

## Preliminary Summary of Scoping Comments (3/7/2007)

**Public scoping period:** November 30, 2006 – January 16, 2007 (original end date of January 2, 2007 was extended)

**Public meetings:**

November 30, 2006 – Meridan Park Elementary School

December 6, 2006 – Shorewood High School

**Notice provided for meetings and scoping period:**

Newspaper ads in Seattle Times and Shoreline Enterprise

- Legal notice of meeting published in Seattle Times and Shoreline Enterprise legal sections
- Additional press release

Notice in City newsletter - Currents

Postcards mailed to citizens

- All businesses
- All property owners
- Residences located within 700-feet of Aurora Avenue centerline
- All people on "interested party" list

Notice on City website

Notice on government access channel (channel 21)

Four notice boards set up along project site

**Total number of commenters:** 208 (199 written, 9 verbal at public meetings)

**Total number of comments:** ~1,000

## Preliminary Summary of Scoping Comments (3/7/2007)

Topic <sup>1</sup>	Approximate Number of Comments <sup>2</sup>	Comments
Noise	2	Few specific comments were provided requesting noise analysis. Noise is also mentioned more generally under some of the transportation and the environmental process comments.
Economics	97	Comments cover a wide variety of topics. Many comments are concerned with the economic impacts of project construction. Many other comments suggest the importance of assessing the project's effect on long-term economic viability. Other comments/questions were provided about the effect of the project on property values.
Air Quality	5	Only a few specific comments were provided regarding air quality – most request analysis of vehicle emissions. Air quality is also mentioned more generally under some of the transportation and the environmental process comments.
Hazardous Materials	0	---
Transportation	122	A wide variety of comments were provided in this category, including questions about level of service; the effect of medians on traffic circulation, operations, and emergency vehicle access; transit operations; commuter bicycle traffic; freight mobility; effects of new traffic signals; traffic operations on intersecting east-west roads and parallel routes.
Safety	101	A wide variety of comments were provided in this category. The highest numbers of comments are concerned with pedestrian safety in the corridor, but there are also a number concerned with vehicular safety. Majority of comments expressed opinion of a need for increased safety, but other comments indicated the opinion that the corridor is safe under existing conditions.
Land Use, Plans, Policies	19	Comments provided in this category focus both on the City's adopted vision, framework goals and policies that led to this project; as well as project effects on overall urban form and densities.
Cultural / Historical	5	Comments consist of 3 requests to preserve the red brick road (Ronald Place) and 2 letters listing a number of features and structures suggested for review as part of the cultural assessment.
Visual Quality	26	The majority of comments are either critical of the existing aesthetic quality of the Aurora corridor, or express a strong desire to improve the aesthetic quality of the project corridor
Stormwater / Surface Water	57	The majority of comments indicate a high priority for improving water quality. Strong support is voiced for utilization of natural stormwater systems, and minimizing runoff and the effects to surrounding streams and water bodies.
Fish and Wildlife	11	Most comments that express concern to fish and wildlife were coupled with comments concerning water quality.
Wetlands	0	---
Prefer Alternative A	9	Tally consists of 1 'vote' per commenter. Any repeat comments by same commenter in favor of this alternative are coded as "other".
Prefer Alternative B	2	Tally consists of 1 'vote' per commenter. Any repeat comments by same commenter in favor of this alternative are coded as "other".
Prefer Alternative C	8	Tally consists of 1 'vote' per commenter. Any repeat comments by same commenter in favor of this alternative are coded as "other".
Prefer Alternatives B or C	118	Tally consists of 1 'vote' per commenter. Any repeat comments by same commenter in favor of this alternative are coded as "other".  Many of these comments simply indicate that the commenter wants a continuation of what is being built in the 'first mile' (N 145th Street – N 165th Street)
Prefer No Build	1	---
Project Design Elements	85	Comments provided in this category provide input on a wide spectrum of the project design elements, including but not limited to questions/opinions on the presence or absence of amenities, location of project elements, sidewalk widths, intersection configurations, signs, driveways, medians.
Landscaping	29	The majority of comments in this category favor high level of landscaping. A few comments were provided that either oppose trees being planted along the corridor, or are opposed to landscaping in general.
General comment in favor of project/process	66	Comments in this category covered a wide variety of topics, but general tenor is complimentary of the City's actions regarding the corridor up to this point.
General comment critical of project/process	17	Comments in this category covered a wide variety of topics, but general tenor is critical of the City's actions regarding the corridor up to this point. Not all of the negative comments are critical of the project. Some comments are critical of the project process; others are critical of the City's actions that they feel are unduly delaying progress of the project.
Public Involvement / Review Process	42	Wide variety of comments in this category. Topics included general requests to be included on the contact list for this project; opinions regarding the length of the scoping period (some indicating it was too short, others indicating that it was too long); and questions or opinions about the overall public review and comment processes.
General Environmental Process	23	A lot of comments in this category express a general interest that is 'good for the environment', or raise questions/issues with the overall NEPA and/or SEPA processes.
General Project Cost / Money Spent on Project	55	Wide variety of comments in this category. Most are questions/concerns/opinions regarding to the overall cost of the project; funding sources for the project;
Construction	14	Comments in this category are generally concerned with the phasing and timing of construction. Comments regarding specific impacts of construction (i.e. economic impacts, traffic impacts) were categorized under the applicable category of impact.
Other	86+	Includes wide variety of comments that don't fit into any of the categories listed above, or are repeat comments by one commenter expressing support for any of the specific alternatives. We will revisit comments in this category toward end of process and identify any additional logical groupings that could make up additional categories.

<sup>1</sup> Some comments include more than one topic. For purposes of this summary, comments were categorized by the topic that was considered dominant. However, in the responses to comments that are under development, multiple responses are provided for multiple parts when applicable.

<sup>2</sup> Tallies provided in this summary are preliminary, based upon our initial efforts at providing responses, and are intended to provide ballpark estimates of the type and magnitude of comments received. As we refine responses and double-check for consistency within comment categories, we expect that some shifting between topics will take place (particularly between the 'general' categories).