Africa Money Wiring

In total, 39 businesses were reached within a 3-block radius from the light rail station using the door-to-door visit method. Cascadia estimates that 40% of these businesses answered the questionnaire on site, 50% said they would complete the questionnaire online later, and 10% asked the outreach team to revisit another time. All visited businesses accepted the project factsheet and bookmark. Responses from these businesses were entered into the “General public” result, presented later in the report.

ONLINE SURVEY

The online survey was a primary tool for receiving general public input about the Accessible Mt. Baker prior to the first open house. The project team developed the survey questions distributed them to the public through the SDOT Accessible Mt. Baker website, Mt. Baker

station tabling events, door-to-door business outreach, multilingual community meetings, and the first public open house. While the survey questionnaires were developed in English, it was translated into 7 other languages by the POELs and Cascadia outreach specialists to be used for non-English speakers. The survey primarily asked participants to indicate their positions about various safety improvement priorities, and provide insight about what sorts of improvements and developments are most desired by people who lives, shops, works, attend schools or passes by the Mt. Baker station area. The survey also offered participants opportunities to write comments about additional concerns or recommendations. In total, we received 462 survey responses and 163 survey comments.

MULTILINGUAL AND YOUTH COMMUNITY MEETINGS

To reach non-English speakers who live, shop, work, and attend school in the Mt. Baker neighborhood, outreach specialists subcontracted by Cascadia and the Department of Neighborhood (DON)’s Public Outreach and Engagement Liaisons (POEL) were contracted to conduct community meetings and host focus group conversations with various existing culture and multilingual groups in the Mt. Baker neighborhood. The outreach conducted by the Cascadia outreach specialists visited E and SE Asian groups, including the Chinese, Vietnamese, Filipino, and Cambodian communities. The POEL from DON conducted outreach to the East African groups, including the Somali, Ethiopian, and Eritrean communities. A description for these two parallel outreach efforts is as follow:

Public Outreach and Engagement Liaisons (POEL) Outreach Workshops

Since April 2015, the POEL has conducted four focused group discussions covering youth, Ethiopian, Somalian, and Eritrean community groups. Valuable discussions were made on the importance of community participation in accessible Mt. Baker neighborhoods to make safer for traffic. Moreover, interactive and

participatory discussion was made on the objective of group survey among the participants. For foreign language groups, survey questionnaires were translated into their specific languages and were distributed to the participants at their group discussion workshop. Most groups had approximately 13 - 28 people participated.

Cascadia Outreach Specialists Community Meetings

After the first Accessible Mount Baker Open House on March 26, Cascadia staff and subcontractors conducted 7 community meetings with 130 multicultural users of Mount Baker Light Rail station to solicit feedback on the changes that will happen in the project area. Cascadia chose the “casual meeting” approach, which means project staff integrated Accessible Mount Baker project presentation, surveying, and discussion at the end of selected existing community meetings. Community groups reached by the Cascadia staff and outreach specialists include:

1. Chinese residents from Eastern Hotel and Nahachimi Apartments
2. Vietnamese residents of Mt. Baker Village Apartments
3. Vietnamese visitors at the Asian Counseling and Referral Services
4. Filipino participants of the Naturalization Classes Celebration at the Filipino Community Center
5. Cambodian residents of the Mt. Baker Village Apartments.

COMMUNITY MEETINGS FOR DEAF AND/OR BLIND PARTICIPANTS

Since the beginning of the project outreach, the Accessible Mt Baker project team has met with a stakeholder group from Lighthouse for the Blind twice, on March 16, 2015 and November 17, 2015. The project team spent its first meeting presenting an overview of the project concept plan and solicited initial feedback. The meeting included sign language interpreters to help participants understand and engage with the conversation. Approximately a dozen blind or deaf/blind attendees were seen, and many of

them requested that the project team come back with updated information later in the year.

Responding to attendees’ request, the project team held a second Lighthouse for the Blind meeting which presented the updated project concept, road cross-sections, and the detailed traffic analysis data. To ensure a more effective interpretation than the first meeting, the project team also previewed the presentation with the sign language interpreters prior to the meeting to familiarize them with the project concepts. A tactile map of the proposed project concept was also presented to the participants, many of whom appreciated this unique communication tool. Feedback from these two meetings has been solicited and is included in the overall written comment.

MEDIA

Blog Postings

The Accessible Mt. Baker project information was posted on various websites and blogs. Websites that shared the Accessible Mt. Baker project in their news feed or blog posts include:

1. [Seattle Transit Blog](#)
2. [Seattle Bike Blog](#)
3. [Friends of Mt. Baker Town Center](#)
4. [Rainier Valley Post](#)
5. [Seattle Neighborhood Greenways](#)
6. [Columbia City Source](#)
7. [The C is for Crank](#)

Furthermore, there were also a few websites that announced the upcoming Accessible Mt. Baker open houses. These websites include:

1. [Kirotv.com](#)
2. [South Seattle Emerald](#)
3. [El Centro de la Raza](#)
4. [Mount Baker Community Club](#)
5. [Eventful](#)

Social Medias

On March 21, 2015, an Accessible Mt. Baker twitter account is created to provide timely information about the updates of the project. Until now, 55 tweets were posted and the page received 34 followers.

OUTREACH IN NUMBERS



462

Total survey responses collected

330

Written comments



263

General public participants



130

E and SE Asian participants

40 Chinese-speaking survey participants

32 Vietnamese-speaking survey participants

38 Tagalog-speaking survey participants

21 Khmer-speaking survey participants

56

East African participants

13 Amharic-speaking survey participants

15 Oromo-speaking survey participants

10 Somali-speaking survey participants



21

Community meetings

14

Non-English meetings with


7

multilingual communities



28

Youth survey participants



9

Different languages translated from key materials

39 Businesses reached by door-to-door outreach located within a 3-block radius from the light rail station



45

Stakeholders



RESPONDENT'S PROFILE

GENERAL PUBLIC


The general public survey group consists of a wide range of population who live, work, shop, or go to school in the Mt. Baker neighborhood. A total of 263 people participated in the survey and questionnaire and submitted their responses. The following figures summarize some key characteristics of these respondents.

Respondents for this group were reached through the following methods:


- Two public engagement tabling events conducted at the light rail station on February 27 and March 19. About 30 people answered the Accessible Mount Baker survey questionnaire on site with iPads.
- Accessible Mt. Baker Open House, 90 people attended and 99 comments were collected.
- Online questionnaire linked to the Accessible Mt. Baker website

Note: Age and income level of the group is not captured in the survey questionnaire

PREFERRED LANGUAGE



RACE




E AND SE ASIAN


The E and SE Asian survey group consists of multicultural/multilingual users of Mount Baker Light Rail station who has an E and SE Asian cultural background. A total of 130 people participated in this outreach and submitted their questionnaire answers. The following figures summarize some key characteristics of these respondents.

People from this survey group were reached at various community meetings in the Mt. Baker neighborhood. 7 meetings were conducted at the end of selected existing community events; during which project staff integrated Accessible Mount Baker project presentation, surveying, and discussion. The following table summarizes the number and ethnicity of participants by community events.

ETHNICITY



PREFERRED LANGUAGE



Community events	Participants
Eastern Hotel and Nachimi Apartment (twice)	40 Chinese residents
Mount Baker Village Apartments health insurance meeting	15 Vietnamese residents
Weekly Club Bamboo lunch	17 Vietnamese senior residents who frequent the Asian Counseling and Referral Services (ACRS)
Filipino Naturalization Classes Celebration	38 Filipino participants
Mt. Baker Village Apartments (twice)	20 Cambodian residents

EAST AFRICAN

The East African population in the Mt Baker neighborhood is reached via Ethiopian, Somalian-youth, and Eritrean Public Outreach and Engagement Liaisons (POEL). Number of East African participants reached is:

13

Ethiopian Participants

15

Somalian/Oromo Youth Participants

28

Eritrean Participants

The following section summarizes the characteristics and outreach process for each of the three focus groups.

Ethiopian Focus group

The Ethiopian focus group consists of 13 Ethiopian residents in the Mount Baker neighborhood, seven males and six females. They were reached by the POEL focus group workshop conducted by the Ethiopian POEL. Among them, 9 participants prefer using Amharic, 4 are ok with both Amharic and English.

Workshop summary

The focus group facilitation started with project briefing, and was followed by an interactive and participatory discussion on the objective of group survey. At the end of the workshop, participants collectively completed the Amharic translated questionnaires.

Somalian/Oromo-Youth Focus group

The Somalian-Youth focus group is made up of 15 youths, among which 10 are Somalian and 5 are Oromo. They were reached by the POEL focus group workshop conducted by the Somalian/Oromo POEL. Among them, 12 participants prefer using English, 2 prefer Somalian, and 1 prefers Oromo.

Workshop summary

The focus group was facilitated as a group conversation by the Somalian/Oromo POEL, where for some questions, the large group split into two smaller groups in order to keep the conversation on track and allow everyone to share. Additional feedbacks about the Mt. Baker intersection was also provided by the Somalian/Oromo youth focus group after answering the questionnaires.



Eritrean Focus group

The Eritrean focus group includes 28 Eritrean participants whom were reached by the Eritrean POEL at their existing community gatherings. The following table summarizes the number and type of participants by community gatherings.

Community gatherings	Participants
Eritrean Dance Group practice	8 youth between the age of 5 and 18
Eritrean Association in Greater Seattle Members meeting	5 adult men
Eritrean Community of Seattle and Vicinity monthly meeting	7 participants, mostly men in their 50s and 60s
Amnearegawi Mahber monthly meeting	7 adult women
Focus group meeting	13 participants, 12 of them have been reached previously

Notice that a focus group meeting was also conducted to further discuss the project and solicit additional survey answers. The Eritrean POEL invited everyone who filled out the survey to attend this group meeting. The turnout was 13 participants, of whom most were youth from the dance group and members of the Eritrean Association in Greater Seattle.

Among all participants, 25 of them prefer using Tigrinya, and 3 of them are ok with both Tigrinya and English.

Workshop summary

The meeting started with an introduction of the Accessible Mt. Baker project and a quick read-through of the survey questionnaires. Then, the survey questionnaires were distributed to participants while the POEL stayed alongside of them in case questions emerges. According to the POEL, in addition to project related questions, participant also asked about jobs, housing and education opportunities for the Eritrean community.

YOUTH

The Youth survey group consists of 13 students from the Franklin High School Student Senate, and they are reached by the Youth focus group POEL during one of their meeting periods. Students from this group come from various ethnic backgrounds, such as Chinese, Filipino, and African-American. 10 out of 13 students indicated their preferred language to receive information, and all 10 of them preferred using English.

Workshop summary

The youth group POEL started the workshop with an introduction about the Accessible Mt. Baker Project. Then, the POEL led students through a discussion of survey questions, where student participants provided individual answers to the first three and last four questions, and reached to consensus and provided a set of collective answers for the rest of the survey questions. Each youth also received a survey form, which they filled out as the group went through the discussion.

SURVEY RESPONDENT'S PROFILE II

SURVEY SAMPLE RACIAL REPRESENTATIVENESS

Based on available survey data, a comparison of the race of the survey respondents to the race of people living in the Mt. Baker neighborhood is presented in Figure 1. The proportion of Asian and African American represented in the sample is higher than their actual share of the population in Mt. Baker neighborhood. This is most likely because of the specific community outreach efforts to the Asian and African American communities.

The proportion of White represented in the sample is lower than the neighborhood percentage; however, it is expected that if tallied the number of white participants at the open house, this number of representation will likely increase. The proportion of Hispanic and Latino represented in the sample is lower than the actual ethnic make-up (by 2.2 percentage points), meaning that this group is currently underrepresented in our surveying process.

Race, Survey Sample vs. Population						
	White	Asian	Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Mixed	Others
Survey Sample ¹	28%	43%	22%	2%	4%	1%
Mt. Baker Population ²	52.1%	17.7%	17.8%	5.8%	6.2%	0.3%

RESPONDENT GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION


Based on the available responses to survey question fifteen 3 (283 valid responses), Map 1 below shows the location distribution of respondents. As shown, most of the respondents came from Rainier Valley Region and the Central District. There are a few respondents (less than five) who came from regions south of the Seattle city boundary.



¹344 respondents indicated their race in their survey response

²Data source: 2010 census and 2009-2013ACS

Respondent Geographic Distribution by Seattle Neighborhoods



SURVEY RESULTS

I. BASELINE CONDITION SURVEY Question 1, 2

1. OVERVIEW

A main purpose of the Accessible Mt Baker Survey is to understand the current travel behaviors of those who frequent the Mt. Baker neighborhood and the reasons that draw them to the neighborhood. Two questions were asked in this section of the survey: 1. How do you usually get around the Mt. Baker Neighborhood? 2. What is your relationship to the Mt. Baker Neighborhood?

Question 1 gives respondents six commonly-used travel modes in its answer options: walking, biking, transit, car, commercial vehicle and motorcycle. All 462 respondents made selections within the given answer options; and their responses were utilized to showcase:

- Overall usages of each travel mode among all respondents
- Preferences for each travel mode by survey groups

Note that when showcasing the model preferences by survey groups, the POEL Eritrean, Somali, and Ethiopian focus groups were convened into one group called the East African survey group in order to produce simplicity in graphic illustration.

Question 2 provides four answer options, including living, working, shopping, and attending school or training. Respondents were asked to choose the applicable answers from these options; and they were allowed to leave written comments for any additional relationships not listed in the provided answers. For Question 2, the survey responses collected contain both quantitative data and written comments. While analyzing and graphing these two types of responses, the goal is to:

- Visualize the diverse relationships that each group has with the Mt. Baker neighborhood
- Highlight the differences amongst survey groups in terms of their most dominant relationship with the Mt. Baker neighborhood
- Bring attention to the additional relationships and the varying ways that individual participate in the life of the neighborhood

In total, 462 surveys responses and 127 written comments were collected from all six survey groups, which include community members from the general public, E and SE Asian language group, East African language group, and youth group.


The following summary sheets display graphical results, key findings and recommendations in regard to current travel behaviors and relationships to shape the future in the Mt. Baker neighborhood.

ACCESSIBLE MT. BAKER

Travel Behavior


Q1: How do you usually get around the Mt. Baker Neighborhood?

Given a total of 462 survey respondents, the graph on the right shows the percentage of respondents who uses each travel mode. (Respondents may select more than one mode).




Model Preferences by Survey Groups


WALK




BIKE



TRANSIT



CAR



¹Refers to Chinese, Vietnamese, Filipino, and Cambodian multilingual survey groups

²Refers to Amharic-Ethiopian, Eritrean, and Somalian multilingual survey groups

2. TRAVEL BEHAVIOR

The first survey question asked respondents to select their frequent modes of travel.

Respondents were given the options of walking, biking, transit, in a car, in a commercial vehicle and in a motorcycle, and they were permitted to choose more than one option, if applicable. From the results collected, the following characteristics indicate the travel behavior of survey respondents in the Mt. Baker Neighborhood.

First, out of all 462 survey responses:

- 54% of all respondents take public transit to get around the Mt. Baker Neighborhood
- 33% of all respondents uses car to get around the neighborhood
- 30% of all respondents get around the neighborhood by walking
- Only 7% of the respondents travel in the Mt. Baker Neighborhood by bike
- No respondents indicated that they travel by motorcycle or a commercial vehicle

Furthermore, when comparing the survey results from each survey groups, it is found that:

- 85% of youth respondents get around the Mt. Baker Neighborhood by car
- 77% of respondents from the East African language groups travel by transit
- 54% of respondents from the E and SE Asian survey group rely on transit
- Traveling by car is the second most populous option for the East African language groups (45%)

- General survey group and youth focus group have more respondents who walk (30% and 46%), while the E and SE Asian and East African language groups³ has fewer respondents walking (23% and 21%)
- The 7% that indicated travel by bike are predominantly from the general survey group.
- For all other survey groups (outside than General survey group), there is a few and almost no respondent bike in the Mt. Baker Neighborhood.

Recommendations

- Based upon the project guiding principles, prioritize pedestrian improvements in the station area and to the high school
- Introduce bicycle facilities for all ages and abilities
- Once protected bicycle facilities are introduced, expand bike share to the station area
- There is a substantial reliance on public transit across all survey groups. Making transit-related improvements will benefit many in the Mt. Baker Neighborhood. Relocate the bus transit center adjacent to the light rail station and improve transit rider facilities
- Provide for consistent and predictable traffic movement, with drop-off access to transit for private automobiles and transportation network companies such as Uber, Lyft and taxis


³Refers to the POEL Ethiopian, Somalian, and Eritrean focus groups

ACCESSIBLE MT. BAKER

Relationship to the Mt. Baker Neighborhood


Q2: What's your relationship to the Mt. Baker Neighborhood?

Proportion in each of the given relationships by survey groups



*Refers to Chinese, Vietnamese, Filipino, and Cambodian multilingual survey groups

Percentages of total respondents who mentioned the following additional relationships in their written comments



3. RELATIONSHIP TO THE MT. BAKER NEIGHBORHOOD

Question 2 asked respondents to indicate their relationship to the Mt. Baker Neighborhood, in another word, their reasons for frequenting the Mt. Baker neighborhood. Respondents are given the options of “shop here”, “live here”, “work here” and “attend school/training”, and they are permitted to make multiple selection, and leave written comments for any additional relationships. Key findings:

Live

- 42% of all survey respondents live in the neighborhood
- All of the Somalian-youth respondents live in the Mt. Baker Neighborhood
- Eritrean survey group has the least respondents living in the Mt. Baker Neighborhood

Work

- Only 16% indicated that they work in the neighborhood
- Eritrean survey group has the most respondents working in the Mt. Baker Neighborhood (71%)

Shop

- There are an even amount of general public respondents who shop and live in the Mt. Baker neighborhood
- Ethiopian survey group has the most respondents shopping in the Mt. Baker Neighborhood (77%)
- Most respondents from E and SE Asian survey group come to the neighborhood to shop (55%)
- Only a small percentage of Eritrean and youth respondents shop in the Mt. Baker Neighborhood

Attend School

- 12% of respondents indicated that they attend school/training in the neighborhood
- E and SE Asian survey group has the least respondents attending school in the Mt. Baker Neighborhood

In addition to selecting the given answer options, respondents also provided comments⁴ that suggested a few more populous relationships, which include:

- Traveling through the neighborhood
- Making transit transfer in the neighborhood
- Visiting friends/family in the neighborhood
- Participating in recreational activities in the neighborhood

Recommendations

- Implement SRTS to ensure the safety and mobility for youth attending school and training in the neighborhood
- Diversify business recruitment to attract more commercial activities from diverse population
- Create a diverse job base, including people of different languages, races, cultures and ages
- Make Mt. Baker a “to place” by considering the cultural diversity of people using the Town Center
- Allow for the mixed use opportunities that are coordinated with transit investments. Consider commercial activities col-locating with the relocated transit center.
- Continue to improve urban spaces, open spaces and retail activities to attract more visits

⁴See Table 1-2 for detail comments

II. PRIORITIZATION SURVEY

Question 4, 5, 6, 7, 8

1. OVERVIEW

One of the main objectives of the Accessible Mt. Baker Survey is to determine whether the proposed project goals and focus of improvements align with the broader community priorities. As the project is currently in the process of identifying near-term access and safety improvements near the Link light rail station and the intersection of Martin Luther

King Jr. Way and Rainer Ave, and developing a long-term multimodal plan consistent with the objectives of the Mt Baker Urban Design Framework and the North Rainier Neighborhood Plan, the project team understands that community feedbacks and recommendations are the key to pushing the project forward. Thus, question 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 are developed to help identify community opinions about the proposed improvements in regard to pedestrian safety, multi-modal transportation, land use, and open spaces.

In question 4, 5, 6, 8, respondents from all survey groups were asked to rate or rank the given answer options, or to leave additional comments if none applies. The answer options that were provided in each of the four questions are as follows:

QUESTION 4 Pedestrian Safety Improvement Strategies	QUESTION 5 Other improvements (Other than pedestrian safety improvements)	QUESTION 6 Type of uses	QUESTION 8 Type of open spaces
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slow down traffic • Shorter pedestrian Crossings • Bus stop close to light rail • Sidewalk/crosswalk maintenance • Streets/ open space lighting • Improve connection between Winthrop and Mt. Baker Blvd • More pedestrian waiting spaces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe bicycle lanes • Improved bus services • Bus rider amenities • Freight and vehicle routes • Vehicle travel reliability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social and health services • Youth activities • Training/education • Market-rate housing • Active open spaces • Job/employment • Living-wage housing • Arts/entertainment • Retail/restaurants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plaza that encourage retail activity and community gatherings • Open spaces with grass, trees and benches • Outdoor play spaces for residents and/or children • Community gardens or farms

Responses to above questions were further analyzed to reveal community core ideas. The goal of survey data analysis is to:

- Identify overall neighborhood priorities for each improvement area
- Highlight the different priorities across survey groups in regards to each type of improvement

Question 7 is a preparatory query to Question 8 and its responses are analyzed to reflect the neighborhood’s overall position for the introduction of open spaces. In this question,


respondents were asked to select whether they think the introduction of open spaces is “very important”, “important”, “not important”, or “I don’t know”. Results and finding to this question will be briefly discussed in the Question 8 summary portion.

In total, 462 survey responses and 130 written comments were collected. The following summary sheets display graphical results, key findings and recommendations in regard to community and individual survey group priorities for the above areas of improvements.

ACCESSIBLE MT. BAKER

Pedestrian Safety Improvement Strategies

Q4: Please prioritize the specific strategies that you believe will improve pedestrian safety in the neighborhood from 1 to 3¹ (with 1 being your highest priority)



Neighborhood's ranking of the proposed pedestrian safety improvement strategies

¹Adjusted scale to enable better analysis, detail explanation can be found in Appendix I

²Two types of survey answer were collected: 1. Collective Rankings, and 2. Individualized ratings

³Percentage of people in each of the three groups who choose the option as their first priority, calculated using the individualized ratings for each answer option

⁴Refers to Chinese, Vietnamese, Filipino, and Cambodian multilingual survey groups

Priority rankings for each survey group, organized by answer types²

	COLLECTIVE RANKINGS			PERCENTAGE OF SUPPORTS ³	
	Youth	POEL Ethiopian	POEL Somali-Youth	General Public/E and SE Asian ⁴ /Eritrean	
Slowing down traffic	5th	7th	1st	0%	50%
More pedestrian waiting space	1st	1st	1st	0%	50%
Sidewalk/crosswalk maintenance	3rd	4th	4th	0%	50%
Streets/open space lighting	2nd	2nd	5th	0%	50%
Shorter pedestrian crossings	6th	6th	5th	0%	50%
Improve connection between Winthrop and Mt. Baker Blvd	4th	3rd	5th	0%	50%
Bus stop close to light rail	7th	5th	3rd	0%	50%

● General public survey group, total of 263 respondents

● E and SE Asian survey group, total of 130 respondents

● POEL Eritrean survey group, total of 28 respondents

2. PEDESTRIAN SAFETY IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES

Question 4 asked respondents to rate the importance of proposed pedestrian safety improvement strategies. From the results collected from the general survey group, the E and SE Asian survey group, POEL Ethiopian, Somali, Eritrean and youth focus groups, it was found that the top three most significant pedestrian improvement strategies priorities are:

1. Providing more pedestrian waiting spaces
2. Slowing down traffic
3. Improving sidewalk/crosswalk maintenance

Comparing the survey results from each survey group revealed that each survey group supports a very distinct set of priorities for pedestrian safety improvement strategies. Key findings from above comparison include:

- The general public survey group exhibits greater support for all proposed improvement strategies, while the East African language groups⁵ weight in only a portion of the given strategies.
- **Sidewalk/crosswalk maintenance** is the top priority for POEL Eritrean group (27%)
- **Streets and open space lighting** is the second highest priority for the POEL Youth and Ethiopian focus groups
- **Bus stop close to the light rail and Improve connection between Winthrop and Mt. Baker Blvd** were ranked third by various survey groups.



While ensuring that above strategies are implemented, respondents' **written comments**⁶ also suggested increasing crossing time, providing more, wider and green walking spaces, improving crosswalk pavements, and creating better crosswalk markings and signal systems as additional strategies to improve pedestrian safety. In addition, many respondents want to see more bike racks along the sidewalks and street-facing retails. Some also mentioned that while pedestrian safety is improved, ensuring good traffic flows is also very important to them.

Recommendations

- Prioritize providing more pedestrian waiting spaces and slowing down traffic.
- Create safer walking environment by providing better sidewalks and open space lighting.
- Move the bus stop close to the light rail and connect Winthrop St. to the west and Mt. Baker Blvd to the east with pedestrian features.
- Incorporate additional improvement measures mentioned in the written comments summary above.


⁵Refers to the POEL Ethiopian, Somalian, Eritrean and Youth focus groups

⁶See detail comments in Appendix I

ACCESSIBLE MT. BAKER

Other Improvements

Q5: In addition to pedestrian safety improvements as listed in Question #4, please prioritize the other safety improvements from 1 to 3¹ (with 1 being your highest priority).



Neighborhood's ranking of all proposed safety improvements

Priority rankings for each survey group, organized by answer types²

	COLLECTIVE RANKINGS			PERCENTAGE OF SUPPORTS ³	
	Youth	POEL Ethiopian	POEL Somali-Youth	General Public/E and SE Asian ⁴ /Eritrean	
Safe bicycle lanes	5th	4th	1st	0%	58%
Improved bus service	1st	3rd	2nd	0%	50%
Bus rider amenities	2nd	1st	3rd	0%	50%
Freight and vehicle routes	3rd	5th	4th	0%	50%
Vehicle travel reliability	4th	2nd	4th	0%	50%

¹Adjusted scale to enable better analysis, detail explanation can be found in Appendix I

²Two types of survey answer were collected: 1. Collective Rankings, and 2. Individualized ratings

³Percentage of people in each of the three groups who choose the option as their first priority, calculated using the individualized ratings for each answer option

⁴Refers to Chinese, Vietnamese, Filipino, and Cambodian multilingual survey groups

- General public survey group, total of 263 respondents
- E and SE Asian survey group, total of 130 respondents
- POEL Eritrean survey group, total of 28 respondents

3. OTHER IMPROVEMENTS

Question 5 asked respondents to rate the importance of other safety improvements in addition to pedestrian safety improvements listed in the Question 4. From the results collected from the general survey group, E and SE Asian survey group, POEL Ethiopian, Somali, Eritrean and youth focus groups, it was found that the top three non-pedestrian related safety improvement priorities for all respondents are:

1. Improved bus services (faster bus routes and more reliability)
2. Separated and safe bicycle lanes
3. Bus rider amenities (e.g. improved maps, signage, bus stops, and real-time arrival and departure updates)

Priorities identified by each individual survey groups differ in the following ways:

- Improved bus services is one of the top three priorities for Youth and all multilingual groups
- Bus rider amenities is one of the top three priorities for Ethiopian, Youth, Somalian Youth, and the general public.
- Bicycle safety improvements are the first priority for the general public, E and SE Asian survey group, and POEL Somalian focus group.
- Vehicle travel reliability is the second priority for POEL Ethiopian group
- Freight and vehicle routes is the third priority for POEL youth group

When pairing above results with respondents' answers to question 1 (travel behavior), it is found that each survey group's improvement priority correspond to their travel behaviors, which reaffirms the accuracy of above survey findings.

In addition to emphasizing the needs for safety improvements, respondents also addressed their concerns related to car and bike parking,

green spaces, transit reliability, traffic volume in neighborhood corridors, and safety for commutes in their written comments⁷. Furthermore, comments suggested various improvements such as supplementing way-findings, expanding special transit services (for disabled persons and seniors), providing better bicycle parking, increasing lighting, building planted buffers, installing transit stop public restrooms, and incorporating bike rental stations.

Recommendations

- Prioritize improving bus services and installing more and better bus rider amenities
- Also prioritize creating separated and safe bicycle lanes
- Addresses transit reliability and bike/car biking concerns
- Pedestrian, biking, and transit improvements are higher priorities than vehicle and freight improvements.
- Consider the specific improvement measures mentioned in respondents' written comments.



⁷See detail comments in Table 4-6

ACCESSIBLE MT. BAKER

Types of Uses and Activities


Q6: What new uses or activities would you like to see in the area within walking distance of the light rail station? Please prioritize the following uses from 1 to 3¹ (with 1 being your highest priority).

¹Adjusted scale to enable better analysis, detail explanation can be found in Appendix I

²Two types of survey answer were collected: 1. Collective Rankings, and 2. Individualized ratings

³Percentage of people in each of the three groups who choose the option as their first priority, calculated using the individualized ratings for each answer option

⁴Refers to Chinese, Vietnamese, Filipino, and Cambodian multilingual survey groups



Neighborhood's ranking of all proposed types of uses and activities

Priority rankings for each survey group, organized by answer types²

	COLLECTIVE RANKINGS			PERCENTAGE OF SUPPORTS ³	
	Youth	POEL Ethiopian	POEL Somali-Youth	General Public/E and SE Asian ⁴ /Eritrean	
Social and health services	2nd	3rd	3rd	0% (Green), 0% (Orange), 50% (Blue)	50%
Youth activities	4th	7th	2nd	0% (Green), 0% (Orange), 50% (Blue)	50%
Training/education	7th	4th	5th	0% (Green), 0% (Orange), 50% (Blue)	50%
Market-rate housing	9th	9th	N/A ⁴	0% (Green), 0% (Orange), 50% (Blue)	50%
Active open spaces	6th	5th	1st	0% (Green), 0% (Orange), 50% (Blue)	50%
Job/employment	1st	2nd	4th	0% (Green), 0% (Orange), 50% (Blue)	50%
Living-wage housing	3rd	1st	6th	0% (Green), 0% (Orange), 54% (Blue)	54%
Arts/entertainment	8th	8th	7th	0% (Green), 0% (Orange), 51% (Blue)	51%
Retail/restaurant	5th	6th	N/A	0% (Green), 0% (Orange), 63% (Blue)	63%

● General public survey group, total of 263 respondents

● E and SE Asian survey group, total of 130 respondents

● POEL Eritrean survey group, total of 28 respondents



4. TYPE OF USES AND ACTIVITIES

Question 6 asked respondents to rate the activities that they would like to see the most in the Mt. Baker station area. From the results collected from the general survey group, E and SE Asian survey group, POEL Ethiopian, Somali, Eritrean and youth focus groups, it was found that uses with the highest support are:

1. Job / employment (190 respondents supported it to be the top three priority)
2. Living-wage housing (176 respondents supported it to be the top three priority)
3. Active open spaces (110 respondents supported it to be the top three priority)
4. Social and health services (103 respondents supported it to be the top three priority)

When the response from each survey group is weighted the same, the living-wage housing and job/employment receive equal priority scores, which mean that they are both very important to the survey respondents. However, when factor in the sample size of the survey groups, Job/employment has more number of supporters from the overall survey population. Similarly, active open spaces and social and health services

score equally but slightly less than the previous two. Nonetheless, active open spaces receive more support in number of respondents than the social and health services.

Types of uses prioritized by each survey group differ in the following ways:

- Living-wage housing is the first priority for POEL Eritrean and POEL Ethiopian focus groups
- Job and employment is the first priority for Youth and E and SE Asian survey groups
- Retail and restaurant is the first priority for the general public survey group
- Social and health services is within top three priorities for Youth, POEL Ethiopian and POEL Somalian Youth
- Active open spaces and youth activities are the top two priorities for POEL Somalian Youth
- Arts and entertainment is rated second most important for E and SE Asian and the general public

In addition to the above preferences, respondents' written comments⁸ also brought forward a few additional uses that they would like to see, such as mixed-use and high-density developments, coffee shop next to the Light Rail Station, parking garages for retail customers, and youth training and play centers. Needs were also elaborated on the existing answer options, including more purchasable living wage housing, safer and more welcoming open spaces, more diverse retail types, and better cross-community access.

Recommendations


- Actively support developments for living-wage housing, job/employment, social and health services and active open spaces
- Prioritize improving access to social services, public resources and the employment opportunities in the Mt. Baker neighborhood

⁸See detail comments in Table 7-8

ACCESSIBLE MT. BAKER

Type of Open Spaces

Q8: If open space is very important or important to you, what type of urban open spaces would you like to see more of? Please prioritize the following open spaces from 1 to 3¹ (with 1 being your highest priority).



Neighborhood's ranking of all proposed types of open spaces

Priority rankings for each survey group, organized by answer types²

	COLLECTIVE RANKINGS			PERCENTAGE OF SUPPORTS ³	
	Youth	POEL Ethiopian	POEL Somaliian-Youth	General Public/E and SE Asian ⁴ /Eritrean	
Plaza	1st	4th	2nd	0%	57%
Open green spaces	2nd	2nd	1st	0%	53%
Outdoor play spaces	3rd	1st	1st	0%	46%
Community gardens/farms	4th	3rd	2nd	0%	28%

¹Adjusted scale to enable better analysis, detail explanation can be found in Appendix I

²Two types of survey answer were collected: 1. Collective Rankings, and 2. Individualized ratings

³Percentage of people in each of the three groups who choose the option as their first priority, calculated using the individualized ratings for each answer option

⁴Refers to Chinese, Vietnamese, Filipino, and Cambodian multilingual survey groups

- General public survey group, total of 263 respondents
- E and SE Asian survey group, total of 130 respondents
- POEL Eritrean survey group, total of 28 respondents

5. TYPE OF OPEN SPACES

Question 8 is a continuation of question 7, which surveyed respondents' positions for the introduction of open spaces, defined as parks, green spaces or others. From its responses, it was found that all survey groups broadly support the introduction of open spaces; thus, question 8 is placed to ask the type of urban open spaces that respondents would like to see more of in the Mt. Baker station area. From the results collected from the general survey group, E and SE Asian survey group, POEL Ethiopian, Somali, Eritrean and youth focus groups, it is found that utmost supports across all survey groups are for:

- Plaza (that encourages retail activity and community gatherings)
- Open green spaces (with grass, trees, and benches)
- Outdoor play spaces (outdoor play spaces for residents and/or children)

Types of open spaces favored by each survey group are mostly similar among above three options; however, the POEL Ethiopian and Somalian youth would also like to see community gardens or farm in the neighborhood. Additional written comments⁹ suggested that some respondents would also want to have upscale shopping and restaurants, sport fields, covered recreation area, and dog parks. Many mentioned the desire for farmers market and outdoor concerts. Some also mentioned more green belts, buffers and landscape beautifier.



Recommendations

- The top three all rated highly, recommend implementing all three
- Incorporate mixed use plaza into transit design
- Incorporate outdoor play spaces into the central triangle
- Open green spaces linking the Olmstead Blvd and new protected walking and bicycle facilities
- Encourage and support activities, festivals, cultural events and retails
- Ensure open spaces are welcoming to a diverse population

⁹Detail comments can be found in Table 9-10


COMMUNITY COMMENTS

1. OVERVIEW

As of September 2015, a total of 317 written comments have been collected from the first project open house and the community survey responses. These comments include comments written on post-it notes at the open house stations, written comment cards, public comments or questions, and comments given in the survey responses. Based on the content of the comments collected, they are generally sorted into six major themes, walk, bike, transit, general traffic, land use, and others. The content of each comment was further analyzed and reworded

into recommendations. Comments with similar or repeating recommendations are sorted under the same sub-category. The detail lists of sorted comments can be found in Appendix 1.

The following section displays the sorted community recommendations by themes, which are interpreted and summarized from all 317 written comments. The top row shows the goals which the recommendations help achieve, and the right-most column shows project team's response to these community recommendations.



I. WALK

Goal 1 : Create a safe and pleasant walking environment around the Mt. Baker Station area			
Action Item	Location	Community Recommendation	Proposed Action
1.1 Improve lighting	Hanford Steps, Cheasty Blvd, 25th Ave S, Rainier/MLK	Improve lighting on the Hanford Steps, Cheasty Boulevard sidewalks, 25th Ave S, the walking area around the Mt. Baker Station, and the MLK/Rainier cross section.	The project team will recommend completing Hanford Steps from Cheasty to Morse street and include lighting. Additionally, the Neighborhood can request pedestrian lighting installment with fixture options to choose from along main business arterials from a Department of Neighborhoods (DON) and Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) operated pedestrian-scale lighting program
1.2 Walkway clearing	Hanford Steps, 25th Ave S, and Cheasty Blvd	Cut back excessive vegetation at Hanford Steps, 25th Ave S, and Cheasty Boulevard. Improve planting strip maintenance to make walk ways more visible.	The project team will submit maintenance request to the Urban Forestry group. The project team will also look for opportunities to work with the respective city departments to improve maintenance of street trees planted by the city along those streets. Additionally, neighborhood can report street tree overgrowth that forces pedestrians off the sidewalk into the street to the Department of Planning and Development for inspection and trimming.
1.3 Safety camera	Hanford Steps and Cheasty Blvd	Install safety cameras in the Hanford Steps area and along the Cheasty Boulevard S to monitor activities and collect behavior data to guide future safety improvements	The project team will consider the feasibility and the pedestrian benefits of installing safety cameras at the Hanford Steps and Cheasty Blvd. In the meanwhile, the project team will look for opportunity to collaborate with respective departments to help resolve the safety issues at various dangerous locations in the neighborhood.
1.4 Wider and safer sidewalks	Hanford Steps, Cheasty Blvd, 25th Ave S, Rainier, MLK	Widen sidewalks and provide adequate pedestrian-traffic separation on 25th Ave S, Cheasty Boulevard, Rainier Ave S, MLK S and the ladder streets between Rainier and MLK. Make width improvements to the stairs at Hanford Steps.	The Accessible Mt. Baker project is considering changing the current 6' sidewalk to 8' protected sidewalk on Rainier Ave. S, and to provide ample space for safe pedestrian movements and waiting. The project team will work with other SDOT staffs to look at the possibility of introducing similar sidewalk improvements on other roadways in the future.

1.5	Location Hanford Steps, Cheasty Blvd, 25th Ave S, McClellan	Community Recommendation Install better sidewalk and stairway pavements on Cheasty Blvd, Hanford Steps, 25th Ave S and McClellan	Proposed Action The project team will recommend completion of the Hanford Steps from Cheasty to Morse street with concrete pavement. Along with improvements to the Hanford steps, the project team will advocate for greenway improvements (consistent with the Bicycle Master Plan) between the Hanford steps and MLK Jr. Blvd to provide a paved surface and adequate lighting for pedestrians using the steps.
1.6	Location N/A	Community Recommendation Beautify sidewalks by growing and maintaining planting strips on both sides of the path.	Proposed Action The Accessible Mt. Baker project will likely include tree-lined streetscape into its conceptual design, along with improved and protected sidewalks. Many of these improvements will be realized with private development projects.
1.7	Location S Bayview St near 23rd Ave	Community Recommendation Construct a new sidewalk to replace the muddy path on S Bayview St as it crosses the 23rd Ave heading towards Rainier Ave S. Consider making it a sidewalk identical to the new one connected to it.	Proposed Action The project team will look for opportunity to include this section of the missing walkway for consideration by the ongoing pedestrian master plan update. The Accessible Mt. Baker project will also consider the feasibility of including related pedestrian improvements as part of the implementation plan.
Action Item			
Goal 2: Provide more pedestrian-friendly crossings with safety features at major intersections			
2.1	Location Major crossings	Community Recommendation Enforce pedestrian right of way at crossings by introducing features that will improve the priority to cross for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users.	Proposed Action The Accessible Mt. Baker project will likely include many features that will prioritize pedestrian uses at major crossings. These features include shorter crossing distances, direct and easy to navigate routes, less wait and fewer signal phases, improved and protected sidewalks, etc.
2.2	Location Rainier/MLK intersection	Community Recommendation Create an at-grade ADA crossing with enhanced pedestrian safety features to replace the function of the pedestrian bridge over at Rainier Ave S and MLK S intersection	Proposed Action The Accessible Mt. Baker project will likely change all crossings to at-grade ADA crossing to replace the non-ADA crossing function of the existing pedestrian bridge. Future design phases will consider if the bridge structure can be modified and retained meeting ADA requirements.
2.3	Location Rainier/MLK intersection	Community Recommendation Increase pedestrian signal time to cross and decrease the pedestrian crossing wait time at the Rainier Ave S and MLK S intersection	Proposed Action The Accessible Mt. Baker will likely include less waiting time with fewer signal phases in its project plan. Shorter crossing distance will also be included to provide more time for crossing.

	Location	Community Recommendation	Proposed Action
2.4 Shorten crossing distance	Rainier/MLK intersection	Shorten the crossing distances and crosswalk lengths at the Rainier Ave S and MLK S intersection	The Accessible Mt. Baker pedestrian improvement plan and concept will support shorter crossing distances.
2.5 More stop lights	High-traffic roadways	More stop lights on major road ways to slow down cars and create more opportunities for pedestrian crossing	The project design team will examine and evaluate the feasibility and pedestrian safety benefits of including two new signalized east-west street, including forest to MLK and the street through the current Lowe's site.
2.6 Crosswalk safety features	Crossings	Introduce more safety features at crosswalks such as the flashing LED lights, "Pedxing" caution signs for drivers, clearer and brighter crosswalk markings, tactile pavings, and audible pedestrian signals	The Accessible Mt. Baker will identify several crossing safety measures such as shorter crossing distance, wider crossing waiting spaces, and more consistent crossing signals. The project will continue looking for opportunity to add additional safety features such as flashing LED lights, pedestrian flags, pedestrian crossing caution signs, tactile paving, etc.
2.7 Pedestrian Islands	large crossings	Consider installing protected medians or crosswalk islands at complex and lengthy crossroads to enable slower pedestrians to cross the in two stages	The separation of Rainier and MLK proposed in the Accessible Mt. Baker plan will create an open space to assist pedestrian and bicycle crossing, by including and pedestrian and bicycle mixing or queuing area. The project design teams will continue to examine the need and evaluate the feasibility and pedestrian safety benefits of installing pedestrian islands at other major crossings.
2.8 Widening waiting spaces	crossing waiting spaces	Modify the design for pedestrian crossing waiting space to provide larger waiting spaces at the Rainier and MLK intersection.	The Accessible Mt. Baker project will incorporate wider waiting spaces in its design.
2.9 Pedestrian bridge design improvement	Pedestrian bridge at Rainier/MLK intersection	Rethink pedestrian bridge design to include a station mezzanine that connects the two stations directly with the bridge structure, and provide covered escalators and elevators to assist seniors and people with disabilities to get across between two locations.	The function of the pedestrian bridge will likely be replaced by at-grade safety-enhanced crossing to allow for better safety, more direct routes for all, and accessibility for people with disabilities. However, the project team will continue to examine the cost and benefits of keeping and improving the pedestrian bridge.

Goal 3: Pairing with the pedestrian safety improvements, create a people-oriented development pattern that enhances the community image, stimulates pedestrian activities, creates more job, and protects the natural environments.			
Action Item	Location	Community Recommendation	Proposed Action
3.1 Open Spaces	Mt. Baker station area	Create open spaces and plazas around the Mt. Baker light rail station area to allow for various uses such as community gatherings, farmers markets, youth activities, concerts, and sports. Ensure the design of these open spaces and plazas area inclusive of a diverse population, safe, and accessible by bike, walk, and transit.	The Accessible Mt. Baker project design will likely lead to a central public open space to connect transit with people, and enhance the Mt. Baker community interaction and identity. The project team will ensure that preferable uses suggested by the public will be accommodated in the open space designs.
3.2 Street-level retails	Mt. Baker station area	Community Recommendation In concert with the Mt. Baker Town center visions, encourage mixed use developments with diverse retail, businesses and centers at the street level at and around the Mt. Baker station area.	Proposed Action The Accessible Mt. Baker project will support the Mt. Baker Town Center vision. The project will develop streetscape concepts and will continue to work with neighborhood organizations and other departments to promote people-friendly developments and street-level activities around the station area.
3.3 Green Spaces	Mt Baker station area, Olmsted Blvd	Community Recommendation Improve upkeep of existing green spaces along the Olmsted Blvd, create more opportunities for new green spaces near the Mt. Baker station area, and install more planting strips along sidewalks in the neighborhood.	Proposed Action The Accessible Mt. Baker project recognizes that Olmsted Greenbelt and the Rainier street plants is important environmental asset to the neighborhood. The project will try to work with the Parks Department to preserve and enhance these existing spaces. Furthermore, the project will likely include a central community open/landscape space at the intersection area and further greenspace enhancement at the Mt. Baker Blvd. The project team will also continue to explore more opportunities for a greener Town Center.
3.4 Job and Employment	N/A	Community Recommendation Support the growth of equitable job and employment opportunities for a diverse population in the Mt. Baker neighborhood	Proposed Action The transportation related improvements identified in the Accessible Mt. Baker project will support the Mt. Baker Town Center vision and will likely help bring more businesses and jobs into the Mt. Baker neighborhood. Specific opportunities may include the redevelopment of the existing bus transit center and conversion of auto focused development to transit-oriented development.

II. BIKE

Goal 1: Create safe and well integrated biking facilities around the Mt. Baker station area, along the major arterials, and connecting the Olmsted boulevard			
Action Item	Location	Community Recommendation	Proposed Action
1.1A Protected Bike lanes	Rainier Ave and MLK S	Modify roadway designs on the Rainier Ave and MLK S to include protected bike lanes, signals for bikes, and other bicycle safety facilities.	The Bicycle Master Plan (BMP) has called to eliminate bicycle sharrow and provide more protected bike lanes throughout Seattle. As indicated in the Bicycle Master Plan, protected bike lanes will be developed on Rainier Ave S north of the MLK/Rainier intersection and all sections of the MLK. The Accessible Mt. Baker project will further exam the possibility of providing protected bike lanes on sections of the Rainier Ave that has not been identified in the BMP. The project team is also seeking other opportunities to provide better the safer connection for bikes throughout the neighborhood such as the Neighborhood Greenway program.
1.1B Shared bike lanes	Rainier Ave and MLK S	Do not modify roadway designs on to include protected bike lanes, instead sign and designate the Rainier Ave street lanes. It is believed by a commenter that separate bike lanes do not get bikers where they would like to go and can often causes more injuries when bikers trying to maneuver away from the separated bike lanes to try to get somewhere they want to go.	The Seattle Bicycle Master Plan has called to eliminate bicycle sharrow and provide more protected bike lanes throughout Seattle. The Accessible Mt. Baker project will focus on bringing protected bike lanes and bicycle greenways to strengthen the bicycle network of the neighborhood and its connection to other parts of Seattle.
1.2 Neighborhood Greenways	N/A	Implement the neighborhood Greenway program to provide more bicycle trails for cross-community access on off-arterial streets in the Mt. Baker neighborhood	The Rainier Valley NS Neighborhood Greenway is currently under refinement, which, when completed, will bring neighborhood greenway through the Mt Baker neighborhood and the Rainier valley. The Central Area Neighborhood Greenway has a planned greenway north of the Rainier and MLK intersection and south of I-90, and will be constructed during phase two of the project. The SRTS Greenway Spur includes a greenway connecting the station to the NS greenway.

1.3	Bicycle parking	Major destinations	Community Recommendation Install bicycle parking facilities such as open-air bike racks, covered parking booth, and bicycle parking garages at major destinations and transit centers in the Mt. Baker neighborhood.	Proposed Action The project is working with Sound Transit to possibly develop secure bike parking at the light rail station. SDOT will also look for opportunities to work with new developments to develop facilities that incorporate bicycle uses such as parking, shower facilities, bicycle valet, etc. The neighborhood can also request bicycle racks installation in the public right-of-way locations that are attractive for bicyclists without obstructing pedestrians.
1.4	Bicyclist-friendly amenities	Along bike routes	Community Recommendation Provide clear way-finding signs, restrooms, and water fountains along bike routes.	Proposed Action The project team will consider these amenities when developing the detail bike lane design. If budget allows, the project team will strive to provide better bicycle amenities while balancing other needs.
1.5	Bike sharing/rental	N/A	Community Recommendation Introduce bike rental programs and rental stations centered around the Mt. Baker light rail station and slowly extend the rental bike access throughout the neighborhoods	Proposed Action The Seattle Department of Transportation is working to expand Pronto bike share city wide, including the Mt. Baker neighborhood. Though this bike share expansion could be slow, it will focus on offering the opportunity to introduce bike share to low-income communities throughout the city, siting stations based on the community's need for low-cost active transportation modes. SDOT also hopes that Pronto pass holders will be able to access the system using their ORCA cards
1.6	One way cycle tracks	Rainier Ave and MLK S	Community Recommendation Use one-way cycle tracks if the protected bike lanes were to be built by major arterials. Two way bike lanes should be limited for extremely exceptional needs and for only short distances with clear speed limits.	Proposed Action The project team is refining the bike lane design so that it will provide the maximum safety while balancing other constraints.

III. TRANSIT

Goal 1: Reinforce the connectivity and accessibility of the multi-model transportation system and provide the neighborhood with convenient and attractive travel alternatives to the use of an automobile.		
Action Item	Location	Proposed Action
1.1 Stations connectivity	Mt. Baker station area	The Accessible Mt. Baker project plan will likely move the transit center closer to the light rail and repurposing the existing transit center block. The project team is currently in discussions with the Metro and the University of Washington about the proposed plan. The project will also include various improvements to make walking, biking, and busing between the transit stations safer, easier and more direct, and provide easier transfers and better visibility of facilities. Seattle is working towards converting the routes 7 and route 48 to RapidRide. SDOT will also work with Metro to consider circulator access to the station.
Goal 2: Continue to improve bus services and bus stop amenities, making transits more reliable, frequent, convenient and attractive to more riders.		
Action Item	Location	Proposed Action
1.1 Rapid rides	N/A	The City of Seattle and the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) is working to extend the RapidRide BRT network throughout various neighborhoods in Seattle, including conversion of the routes 7 and 48 to RapidRide in the Mt. Baker neighborhood.
1.2 Inclusive bus services	N/A	SDOT will continue to work with various transit agencies to promote better and more equitable transit services for all. SDOT will also work to incorporate transportation network companies such as taxis, Uber and Lyft into the plan.

1.3	Station amenities	N/A	Community Recommendation Upgrade the transit and light rail station amenities to include wayfinding signs, audible real-time transit information, active plazas, and public restrooms.	Proposed Action The Accessible Mt. Baker project will likely include more space for bus stop amenities in its design concept. The project team will work with the Sound Transit and the King County Metro to provide more and better station amenities in the Mt. Baker station area. Public restroom facilities will be considered within the context of open space and redevelopment concepts.
1.4	Retailers near the station	Mt. Baker station area	Community Recommendation Provide commercial outlets for small businesses and retailers to open next to the light rail station	Proposed Action The project will develop a design concept with small retail adjacent to the new transit center.
1.5	Ensure bus stop safety	Mt. Baker station area	Community Recommendation Ensure that newly located bus stops are sufficiently lighted and well-designed to create a sense of safety and comfort. Bus stop located in the dark and less visible areas often invite undesired activities.	Proposed Action The project will ensure that bus stops are sufficiently lighted and well-designed to create a sense of safety and comfort.
1.6	Impact evaluation	N/A	Community Recommendation Further evaluate the impact on existing parking, parking and natural landscape, as well as the potential air and noise pollution to nearby residential areas on S Winthrop St, 27th Ave S and S Forest St, where the proposed bus looping route is located.	Proposed Action The project team will further evaluate project's impact on existing parking, residents, natural environment on S Winthrop St, 27th Ave S and S Forest St, where the proposed bus looping route is located.

IV. TRAFFIC

Goal 1: Ease congestion and improve travel reliability for all modes of transportation			
Action Item	Location	Community Recommendation	Proposed Action
1.1 Slow down traffic	Rainier and MLK, McClellan	Slow down the general traffic on Rainier Ave S, MLK S, and the S McClellan St through speed limits reduction and traffic controls	Speed reductions will be considered in subsequent design phases. The current project plan will likely provide for calm and consistent traffic movements.
1.2 Eliminate free right turn	Rainier Ave S to MLK S	Community Recommendation Eliminate free right turns from Rainier Ave S to MLK S to provide more safety for the pedestrian and bicyclists	Proposed Action The Accessible Mt. Baker is working to complete the elimination of free right turns from Rainier Ave S to MLK S to allow for additional pedestrian curb space and shorter crossing distance.
1.3 Limit peak hour access	Rainier Ave S to MLK S	Community Recommendation Limit access for large commercial vehicles and trucks during traffic peak hours	Proposed Action Not consistent with city transportation policy. Portions of Rainier Ave. and MLK S are designated truck streets.
1.4 Evaluate traffic impact	N/A	Community Recommendation Evaluate the impact on general traffic travel times along major corridors and the impact on the rest of the neighborhood roadway network. Ensure that to move forward with the plan, enough analysis is done and enough justification is given	Proposed Action The project team will conduct evaluations to examine to project's impact on general traffic travel times along major corridors and the impact on the rest of the neighborhood roadway network.

V. TRANSPORTATION SUPPORTIVE LAND USES

Goal 1: Encourage a mix of use and activities that promote social equity and community interaction		
Action Item	Location	Proposed Action
1.1 Social programs	Mt Baker Station area	<p>Community Recommendation</p> <p>Provide training center, adult education center, youth activity centers, public library and affordable housing programs accessible using low-cost transportation for the low-income and multicultural communities.</p> <p>Proposed Action</p> <p>The project team will consider a joint-use development and social programming on the two parcels south of Art Space in conjunction with the transit center development.</p>
1.2 Town center vision	Mt Baker Station area	<p>Community Recommendation</p> <p>Support the town center vision and high capacity development around the Mt Baker station area.</p> <p>Proposed Action</p> <p>The goal of the Accessible Mt. Baker project is to establish the Mt. Baker station area as a neighborhood and regional destination. The project will help improve various aspects of the existing conditions of the neighborhood and make it more attractive to people and developments. The project; however, will not be reconsidering the 2014 rezone.</p>
1.3 Sound Transit Property	Mt Baker Station area	<p>Community Recommendation</p> <p>Free up the Sound Transit fenced property to allow more spaces for mix use developments</p> <p>Proposed Action</p> <p>The project team will continue to work with Sound Transit to remove fences and develop these properties.</p>
1.4 Open Public Spaces	Mt. Baker station area	<p>Community Recommendation</p> <p>Create open spaces and plazas around the Mt. Baker light rail station area to allow for various uses such as community gatherings, farmers markets, youth activities, concerts, and sports. Ensure the design of these open spaces and plazas area inclusive of a diverse population, safe, and accessible by bike, walk, and transit.</p> <p>Proposed Action</p> <p>A central public open space adjacent to the station is likely to be included the Accessible Mt. Baker project plan. The project team will ensure that preferable uses suggested by the public will be accommodated in the open space designs.</p>
1.5 Retain parking spaces	Mt Baker Station area	<p>Community Recommendation</p> <p>Accommodate for light rail and retail parking needs while ensuring that priority of the project remains as providing more alternative travel options to the Mt Baker neighborhood</p> <p>Proposed Action</p> <p>The project team will try to incorporate on-street parking on the new east-west streets and other streets as space allows.</p>

VI. OTHERS

Goal 1: Improve safety, infrastructure and employment around the Mt. Baker station area		
Action Item	Location	Proposed Action
1.1 Improve police services	N/A	Community Recommendation Faster police responses, more police presence at light rail station and under the pedestrian bridge, and a 911 foreign language calling system to serve the growing multicultural communities in the neighborhood.
1.2 Fix Drainage Issue	Location Around Art Space	Community Recommendation There has been a drainage issue at the east die of Rainier Between MLK Jr Way and Mt Baker Boulevard. Lack of drainage makes it impossible to ride bikes through the area.
1.3 More employment	Location N/A	Community Recommendation Bring real jobs to the Mt Baker area
		Proposed Action The project team will forward this request to the Seattle Police Department.
		Proposed Action The project team will forward this request to the Seattle Public Utilities. The project team will also explore other options of fixing drainage issues such as the use of permeable pavements within our capabilities.
		Proposed Action The Accessible Mt Baker project itself has a component of supporting Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) around the station area, which will likely increase the development and employment opportunities. The project team will also forward this request to Seattle Office of Economic Development and the Seattle Development and Planning Department.

Goal 2: Continue to improve the SDOT inclusive public outreach and engagement process			
Action Item	Location	Community Recommendation	Proposed Action
2.1 Stakeholders selection	N/A	Extend the current list of stakeholders to include communities and organizations that are from neighborhoods adjacent to the Mt. Baker neighborhood, who will also be effect by the project	The project team will continue its outreach efforts to those who might be affected by the project. An effort to outreach to near-by neighborhood stakeholders includes the Rainier Valley Public Meeting on July 30, 2015, where stakeholders of other neighboring projects such as NS Neighborhood Greenway and the Rainier Ave Safety Corridor were introduced to the Accessible Mt. Baker project and were invited to provide feedback. The project team will continue to collaborate with other neighboring projects to conduct wider-range, inter-neighborhoods outreach.
2.2 Informing the public	N/A	Provide timely updates and actively involve the public about all proposed ideas and plans	The project team will continue to provide project updates to the public and follow up with key stakeholders. A second public meeting will be hosted on November 12, 2015 to introduce project updates and solicit further community feedback.
2.3 Resident review board	N/A	Create a resident review board in collaboration with the project team to periodically review and evaluate the project plans and ensure that the project represent the need and desire of the neighborhoods.	The design review program is currently considering changes to the project review process. Refer to the link below for more information. http://seattledesignreview.publicmeeting.info/
2.4 Participant inclusion	N/A	Improve outreach and increase assistance to community members who has a barrier to participate	The project team will continue to work on enhancing inclusive outreach to underrepresented communities. Experiences and feedback on public outreach process will also be shared with other departmental staffs and project teams to help improve the city's inclusive outreach moving forward. The project team is also working directly with the Lighthouse for the Blind.

APPENDIX I. COMMENT TABLES

I. PEDESTRIAN RELATED COMMENTS

1. SAFETY FOR WALKING CONCERNS

Hanford Steps and Cheasty Boulevard is the primary pedestrian connector from NE Beacon hill to the MT. Baker station area but it is currently very unsafe.		
1.1A	OHC	This is a primary connector to the station from upper NE Beacon Hill.
1.1B	OHC	People have been mugged, even held up at gunpoint on the upper Harford steps. Safety concerns are keeping people from using these steps and walking along Cheasty.
1.2A	OHC	This whole neighborhood area is concerned about safety/access to Mt. Baker Station (through Hanford Steps). We are using/ walking an extra 20 minutes to Beacon Station to feel more safe. Currently it is unsafe to walk to Mt. Baker Station (From NE Beacon Hill).
1.3	OHC	Between Walden and MLK Crossing (East/West), connection from Cheasty Boulevard to MLK is a narrow residential street that may need revisiting
1.3A	MIC	Current conditions on Hanford Steps, Cheasty Blvd, 25th Ave S and McClellan include lack of pedestrian-safe paved sidewalks, inadequate separation from traffic, lack of marked cross-walks, poor lighting, vegetation overgrowth, and lack of maintenance.
1.4A	GS	Improve safety access from North Beacon Hill neighborhood to Mt. Baker Light Rail station
Dangerous sidewalks for pedestrian		
<i>Location 1: West side of the Rainier Ave between MLK/Rainier and Forest/Rainier intersection</i>		
1.5	OHC	Half the side walk is a curb cut and the fence forces you towards Rainier danger.
<i>Location 2: Along Rainier Ave S and MLK S</i>		
1.6A	OHC	Rainier and MLK all the way to I-90 is a very unsafe commute for bikes and impossible for pedestrians. Underutilized row!
<i>Dangerous crowding on narrow sidewalks (general comment, no location indicated)</i>		
1.7	OHC	Kids are crowded on narrow sidewalk by track. Splashed in the rain!
1.8	GS	More safety for teens where there is a lot of street activity near Franklin
1.9	POEL(2)	Youth who goes to Franklin High school mentioned that the sidewalks are narrow for many students after school dismissal
Disconnected pedestrian pathways near Bayview St and 23rd Ave intersection		
1.10	OHC	Between Bayview and 23rd, new sidewalks empty into muddy path, the path is heavily traveled.

Key

OHC – March 2015 Open House comments
 OHC2 – Nov 2015 Open House comment
 GS – general survey comments
 MCS – Multicultural survey comments
 POEL(1) – Ethiopian POEL survey comments

POEL(2) – Somalian POEL survey comments
 POEL(3) – Eritrean POEL survey comments
 POEL(4) – Youth POEL survey comments
 MIC – Others, including email, phone call, and in person conversation

IDEAS

Improve pedestrian safety by providing better pathway lighting and cutting back excessive vegetation by the walk ways.		
<i>Location 1: Hanford Steps area, including Cheasty Boulevard S and 25th Ave. S</i>		
1.1C	OHC	Need improved lighting and additional clearing along the sides of the steps.
1.11	OHC	Show stairway at Hanford
1.12	GS	Maintain green belts with trails
1.13A	OHC	Get rid of trees at top of stairs. Make the full stair path open and safe feeling.
1.4B	GS	Improved lighting, cut back vegetation & trees at Hanford Steps
1.4C	GS	Install more lighting and cutback vegetation/trees on 25th Ave S between Hanford & McClellan, and Cheasty Blvd between Hanford Stairs& Light Rail Station.
1.14	GS	Better safety, lights particularly on the Hanford Steps.
1.2B	OHC	All of Hanford Steps and Cheasty Boulevard needs improved safety, lighting and access for pedestrians/commuters.
1.2C	OHC	Provide better lighting (motion censored) and Maintain the bush/green belt at the Hanford Steps area
1.15A	OHC	Lighting for pedestrians on Cheasty Blvd. S
<i>Location 2: Mt Baker Station area, including the Rainier/MLK intersection</i>		
1.16	OHC	More lighting at Mt Baker Station and walking areas near/around it.
1.17	OHC	Need lighting from LRT out to neighborhood.
1.18A	GS	Increased lighting at the Rainier/MLK intersection
<i>Location 3: Along Rainier Ave. S</i>		
1.19	OHC	Light Rainier for pedestrians
<i>Other general comments (no location indicated)</i>		
1.20	OHC	Pedestrian paths lighted and clearly visible.
1.201	OHC2	Continue to make sure lighting is always available in order to make a safer community
Improve pedestrian safety by installing security cameras at Hanford Steps and Cheasty Boulevard S		
1.2D	OHC	Video/safety cameras in Hanford Steps area
1.15B	OHC	Safety cameras Cheasty Blvd. S
Improve pedestrian safety by making sidewalk wider, greener and better paved		
<i>Location 1: Hanford Steps area, including Cheasty Boulevard S and 25th Ave. S</i>		
1.4D	GS	Widen sidewalks on 25th Ave S between Hanford & McClellan
1.4E	GS	Install a paved sidewalk on Cheasty Blvd between Hanford Stairs & Light Rail station
1.18D	OHC	Install walkable path in Hanford Steps area
1.13B	OHC	Widen stairs or make all foliage at stairs low
<i>Location 2: On Roadways that connects to the I-90</i>		
1.6B	OHC	Looking forward to having sidewalks all the way to 1-90 trails
<i>Location 3: Along Rainier Ave. S and MLK S</i>		
1.21	OHC	Make sure that both Rainier and MLK, and the streets between them have wide sidewalks

<i>Other general comments (no location indicated)</i>		
1.22	GS	Greener and wider sidewalks
1.23	GS	More trees on the sidewalk please
1.24	GS	More green big sidewalks
1.25	OHC	Like the idea of increasing sidewalk width in the Phase 1 short-term projects
1.26	GS	Improved green street ways with street trees along roads to encourage walking

2. SAFETY AT CROSSING CONCERNS

MLK S/Rainier Ave S Intersection		
<i>Issue 1: Long pedestrian signal waiting time</i>		
1.27A	GS	The traffic light on Rainier Ave. between transit center and the light rail is very long and you can be standing and waiting for it to change while your bus arrives across the street and departs.
<i>Issue 2: Long crossing distance leads to illegal crossing</i>		
1.28	OHC	Long distances between intersections like this one need to be addressed. Otherwise people will continue to be forced to jaywalk.
<i>Issue 3: Starbucks being across the street from transit stop and the light rail station leads to illegal crossing.</i>		
1.29	GS	Many people cross the Rainier Ave. illegally between the transit stop for south bound busses and Starbucks
<i>Issue 4: The current pedestrian bridge is unsafe, inconvenient, and inaccessible to seniors and people with disabilities, forcing many to make illegal crossings.</i>		
1.30	OHC	I am wary of a pedestrian light to cross Rainier and MLK but prefer this over the daily criminal activity seen hanging out under the pedestrian overpass.
1.31A	GS	The pedestrian bridge is impossible to cross on a bike or in a wheelchair.
1.32A	POEL(2)	Many people jaywalk under the bridge instead of crossing over the bridge because it is easier and more efficient.
<i>Issue 5: Queuing area is currently too narrow to accommodate for high pedestrian volume from the Franklin High school</i>		
1.9	POEL(2)	The youth who go to Franklin High School mentioned that once school is over, there are too many students crossing the streets, and the crosswalk is too narrow for them.
<i>Other crossing safety statements</i>		
1.33	GS	MLK & Rainier intersection needs desperately fixed. It is a serious hazard.
1.34	GS	Thousands of teenagers cross the Rainier and MLK daily, safety at crossing is very important
23 Ave S/Rainier Ave S intersection is also very dangerous for pedestrians		
1.35	OHC	23rd and Rainier is like a miniature MLK and Rainier, need better pedestrian crossing.
1.36	OHC	A pedestrian's worst nightmare is crossing Rainier especially at 23rd.
Other safety at crossing concerns (no location indicated)		
1.37A	GS	Many intersections are pedestrian-unfriendly and could use revamping.
1.38	POEL(2)	There's overcrowding when people are crossing the street.

IDEAS

Enforce pedestrian Right of Way at crossing		
1.39A	GS	Improve priority to cross
1.40	GS	Enforce the pedestrian right of way at crossings
1.37B	GS	Change crosswalks to cater to pedestrians
1.41	GS	Enforce the pedestrian right of way at crossings
Install at-grade crossing at Rainier and MLK intersection		
1.42A	OHC	Yes to at-grade crossing.
1.31B	GS	Create an at-grade ADA crossing to replace the pedestrian bridge
1.32B	POEL(2)	There should be a crosswalk under the bridge
1.43	OHC	Very much value the idea of on at grade crossing at Mt. Baker Boulevard.
Provide longer pedestrian crossing time		
1.44	OHC	More pedestrian time on signals
1.39B	GS	Improve time to cross
More stop lights and signals for cars to allow for more pedestrian safe crossing points		
1.45	OHC	More stop lights for safety
1.39C	GS	Pedestrians pushing the button to notify the traffic signal system at all crossing points
1.46A	GS	Flashing LED lights across the two crosswalks
Better signage and markings that enhance pedestrian safety at crossings		
1.46B	GS	Better signage to look for pedestrians for drivers marking right turns
1.47	POEL(1)	Make crosswalk markings more visible
1.48	GS	Need better maintained crosswalk markings
Provide audible signals at crossings		
1.481	MIC	Don't lose audible pedestrian signals as intersections are upgraded and moved to a non-push button configuration.
1.482	MIC	Include emergency vehicle notification in audible pedestrian signals
Use protected medians to provide crossing in two phrases		
1.49	GS	Need safe protected medians so slower people can cross in two stages

OTHER SUGGESTED CROSSING ALTERNATIVES

Improved pedestrian bridge		
<i>1. Create a pedestrian bridge that directly connects the transit center to the light rail station</i>		
1.50	OHC	Create station mezzanine with pedestrian bridge between the Light rail station and the Transit Center using ST3 funds
1.27B	GS	Pedestrian sky bridge from Mount Baker light rail station across Rainier to bus stop area
1.51	GS	I would like to see a large (like a block long) pedestrian overpass/promenade connecting the transit center and Mt. Baker rail station
<i>2. Install covered escalators and elevators on the pedestrian bridge to assist people going up/down the bridge</i>		
1.52	OHC	Overpass for pedestrians with covered escalators and elevators from Forest & Rainier to the transit center
<i>3. Use pedestrian bridge to separate pedestrian crossings from heavy auto traffic</i>		
1.53	GS	Provide over crossing where traffic levels are high on Rainier
1.54	MCS	Bridges: separate pedestrians from vehicles
1.55	GS	Move Rainier& MLK intersection underground or build infrastructure above
All way crossing		
1.42B	OHC	All way stop at MT Baker Blvd junction with MLK and Rainier

3. PEDESTRIAN-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENTS

IDEAS

Increase street-level activities and businesses		
1.56	GS	Active street level activity with planted buffers between travel lanes and street
1.57	GS	Make this a more walkable area to encourage upscale restaurants and upscale shops
1.58	GS	More and varied retail opportunities at street level (more activity)
Support people-oriented instead of car-oriented developments		
1.59	GS	Neighborhood needs to promote pedestrian oriented development
1.60	GS	A transition from the current car-oriented land use to pedestrian oriented should be the top priority
1.61	GS	Making Mt. Baker a people-oriented environment versus the current car-oriented environment.
1.62	GS	Cars should not be the priority in a location that is major transit hub in Seattle.

II. BIKING RELATED COMMENTS

CONCERNS

Many places in the Mt. Baker Neighborhood are currently unsafe for bike travels.		
<i>Location 1: South end of MLK and Rainier intersection</i>		
2.1A	OHC	South end of MLK and Rainier intersection is a really dangerous pinch- point for bikes.
<i>Location 2: On Roadways that connects to the I-90</i>		
2.2A	OHC	All the way to I-90 is a very unsafe commute for bikes. ROW is currently underutilized.
Teenagers don't ride bikes to school because it is currently too dangerous		
2.3	POEL(2)	It is not a good area to ride bikes for us youth; some of us don't even bother to ride our bikes to school.
Proposed bike route to Beacon hill is a very steep hill		
2.4	OHC	Proposed bike route to Beacon hill is a very steep hill for a bike lane
QUESTIONS		
2.1B	OHC	Could the biking improvement on the South end of MLK and Rainier intersection be addressed earlier rather than later for Phase 1?
2.5	OHC	What is the timeframe for widening sidewalks or bike lanes?

IDEAS

Provide separated and protected bike lanes		
<i>Location 1: On Roadways that connects to the I-90</i>		
2.2B	OHC	Bike lanes all the way to I-90 trail
<i>Location 2: Along Both Rainier Ave. S and MLK S</i>		
2.6	OHC	Love the protected bike lanes on Rainier and MLK
2.7A	OHC	Please make sure that both Rainier and MLK include protected bike lanes
<i>Location 3: Along Rainier Ave. S</i>		
2.8	GS	Provide bicycle lanes parallel to and across Rainier Ave.
<i>Location 4: between Mt. Baker and Judkins Park light rail</i>		
2.7B	OHC	Include safe biking facilities between Mt. Baker and Judkins Park light rail
<i>Other general comments (no location indicated)</i>		
2.9	OHC	Making bike lanes safe and accessible are a top priority
2.10	GS	Keeping bike lanes off street and restricted to bike paths to ensure the safety of bikers
Provided painted on-street bike lanes instead of off street bike lanes		
<i>Location: Along Rainier Ave. S</i>		
2.11	GS	Sign and designate the Rainier Ave street lanes for bike use, but do not separate bike and auto traffic
<i>Other general comments (no location indicated)</i>		
2.12	GS	No separated bikeways. Separated bike lanes are not safer and they don't get you to where you want to go. Data shows that bike accidents are at least one and half times more likely on separated bike lanes, and bike accidents on sidewalks are 16 times more likely.

More bicycle greenways		
2.13	GS	More bicycle trails for cross-community access
2.14	GS	Move bikes off major arterials, and create more greenways.
Install more and better bike parking facilities		
<i>Location 1: Mt. Baker light rail station</i>		
2.15	GS	Better bicycle parking, especially at the station
2.16	GS	More bike rack at the Mt. Baker light rail station and surrounding area along pedestrian corridors
<i>Other general comment (no location indicated)</i>		
2.17	GS	Build more bike racks that fit all bikes like the SDOT inverted U rack
Install bike rental stations		
2.18	MCS	Bike rental Stations
Do not bulb the sidewalk at intersections		
2.19	GS	Do not bulb the sidewalk at intersections, that forces bike riders to abruptly enter traffic with insufficient space to accelerate before merging with traffic.
Do not use two way cycle tracks		
2.20	OHC	Do not use two way cycle tracks
2.201A	MIC	Many various speeds and abilities- folks need to be able to see and pass. But two way bike lanes are too dangerous narrow. Often time, bikers might end up in the other lane to oncoming traffic.
2.201B	MIC	The use of two way bike lanes should be limited for extremely exceptional needs and for only short distances with clear speed limits.
More biker-friendly amenities for bicyclists		
2.21	MIC	Add way-finding for cyclists. Bikers can't just stop at every intersection to navigate the routes when the area is unfamiliar to them, they will need help just as drivers
2.22	MIC	Bikers also need restrooms, water fountains, and locking bike racks

III. TRANSIT RELATED COMMENTS

1. MULTI-MODEL TRANSIT CONNECTIVITY AND ACCESSIBILITY CONCERNS

Transit center and the light rail station are currently disconnected		
3.1A	GS	Separation of the transit center from Light rail makes it impossible for the elderly, disabled, and youth to travel through this area with able-bodied assistance.
3.2A	GS	There has to be a way to better connect buses to light rail, because right now it is ugly.
3.3	OHC	Connections between transit must be easy, safe, and intuitive
Potential bus stop security associated with bus stop and bus looping route relocation		
3.31	OHC2	Vagrants often linger late at night at the bus station. As bus stop is planned to be relocated closer to Cheasty, the darker and less visible environment there will potentially worsen the sense of safety around bus stops.
QUESTIONS		
3.4	OHC	What will it take to relocate the transit center from mid-block to west of Mt. Baker Station?
3.2B	GS	Can SDOT work with UW laundry to provide bus service through the west side of light rail or move SB stops to right at the station on Rainier, just past Rainier on MLK, and NB stops give transit priority to loop back on Winthrop/27th/Forest?

IDEAS

Move transit stations next to the Link light rail station		
3.1B	GS	The light rail and bus station should be integrated
3.5	OHC	Move bus station to same side of the light rail station
3.6	OHC	Relocate the bus depot on the other side of Rainier, next to the light rail station
3.7	OHC	Swap transit center with Rainier Ave. between Forest Street and MLK to create transit only segment of Rainier.
Improve neighborhood-wide connection to the transit and light rail station through street reconnection, pedestrian crossing improvement, and neighborhood circulator		
<i>Street reconnection</i>		
3.1B	GS	Cheasty Boulevard should connect directly to Mt. Baker Boulevard.
<i>Pedestrian crossings improvement</i>		
3.8	GS	Connect the overpass that crosses Rainier and MLK to the light rail platform.
3.9	OHC	More direct access to/from pedestrian bridge at light rail station and transit station at Rainier/Mt. Baker avenue.
<i>Neighborhood circulator</i>		
3.10	GS	Jitney style buses that will transport people from east and west of neighborhood to various stops on the Rainier Avenue (near to the transit center and the light rail).
Install more and better way finding facilities to help passengers maneuver between different modes of transit		
3.11	POEL(1)	Way finding signs should be posted to easily find direction of bus and light rail station.

2. BUS SERVICES AND BUS STOP AMENITIES

IDEAS

Bring faster and more frequent bus services through the neighborhood		
<i>Bring back 7x or a BRT on Rainier.</i>		
3.12	OHC	Bring back the 7 and or BRT for Rainier Ave.
3.13	OHC	Metro should bring back the 7x or give us a BRT for Rainier
<i>Other general comments</i>		
3.14	OHC	Need faster bus to downtown
3.15	OHC	Make high-frequency bus routes work with the proposed concept.
Provide buses that will serve a wider range of people and needs		
<i>Buses that better serve people with disability and seniors</i>		
3.16	POEL(1)	More transit buses should be available for people with disability and seniors
<i>More bus services that operates at night</i>		
3.17	GS	More buses later at night
<i>Buses that serve larger area of the neighborhood</i>		
3.10	GS	Jitney style buses that will transport people from east and west of neighborhood to various stops on the rainier avenue (near to the transit center and the light rail).
Upgrade station amenities		
<i>Way finding signs</i>		
3.11	POEL(1)	Way finding signs should be posted to easily find direction of bus and light rail station
<i>Public restrooms</i>		
3.12	MCS	Public restroom next to the bus stop
<i>Provide audible bus information at stations</i>		
1.483	MIC	Include audible real-time bus information at stations in the vicinity of the Mt. Baker Station and the Lighthouse for the Blind office

3. BUS TRAVEL LANES AND LAYOVER

IDEAS

Opposition to the bus looping through S Winthrop St, 27th Ave. S and S Forest St		
<i>Reason 1: Such looping will take away important parking spaces for the Mt. Baker lofts residents</i>		
3.13	OHC	Forest St. and Rainier –no bus turns around here. Forest Street is the only parking Mt. Baker lofts residents can safely access, especially at late night
<i>Reason 2: The proposed bus looping is next to a residential area</i>		
3.14	OHC	No transit turns around on 27th , this is directly 20-30 yards away from major residence. Please find another looping location.
7.48	OHC2	We are concerned about having the buses circle our building [Artspace building]. We have a lot of air and sound pollution to deal with already.
<i>Reason 3: Winthrop/Cheasty is a protected Olmsted-Landmark</i>		
3.15	GS	Please do not re-route transit buses to the Olmsted-Landmark protected Winthrop/Cheasty Blvd. Neighbors convened to support the location of transit off this blvd 15 years ago.
Supporting the new bus travel/looping routes		
3.16	OHC	Like the change of Transit features and new turning lanes on MLK
3.17	OHC	Hope the UW and Seattle Schools play ball and can give/sell corners to the ROW and transit improvements

IV. OPEN SPACES AND GREEN SPACES RELATED COMMENTS

1. OPEN SPACES

IDEAS

Create a plaza at the light rail station that hosts various events and activities		
4.1	OHC	Underneath Light Rail station -- There is a great opportunity to extend public plaza space under Mt. Baker Station into this area and create a secondary pedestrian/green street and farmer’s market space.
4.2	GS	A programmable pedestrian plaza associated with the light rail station would be ideal. By programmable, I mean there will be an entity that not only maintains the plaza and gives permits, but has a budget to organize events, activities, parties, bands, etc.
Create spaces for markets, movies/concerts, amateur sports events and youth activities		
<i>1. Spaces for movies/concerts</i>		
4.3	GS	Amphitheater for outdoor movies and concerts.
<i>2. Spaces for markets and businesses</i>		
4.4	GS	Create area for open air market for local farmers.
<i>3. Spaces for amateur sports playing and events</i>		
4.5	GS	Baseball parks and soccer fields with bleachers and restrooms, space and hook ups for food vendors and field lights for spectators to attend “semipro” and amateur team sports both day and night
4.6	POEL[2]	Basketball court
<i>4. Spaces for youth activities</i>		
4.7	GS	Outdoor play spaces that allow children to get off the streets to run in the woods, bicycle, explore, and learn.

4.8	POEL(1)	More spaces for youth training activities
4.9	POEL(1)	More youth friendly play centers
Design of open spaces must foster proper uses and good safety		
4.10	GS	Ensure that the design of the open spaces does not encourage loitering and drinking
4.11	GS	Open spaces needs to be designed to be used and be safe.
4.12	GS	Make sure that urban open spaces is separated from car and freight traffic
4.13	OHC	Make sure open/green spaces landscaping create more visibility and will help decrease criminal activities
Ensure open spaces can be reached by walking, biking and transit		
4.14	GS	Make sure all of the open spaces are easy to reach by walking, biking or transit from places where people live, work and go to school

2. GREEN SPACES CONCERNS

Cheasty Green Spaces is currently underutilized and repellent		
4.15A	GS	Cheasty Green Space adjacent to the light rail station is underutilized and not an inviting space at present.
South side of McClellan planting strip is currently poorly maintained		
4.16A	GS	It is currently just grass and poorly maintained.
There are many littering and trash problems in the neighborhood		
4.17	OHC	The neighborhood (location not specified) has chronic trash problems

IDEAS

Beautify the Mt. Baker Station area and its surrounding pedestrian corridors		
4.18	GS	Beautification of the Mt Baker Station and surrounding area along pedestrian corridors (trees, planting, art, benches and etc)
Improve Cheasty Blvd greenspace upkeeps and make it attractive to visitors		
4.15B	GS	Paved sidewalks and improved lighting would make Cheasty Blvd Greenspace more visible and attractive to visitors.
Restore Cheasty blvd to natural area that support wildlife		
4.19	GS	Restore cheasty blvd and greenspace to a natural area with habitat for wildlife
Improve the planting strip at the south side of McClellan		
4.16B	GS	Bring landscape improvements along the south side of McClellan in the planting strip
Create new gardens and green spaces in the neighborhood		
4.20	OHC	New garden
4.21	GS	Non-commercial enjoyment of our currently inaccessible greenspaces
Plant more trees by the sidewalks		
4.22	GS, OHC	More trees, it encourage me to walk more

V. GENERAL TRAFFIC RELATED COMMENTS

CONCERNS

The current car-oriented nature of Mt. Baker hindered human-oriented developments and created air pollution		
5.1A	GS	The place is currently moving large number of cars through at the expense of people using the space as human beings
5.2A	GS	Pollution is so bad
The project may cause backups in neighborhood roads		
5.3A	GS	Vehicles avoiding Rainier and MLK will choose to go north 34th and then west on Lander as they head to 31st to go North, causing backups on McClellan and 34th.
5.4	OHC	Much traffic will go up McClellan and along 38th, through Mt. Baker Boulevard on 33rd. More traffic will also drop down to Lake Washington Boulevard, where it very much adversely affects pedestrian and traffic there.
5.5A	OHC	Consider decision of traffic to Lake Washington Boulevard and Hunter/38th to Genesee. Design needs to go beyond "town center" to incorporate impacts as Rainier MLK proceeds to 90
5.51A	MIC	I worry that once evening commuters headed Southeast from downtown on Rainier are required to make a left turn in the project area, many will choose to come all the way east through the neighborhood rather than using S Genesee and East-West arterials further to the South.
5.51B	MIC	Project might divert traffic onto neighborhood arterials including 31st Ave S, 38th Ave S, and Lake Washington Boulevard through the existing Mt Baker neighborhood.
The project may reduce traffic capacity on Rainier and MLK and cause more congestion		
5.6A	GS	Rainier and MLK does not only serve the people in the neighborhood, but also serves as a major road way for people who cannot use transit to get where they need to go, especially when it involves more than one destination in a limited amount of time.
QUESTIONS		
5.5B	OHC	Are we weighting for actual uses in the project improvement goals, for example, there are more general traffic than ped/bike in this neighborhood?
5.3B	GS	How are you going to address the backups on McClellan and 34th?

IDEAS

Improve or at least maintain current traffic flow		
5.7	GS	Project should lead to better traffic flow, not just narrower streets
5.6B	GS	Whatever is done also needs to maintain vehicle traffic flows
Reduce cars on Rainier Ave S and MLK S		
5.1B	GS	You have to reduce the number of cars traveling through Rainier and MLK to make any kind of impact on walkability
Impose limited access for commercial vehicles to ease congestion		
5.8	POEL(1)	Limit access for big commercial vehicles & trucks during traffic prime time

Slow down traffic		
<i>1. Enforce 35 mph speed limit</i>		
5.9	GS	Strictly enforce 35 mph speed limit on Rainier Ave.
5.10	GS	The lowest accident rate for bicycles are on streets with speed limits of 35mph or lower that are signed as bike routes.
<i>2. Slow down traffic on McClellan</i>		
5.11	OHC	Slow traffic down on McClellan from Beacon Hill
<i>3. Slowing down traffic will reduce pollution</i>		
5.2B	GS	It helps to slow the cars, the pollution in the neighborhood is currently very bad
Opposition to slowing down traffic		
5.12	GS	Slowing traffic will make it more difficult to maneuver when emergency vehicle are passing. This is extremely dangerous and should be avoided.
The project should make roads more accessible and safe		
5.13	OHC	We should make sure our roads are more accessible and safe for our Mt. Baker area
Support eliminating free right turn from Rainier to MLK		
5.14	OHC	Number one priority in the short term is to eliminate free right turn from Rainier to MLK
5.414	MIC	Eliminate right turn on red, and install delayed right turn lights. Pedestrians should get to walk across first before the light turns green for folks to turn right.
Support the proposed ladder street pattern		
5.15	OHC	Idea of filtering thru the grid is very strong and resilient. Thank you.
5.16	OHC	Emphasis on “filtering” thru side streets is brilliant.
Opposition to reducing the number of general propose traffic lanes		
5.17	GS	Do not reduce the number of lanes.
5.18	GS	Narrowing lanes should not be an option

VI. TRANSPORTATION SUPPORTIVE LAND USE (TYPE OF USE) RELATED COMMENTS

IDEAS

More commercial uses		
More businesses, retails, apartments and restaurants		
6.1	OHC	More businesses and homes near the Station
<i>1. More retail and restaurants</i>		
6.2	GS	neighborhood retail
6.3	GS	I would like to see more businesses in the area
6.4	GS	Even more restaurants
6.5	GS	Upscale restaurants and shops
<i>2. Have major retailers in the neighborhood</i>		
6.6	GS	Keep our current grocery store (QFC)
6.7	GS	Major retailers: Whole foods, trader joes, total wine, panera bread
<i>3. Coffee shop on the same side as the light rail station</i>		
6.8	GS	Coffee Shop on the same side of MLK/Rainier as the LR Station
<i>4. New apartments</i>		
6.9	OHC	New Apartment
More street-facing retails enhanced by neighborhood's walkability improvements		
6.10	OHC	Get rid of parking lots and encourage the development of street-facing retail.
6.5	GS	Make this a more walkable area to encourage upscale restaurants and upscale shops
More social programs and public facilities		
Accessible youth activity center and community gathering space		
6.11	GS	Playgrounds, youth activities belong in the neighborhoods served by pedestrian trips and buses.
6.12A	OHC	Community gathering public space around the King County CSO
Affordable and living wage housings		
6.13	GS	Living wage housing should be affordable homes for purchase not rentals
6.14	OHC	We should keep the low income housing here affordable for the disabled and scholars.
More school or training center for the disadvantaged		
6.15	OHC	More schools for low income, disabled, and adults and children with special needs.
Public library across from the high school		
6.16	OHC	Public library needed across from high school with open space
Enhances the Mt Baker Town Center vision and high capacity development		
Ensure project improvements coincide with the vision for Mt. Baker town center		
6.12B	OHC	Make the Mt. Baker station area a village center with public spaces
6.18	OHC	Very excited about all the improvements and the potential town center development.
6.19	GS	Ensure whatever changes are made coincide with the long term ideas and planning efforts for the Mt. Baker town center.

More high capacity development		
6.20	GS	More mixed-use and high-density development
6.21	GS	Put a maximum density on neighborhoods
Create open spaces for businesses, recreational activities and events		
For businesses and events		
6.22	GS	Open air market space for local farmers
6.23	GS	Open space for community events, farmer market, food truck
For recreational activities and community gathering		
6.24	GS	Parks
6.25	GS	Gathering Places for the community
Allow for parking spaces		
For light rail users		
6.26	GS	Need parking for light rail users
6.27	GS	Build a multi-story parking structure next to the Light Rail station where the current parking lot exists, and remove on street parking to reclaim land for ped/bike/transit
6.28A	GS	Parking garage for light rail
For retail customers		
6.28B	GS	Parking for retail customers
Other general comments		
6.29	OHC	Free up ST's fenced off yards, do something about the ST properties.
Redevelop Lowes, the gas station, and the transit center		
6.30	OHC	Encourage redevelopment of Lowes, gas stations and transit center
Other desired types of land use		
6.31	GS	golf course, covered recreation area, marijuana dispensary

VII. OTHER COMMENTS

1. CRIME/SAFETY CONCERNS

Many people feel unsafe in the neighborhood because of periodic presence of criminal activities and drugs		
7.1A	GS	I don't feel safe getting off the train at the Mt. Baker light rail station and walk home alone
7.2	POEL(2)	the area is not safe for many people, changes to make it safer is desired
7.3	POEL(2)	one of the youth said that if he can avoid that area, he would due to safety concerns
7.4	GS	People don't walk around because they are in fear of being mugged or stepping on a needle.
7.5A	GS	There are 30 some homeless/drug addict around the bus stop on MLK where children from Franklin catch the bus.
7.6	GS	Certain areas of Mount Baker--specifically the MLK/Rainier intersection--attract shady people. It feels unsafe walking there at night.
7.7	POEL(2)	Youth most of the time echoed that the new changes to the area should prioritize on making the area safer.

IDEAS

More law enforcement presences around the Mt. Baker Station area		
7.1B	GS	Need safety officers by light rail.
7.5A	GS	There should be some police actions regarding the 30 some homeless/drug addicts at the bus stop.
7.8	GS	More police patrols in the area to change perception that it is unsafe to walk around. Foot and bike patrols would be great.
7.9	GS	More Security or Police - less hostility / aggressive pan handling from drug users
7.10A	GS	Higher law enforcement presence
Faster police responses		
7.10B	GS	Faster police response
Introduce multilingual 911 calling system for the growing non-English speakers in the neighborhood		
7.11	POEL(1)	911 Amharic calling system should be available for growing Amharic speaking community

2. FUNDING/PROJECT DELIVERY

CONCERNS

People fear that the project will not have enough funding to be implemented		
7.12	OHC	Tired of talking about a project when there is no money.
7.13	OHC	It is not responsible to keep bringing up projects when there is no funding; the community has been waiting 15 years already.
7.14A	OHC	The Mt. Baker neighborhood has been studied for too long.
QUESTIONS		
7.14B	OHC	Is there funding for this project?
7.14C	OHC	Is this part of the levy?
7.15	OHC	Where do patrons of Art Space park?

3. GENERAL REACTIONS TO THE PROJECT

Positive reaction: Supportive of the project idea		
<i>General supportive statements</i>		
7.16A	OHC	This is a really exciting, bold plan. Thank you!
7.16B	OHC	It is great to see SDOT thinking about transportation holistically.
7.16C	OHC	Rainier has so much potential to be a destination, not just an arterial and fixing the bottleneck around the Mt. Baker Light Rail Station would be a major step in the right direction.
7.17A	OHC	This looks really fantastic.
7.18	OHC	I am very supportive of this plan. Full steam ahead!
7.19	OHC	Applaud big bold move.
7.20A	OHC	This is great! Let's build it soon!
7.21A	OHC	Congratulations to the Design Team! Some very strong ideas presented.

7.211	OHC2	Well thought-out project. Fantastic plan - Everybody wins! Please break ground and get started!
<i>Supportive of making Mt. Baker a "to go" place</i>		
7.16D	OHC	Rainier has so much potential to be a destination, not just an arterial and fixing the bottleneck around the Mt. Baker Light Rail Station would be a major step in the right direction.
<i>Supportive of the proposed multivalent transportation improvements</i>		
7.21B	OHC	Very pleased to see flexible/multivalent solutions for connections between the 2 arterials.
7.20B	OHC	Love the safety improvements for people walking and biking.
<i>Supportive of the phase 1 and phase 2 improvements</i>		
7.22	OHC	Like the Phase 1 and 2 improvements, go forth.
<i>Supportive of the Roundabout at Bayview and MLK</i>		
7.23	OHC	Love the idea of roundabout at Bayview and MLK
<i>Supportive of the Rainier and MLK separation</i>		
7.24	OHC	Really like modified bowtie with two way traffic on Rainier and MLK.
Negative Reactions: Unsupportive of the project idea		
<i>General unsupportive statements</i>		
7.25	GS	Don't do anything
7.26	GS	Improve existing spaces first
<i>Unsupportive of the "Bowtie" and latter street design</i>		
7.27	OHC	Bowtie sucked in 2011 and it is still wrong
7.28	OHC	Bowtie won't fix transit times
7.29	OHC	No bow tie please
<i>Unsupportive of the biking improvements</i>		
7.30	GS	Bikes should not be encouraged in the area. People move through this area to get on I-90, downtown, the central district, catch light rail and/or busses. Adding protected bike lanes would add a layer of confusing and slowdowns that this area cannot afford.

4. COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROCESS FEEDBACK

IDEAS

Outreach Inclusiveness		
<i>More people of color need to be involved in the process</i>		
7.31	OHC	Have more legacy communities of color to be present.
7.32	OHC	No enough minority participation in open house and other meetings
7.33	OHC	Involve diverse community in all the decision regarding the changes. Especially those who live here.
<i>More assistant for multicultural/multilingual communities during the community outreach process</i>		
7.34	OHC	More translation of materials is needed
7.341	OHC2	I propose having Vietnamese publications to encourage more Vietnamese-speaking residents to contribute their opinions.
<i>Stakeholders pool need to also include those from neighborhoods adjacent to the Mt. Baker neighborhood</i>		
7.35	OHC	Stakeholders are all of Rainier Valley not just the Mt Baker Community Club. We all have to go through Mount Baker, we should all be engaged.
7.351	OHC2	Have a Q&A portion after presentation
Provide timely updates and actively involve the public about all proposed changes and decisions		
7.36	OHC	Involved diverse community in all the decision regarding the changes. Especially those who live here. Need to understand how it will impact their lives.
7.37	POEL(1)	Close contact and information exchange should be available between the community and SDOT officials
Create a resident review board to make sure the project represent the need and desire of the neighborhoods.		
7.38	OHC	Have a resident review board to make sure the project represent the need and desire of the neighborhoods.
About Presentation and information boards		
7.39	OHC	Great graphics on the presentation boards to help convey a lot of knowledge without being too technical.
7.391	OHC2	Show not just road plan but also existing infrastructures such as building, store, housing so we can see it better how it affects the ridership and safety issues
5.51C	MIC	I would like to see additional modelling explicitly addressing the question of whether traffic would divert into neighborhood arterials
7.392	OHC2	The presentation about roadway design that was presented at the beginning of November open house should be filmed and presented at other Open Houses and public education forums as it was education, neutral, factual, and helpful

5. OTHER ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

ISSUES

Drainage Issue at the east side of Rainier		
7.40	OHC	Drainage issues at east side of Rainier Between MLK and Baker, art space tenant
7.401	MIC	Solve the horrible water drainage problem. When it rains, the lack of drainage makes it impossible to ride bikes through the area.
Lack of Job and employment opportunities		
7.41	GS	Bring real jobs to the area
Unclear and hidden directional signs		
7.411	MIC	Many highways like 405N bothell have directional signs in foliage, causing drivers to miss their destinations
QUESTIONS		
About property acquisition		
7.42	OHC	Concept plan cuts through existing properties. What will you do?
About contaminated sites		
7.43	OHC	Is there anything you can do for the contaminated sites?
About traffic movements		
7.44	OHC	Does modeling show traffic actually shifting from Rainier to MLK?
7.16E	OHC	How do we get around within our neighborhoods, not through our neighborhoods?
7.45	OHC	Will the proposed concept "fix" all the crashes shown on the accident graphic?
7.46	OHC2	Where will the semis and trucks be able to drive?
7.17B	OHC	I want to see detailed traffic modelling results once they are done.
About pollution		
7.47	OHC2	We are not sure the noise pollution is great with buses surrounding us. Please clarify.
7.48	OHC2	We are concerned about having the buses circle our building [Artspace building]. We have a lot of air and sound pollution to deal with already.

APPENDIX II. METHODOLOGY

I. BASELINE CONDITION EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Baseline conditions refer to the current characteristics of survey respondents' travel and activities in the Mt. Baker neighborhood. The purpose of these two questions is to understand how people (represented by the survey respondents) travel in Mt. Baker and what draws them to this neighborhood. Questions 1 asked respondents to select their most frequent way of getting around the neighborhood, whether it is by walking, biking, taking transit or driving. Then, Question 2 asked respondents to submit their relationship to the Mt. Baker Neighborhood, given the options of living here, working here, shopping here, and attending school or training here. Both questions allowed written comments for cases that were not mentioned in the answer option. Those comments were also included and analyzed as part of this study.

Travel Behavior Evaluation

The results collected for question one from all survey groups consist of a simple headcount of people using each travel mode. The data was converted into percentages that demonstrate the travel behavior of the neighborhood and of each survey group. Multiple responses were allowed in this survey question; thus, the total percentage is expected to exceed 100%.

Below is the formula for calculating the overall percentage in each travel mode:

$$\text{Percentage in travel mode A} = \frac{\text{Sum of all respondents who use travel mode A}}{\text{Sum of all respondents}}$$

By survey groups, the percentage of people in each travel mode is calculated using below formula:

$$\text{Percentage in travel mode A for survey group} = \frac{\text{Sum of all respondents who use travel mode A in survey group X}}{\text{Sum of all respondents in survey group X}}$$

Relationship to the Neighborhood

Question two asked respondents to select or submit their reasons for being in the Mt. Baker Neighborhood, also described as relationship to the Neighborhood, given the options of "I live here", "I shop here", "I work here", "Attend school or training", and "Other". A total of 93 respondents from the general survey group, the multicultural survey group, and the POEL Eritrean focus group chose "Other" and wrote in their additional relationships to the Mt. Baker Neighborhood. Other respondents from those three groups and the respondents from other POEL focus groups¹⁰, on the other hand, made selections within the given answer options.

To reflect the similarities and differences of respondent's relationship to the Mt. Baker neighborhood across all groups, a variable-width bar graph was created to illustrate percentages, by survey groups, of respondents in each one of the four given answer options (live, shop, work, and attend school or training). The length of the each horizontal bar suggests the total percentages for each survey group, while the width represents its sample size. The various sections in the horizontal bars are color-coded to represent the percentage of respondents in

¹⁰Includes Ethiopian, Somalian, and Youth

each of the four given answer options. Because multiple responses were allowed in this survey question, the total percentage is expected to exceed 100%.

In addition to the answer options, relationships to the Mt. Baker Neighborhood commented by the respondents are important as well; especially when some of them were repeated many times in the survey results. In the survey comments, seven additional relationships were mentioned by the respondents. However, some of these were mentioned only once or twice and were not reflective of the larger neighborhood characteristics. Thus, only the additional relationships that have a substantial amount of comments by each survey group's respondents were further analyzed and presented in the graphic. The process of converting written comments into analyzable data is as below:

I. Categorize and count the comments using repeated themes

There are some consistent and repeated themes in respondent's comments, and they were categorized into the following seven additional relationships:

- Make transit transfers here
- Travels through here
- Visits families or friends here
- Participate in recreational activities here
- Attend meetings here
- Own a business or property here
- Eats here

Once these additional relationships are established; the number of comments in regards to each additional relationship is tallied, and then convert into percentages comparable to the percentages from the existing answer options.

II. Compare and select the most populous relationships

After all written comments were converted into percentages of respondents for each of the seven additional relationships, they were then merged with the existing answer options. Together, they were listed in descending order in according to categorical percentages. Those with the highest percentages are the most populous options chose or commented by the respondents. To obtain significant comments, we selected all comment categories that made it in the top six items in the list. The comment categories that appeared in the top six choices for each of the survey groups' result were compiled into a new list of additional relationships, which included:

- Make transit transfer here
- Travels through here
- Visits here
- Participate in recreational activities here

III. Sum up the counts

To reflect the overall neighborhood's representation in these populous additional relationships, percentages for each of the populous additional relationship was calculated. These percentages are computed using the aggregate count of comments in regards to each additional relationship among all three groups, divided by the total number of comments collected (93).

The final percentages, illustrated in the graphics, reflect the percentages which each populous additional relationship were mentioned by respondents who left written comments.

II. PRIORITY EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

In the Accessible Mt. Baker survey, question four, five, six and eight asked respondents to rate their priorities from a list of options in regards to pedestrian safety improvement strategies, other safety improvements, types of use and activities, and types of open spaces that can potentially be included in the Mt. Baker neighborhood and its station area.

The nature of the inclusive outreach process allowed the facilitators for each survey group to slightly tweak the question, when needed in order to help their participants better understand what is asked and provide feedbacks more easily. Consequently, the results we received from our

survey groups are often in non-uniform formats. For example, the results for question 4, 5, 6 and 8 from the general public, E and SE Asian group, and POEL Eritrean focus group consist of individual ratings for each answer option. Results collected from those three groups can be further calculated and examined. However, the survey results for the same set of questions from the POEL youth focus group, POEL Ethiopian focus group, and POEL Somali focus group are listed in simple rankings, where the priority (indicated by ranks) of each answer option was given after discussion and collective consensus was achieved among the survey groups. Survey data in this format was much more limited for conducting statistical calculations and quantitative analysis.

Q4 Please prioritize the specific strategies that you believe will improve pedestrian safety in the neighborhood			
Sample Size: 128			
1 being the highest priority	1st (Highest)	2nd	3rd (Lowest)
Improve connection between Winthrop and Mt. Baker Blvd	6	12	7
Streets/open space lighting	9	16	28
Bus stop close to light rail	13	12	15
Shorter pedestrian crossing	19	13	11
Sidewalk/crosswalk maintenance	22	15	18
More pedestrian waiting space	25	22	14
Slowing down traffic	27	10	3

Answer Format I

INDIVIDUALIZED RATINGS

Can be found in:
General Survey, E and SE Asian Survey, POEL Eritrean Focus Group Survey

Q4 Please prioritize the specific strategies that you believe will improve pedestrian safety in the neighborhood	
	Priority
More pedestrian waiting space	1
Streets/open space lighting	2
Improve connection between Winthrop and Mt. Baker Blvd	3
Sidewalk/crosswalk maintenance	4
Bus stop close to light rail	5
Shorter pedestrian crossing	6
Slowing down traffic	7

Answer Format II

COLLECTIVE RANKING

Can be found in:
POEL Youth Focus Group, POEL Ethiopian Focus Group, POEL Somali Focus group

One of the challenges in compiling the Accessible Mt. Baker survey results is putting non-uniform answers into a single metric that can be used for meaningful analysis. This effort requires alignments in two major areas: 1. Scales of rating, 2. Survey result types (rankings and ratings). In the individualized rating results, we found an inconsistency in scales of rating in similar-type prioritization questions. For example, the respondents from the general survey groups were asked two separate versions of questions for question 4, 5, and 8 after the survey team confirmed that changes were needed to improve clarity of the questions. The two versions only differ in rating scales and minor languages while the content is similar.

An Example of Question Differences in the General Public Survey	
Version I	<p>O8: If very important or important, what type of urban open spaces would you like to see more of? Please prioritize the following open spaces from 1 to 4 (with 1 being your highest priority)</p> <p>Answer options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plazas • Open Spaces • Outdoor Play spaces • Community Gardens/Farms
Version II	<p>O8: If very important or important, what type of urban open spaces would you like to see more of? Please prioritize the following open spaces from 1 to 5 (with 1 being your highest priority)</p> <p>Answer options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plazas that encourages retail activity and community gatherings • Open spaces with grass, trees, and benches • Outdoor play spaces for residents and/or children (e.g. playgrounds, water, spray parks, and fountains etc.) • Community gardens or farms

The differences in scales were not only seen across different versions of the questions, but also across questions in the same survey, and across different surveys groups. The chart below shows the difference in scales in all above dimensions.

Scales of Rating (Only for the survey groups that applied individualized rating)				
	General Survey		E and SE Asian Survey	POEL Eritrean
	Version 1	Version 2		
Q4	1 – 7	1 - 8	1 - 3	1 - 3
Q5	1 – 5	1 - 6	1 - 3	1 - 3
Q6	1 - 10		1 - 3	1 - 10
Q8	1 – 4	1 - 5	1 - 3	1 - 3

*Notice: 1 is the highest priority in all above scales of rating

Most of the scaling inconsistencies were found within the general public survey. As listed in the above chart, the scale of 1 – 3 is most commonly used in the E and SE Asian survey and POEL Eritrean survey. Scale of 1 – 3 is also the most simple and straight-forward representation of people’s preferences, which can be seen as either positive, neutral, or negative. Thus, for simplicity and clarity, the survey data collected using scales other than 1 – 3 was realigned into a scale of 1 – 3 using simple mathematics calculations. The end result of this alignment is a list of results that are in the same scales and metrics, which allowed us to conduct further analysis that we were not able to do prior to this process.

Methods of Rescaling

Depending on the pre-assigned scales in the survey questions, different treatments were applied in order to realign their results into a 1 – 3 rating scale. When a scale of 1 – 6 is found, we simply grouped the results by pairs and reassigned them into the new 1 – 3 rating buckets. In all other cases, some considerations must be applied to determine how to divide the results. The following chart shows the realignment of all other existing scales.

Existing Scales	Realignment	Reasoning / Consideration
1 – 4	1, 2 →{1}; 3→{2}; 4→{3}	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given a scale of 4, people are generally more likely to see 2 as a “above medium importance” option.
1 – 5	1, 2→{1}; 3, 4→{2}; 5→{3}	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given a scale of 5, people are generally more likely to view 3 as a “medium importance” option, and 5 as the “least important” option.
1 – 7	1, 2→{1}; 3, 4, 5→{2}; 6, 7→{3}	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given a scale of 7, people are generally more likely to view 4 as a “medium importance” option, the suggested regroupings will fully appreciate the fact that 4 as the middle point of the entire spectrum. This realignment will result in a more even distribution of results.
1 – 8	1, 2, 3→{1}; 4, 5→{2}; 6, 7, 8→{3}	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given a scale of 8, people are generally more likely to see 4 as a “above medium importance” option and 5 as a “below medium importance” option.
1 – 10	1, 2, 3, 4→{1}; 5, 6, 7→{2}; 8, 9, 10→{3}	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given a scale of 10, people are generally more likely to see 5 as the “medium importance” option. For the same justification, we move the results so that it is slanted more to the “more important” side.

Once all the individual ratings are reorganized into the same scale, we can conduct statistical computations and analysis on the survey results. Due to the fact that our survey results were collected by survey groups, these group-by-group results are subject to having different sample sizes (total number of participants in each survey group). Thus, to allow for comparison across different population demographics in a way that eliminates the effects of gross influences, we nominalized our results from the General survey group, E and SE Asian survey group and the POEL Eritrean survey group into normalized values (in percentage form). In this case, the higher the percentage, the more supports there are for a certain answer option.

Weighted Percentages

When converting the results into normalized percentages format, some extra treatment was required to take in the account “no respond” cases. After examining the patterns of total responses for each answer option in each

question, it was evident that the respondents did not give a rating to every answer option in each question. A simple normalization against the sample size (total number of people in each survey group) will cause a significant inaccuracy.

Weighted percentages, on the other hand, will give a fairly accurate percentage for each priority (from 1 to 3) in each answer option. The idea behind this is that when fewer people choose to weigh in for the answer option A, the importance of the answer option A becomes low no matter how much the distribution of ratings are skewed towards the “more important” side.

The weight is calculated simply by dividing the total count of people who chose that answer option with the survey group’s sample size. When a weight is calculated for each answer option, multiply that with its corresponding nominalize value (which equals the number of people in a given rating divided by the total number of people who put in an answer for the given answer option).

When the normalized value (in percentage form) is weighted, as shown in example below, its indication is more accurate and realistic.

Weighted percentage for POEL Eritrean Focus group survey result, Q4				
Q4 Please prioritize the specific strategies that you believe will improve pedestrian safety in the neighborhood				
Sample Size: 28				
	1st (Highest)	2nd	3rd (Lowest)	Total
	1	2	0	3
Slowing down traffic	Unweighted percentage			
	33%	67%	0%	
	Weighted percentage			Weight
	4%	7%	0%	0.10714

Combining the Sub-group rankings

Most of the results received in collective rankings formats are fairly straight forward. The POEL Youth focus group and the POEL Ethiopian focus group both provided a single set of collective

rankings for the answer options in each of the four prioritization questions. The POEL Somali focus group; however, was divided into two working groups while answering these four questions. This was a decision made by the focus group facilitator in order to keep the conversation on track and allow everyone ample time to share. Owing to this, the answers for each of the prioritization questions from the POEL Somali focus group consisted of two sets of rankings, which required further actions to consolidate them into a single set of rankings.

Taking into account that the rankings came up by both groups deserved equal weights; we applied the scoring algorithm to these two sets of rankings (detail algorithm will be explained in the "Scoring the priorities" section). Out of all the answer options in each question, we selected the top four options from each sub group's selections, and assigned them with a score of 4 to 1. Then, using the total scores of the two groups, we landed in a new list of priority rankings, which will be used to represent the priorities of the Somali focus group as a whole.

Q4 Please prioritize the specific strategies that you believe will improve pedestrian safety in the neighborhood					
GROUP 1	Priority	Score	GROUP 2	Priority	Score
More pedestrian waiting space	1	4	Slowing down traffic	1	4
Sidewalk/crosswalk maintenance	2	3	Bus stop close to light rail	2	3
Slowing down traffic	3	2	More pedestrian waiting space	3	2
Bus stop close to light rail	4	1	Shorter pedestrian crossing	4	1
Improve connection between Winthrop and Mt. Baker Blvd	5		Streets/open space lighting	5	
Streets/open space lighting	6		Improve connection between Winthrop and Mt. Baker Blvd	6	
Shorter pedestrian crossing	7		Sidewalk/crosswalk maintenance	7	

Top 4	Score
More pedestrian waiting space	6
Slowing down traffic	6
Bus stop close to light rail	4
Slowing down traffic	2
More pedestrian waiting space	2

Comparison between Two Answer Formats


As mentioned earlier in this section, results for the four prioritization questions were in two different formats: individualized ratings and collective rankings, one being ratio data and the other being ordinal data. Comparing these two sets of data required a special algorithm that can combine the two that it: 1. reflect the priorities of the larger groups, represented by the general public, and, 2. preserve and reflect, in identical importance, the priorities of the smaller groups, represented by the people of multilingual and multicultural backgrounds. The following paragraphs will explain the procedure that is used to reconcile the individual results so that final product of analysis fully captures each individual group’s voice.

Converting ratio data into ordinal data

Before putting together each individual survey results, the different types of data first need to be converted into similar formats. Recall that one of the survey data format, individualized ratings, is a ratio data. In order to enable cross-survey group comparison, ratio data collected from the General Public survey, E and SE Asian survey, and the POEL Eritrean focus group were converted into ordinal data, in another word, rankings. Because 1st (Highest) priority rating suggests the highest priority, we used the percentages of people rating 1st (highest priority in the given scale) to suggest the rankings of all answer options in a given question. In this case, answer option that holds the largest percentage in 1st rating has the highest rank.

Base on this logic, we can convert all the ratio data into ordinal rankings for each question. An example is shown below:

Q4 Please prioritize the specific strategies that you believe will improve pedestrian safety in the neighborhood



	Rankings
Slow down traffic	1
Shorter pedestrian crossings	2
Bus stop close to light rail	3
Sidewalk/crosswalk maintenance	4
Streets/open space lighting	5
Improve connection between Winthrop and Mt. Baker Blvd	6
More pedestrian waiting space	7

After obtaining the rankings of each answer option in a given question, the different priorities across all survey groups can be compared. It demonstrates that each survey group supports a different set of priorities—even though there are similarities in the priorities across survey groups, no two groups have exactly identical results. Thus, it is understood that such comparison is useful in indicating the differences, but it is not yet useful for the planner to get a sense of what the community as a whole wants.

Thus, the next step to analyzing the prioritization-type survey results is to consolidate them into one single set of data. The Accessible Mt. Baker public outreach efforts aim to be inclusive of all segments of the population

who lives, works, and visits the Mt. Baker neighborhood on frequent bases. Thus, while combining the survey data from separate and different survey group results, we had to make sure that no voices are lost in the process of consolidation.

Scoring the priorities

To best preserve the opinions of all individual survey groups, we have to take the “total population (not sure this is the right term)” out of the equation. By assigning scores to each answer option and adding up the total scores, we were able to reach final rankings for answer options that take into account of the rankings of each individual group while eliminating the gross influences. The procedure is shown below:



Finally, when the total score for each answer option (ones that made it to the survey groups' top three priority) is calculated, we then compared and ranked the answer options by its scores. Those with the largest scores are the top priorities for all survey groups.

The example below shows the complete process of scoring the priorities and coming up with

the overall rankings for the pedestrian safety improvement strategies. Answer options that are not mentioned in the priority list were those that did not make it to each survey group's top three priorities. As seen below, "More pedestrian waiting space" has the highest total score, which indicates that it is a strategy that is valued the most by the community overall.

	Top 3 Pedestrian Safety Improvement Strategies
General Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slowing down traffic • Shorter pedestrian crossings • Bus stop close to light rail
Multicultural Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slowing down traffic • More pedestrian waiting space • Sidewalk/crosswalk maintenance
Ethiopian POEL group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More pedestrian waiting space • Streets/open space lighting • Better connecting Winthrop to the west and Mt. Baker Blvd to the east with pedestrian features
Somalian POEL group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More pedestrian waiting space • Slowing down traffic • Bus stop close to light rail
Eritrean POEL group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sidewalk/crosswalk maintenance • More pedestrian waiting space • Improve connection between Winthrop and Mt. Baker Blvd
Youth POEL group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More pedestrian waiting space • Streets/open space lighting • Sidewalk/crosswalk maintenance

Ranking	Score
1st Priority	3
2nd Priority	2
3rd Priority	1


$2 + 3 + 3 + 2 + 3 = 13$ The total score for "More pedestrian waiting space"

	Total Score	Overall Rankings
More pedestrian waiting space	13	1
Slowing down traffic	9	2
Sidewalk/crosswalk maintenance	5	3
Streets/open space lighting	4	4
Shorter pedestrian crossings	2	5
Improve connection between Winthrop and Mt. Baker Blvd	2	5
Bus stop close to light rail	2	5

III. COMMENT ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

There are a total of 317 comments collected from the survey results and the public meeting. Comments collected were in the forms of written descriptions, which pose a question, suggest an issue or concern, indicated an observation, or made a recommendation. Comments were read over many times and processed to fit in a multi-level grid. The grid that is used to capture all the comments is as follow:

Using this tier of categorization, the tables in Appendix I is produced. To further interpret the comments and conclude the key findings, the content of the comment tables were converted into a list of goals and recommendations as shown in the main report. These goals were separated into six general categories walk, bike, transit, general traffic, land use, and others. Recommendations were listed under the respective goals which it will help to achieve. Project teams' responses to each of the recommendations are given in the right-side columns.



The Seattle Department of Transportation
700 5th Avenue, Suite 3800
PO Box 34996
Seattle, WA 98124-4996
(206) 684-ROAD (7623)
www.seattle.gov/transportation

