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Appendix J: Comment Letters Received from Jurisdictions
SNOHOMISH COUNTY COUNCIL
SNOHOMISH COUNTY EXECUTIVE
Snohomish County, Washington

JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 09-001

STATING SNOHOMISH COUNTY’S STRONG SUPPORT FOR CONCURRENT DEVELOPMENT OF FREIGHT, PASSENGER, AND EXCURSION RAIL SERVICE AND A BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN TRAIL ON THE EASTSIDE RAIL CORRIDOR

WHEREAS, Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad (“BNSF”) owns the railroad right of way and track from Coulon Park in Renton to Snohomish and the leg from Woodinville to Redmond, now commonly called the Eastside Rail Corridor; and

WHEREAS, BNSF agreed to sell the Eastside Rail Corridor to the Port of Seattle; and

WHEREAS, the Eastside Rail Corridor is approximately one hundred feet wide; and

WHEREAS, approximately seven businesses in the Maltby area of Snohomish County rely on shipping freight over the Eastside Rail Corridor, including Boise Cascade; and

WHEREAS, improved freight service to the Maltby area will create and maintain jobs; and

WHEREAS, passenger rail service along the Eastside Rail Corridor would minimize traffic congestion, with attendant environmental and economic benefits; and

WHEREAS, excursion rail service to the City of Snohomish would substantially benefit the City of Snohomish and surrounding area; and

WHEREAS, the right of way is sufficiently wide to accommodate a bicycle/pedestrian trail adjacent to the railroad track; and

WHEREAS, a bicycle/pedestrian trail on the Eastside Rail Corridor would provide health benefits and be an important addition to regional quality of life; and

WHEREAS, various studies estimate the costs of rails service and the bicycle/pedestrian trail and ridership; and
WHEREAS, the study mandated by HB 3224 established that freight, passenger, and excursion rail service and a bicycle/pedestrian trail are feasible and could be a meaningful component of the region’s transportation system; and

WHEREAS, similar projects elsewhere in the country, such as Escondido, California, and Austin, Texas, have been very successful with substantial ridership and modest costs; and

WHEREAS, even the highest cost estimate to date for passenger rail service is substantially cheaper than light rail and major freeway project costs; and

WHEREAS, other cost estimates of rail corridor redevelopment are substantially lower, and the redevelopment cost may be substantially less than the high end estimate contained in the PSRC/Sound Transit report;

WHEREAS, opportunities exist for participation by private industry;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Snohomish County Executive and Snohomish County Council do jointly:

1. Express their appreciation to the Port of Seattle for keeping this important transportation corridor in public ownership;
2. State their strong support for rail service on the Eastside Rail Corridor, including freight, passenger, and excursion service;
3. State their strong support for a bicycle/pedestrian trail on the entire length of the Eastside Rail Corridor;
4. State their strong support for simultaneous implementation of rail service and a bicycle/pedestrian trail because of cost benefits and efficiencies that will be lost if they are not developed together;
5. State their strong support for exploring creative opportunities for financing, development and operation that would reduce the need to use public funds, including the involvement of private industry;
6. Strongly urge the Port of Seattle and the Washington state legislature to take appropriate steps promptly to advance this project in a timely and cost effective manner.
APPROVED THIS 5th DAY OF January, 2009.

Mike Cooper
Council Chair

Aaron Reardon
County Executive

Dave Somers
Councilmember

Dave Gossert
Councilmember

John Koster
Councilmember

Brian Sullivan
Councilmember

ATTEST:

Kathryn Bredemus
Clerk of the Council

JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 09-001
STATING SNOHOMISH COUNTY'S STRONG SUPPORT FOR CONCURRENT DEVELOPMENT OF FREIGHT, PASSENGER, AND EXCURSION RAIL SERVICE AND A BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN TRAIL ON THE EASTSIDE RAIL CORRIDOR
January 7, 2009

Mr. Charlie Howard
Transportation Planning Director, PSRC
1011 Western Ave, Suite 500
Seattle WA 98104-1035

Dear Mr. Howard:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft feasibility study for rail on the Eastside Rail Corridor. Council appreciates the work that went into preparing the report both by PSRC and Sound Transit staff.

The City of Kirkland has taken the following position on use of the corridor.

"The City of Kirkland has long looked upon the BNSF right-of-way as primarily a facility for non-motorized travel. However, we are also interested in an investigation of how rail transport might function alongside a trail. There are a number of unanswered questions concerning rail operations including impact on residential neighborhoods and local street traffic, ridership potential, parking accommodation and station locations."

Unfortunately the study, although it may answer the question that the legislature posed in SHB 3224, does not answer the questions that are of most interest to the Kirkland City Council. We understand that most of these questions are beyond the scope of the report. In our judgment however, we feel that feasibility is truly defined by how the stations fit in communities, whether adequate parking is supplied, how operations will impact neighbors and what costs, for items such as grade crossing upgrades for example, will be borne by cities. Feasibility is also defined by an upper reasonable bound for cost per rider. Again, you were not given such a definition by the legislature and so the report does not address these issues.

Until a clearer and more complete definition of feasibility is presented, we feel that it is premature to conclude that rail operations are feasible or decide whether or not there are fatal flaws. Almost any project is feasible given enough money. Perhaps the better questions are: is rail practical or desirable?

Given the cost estimates; about $1 billion in capital costs for the rail line, plus about $350 million for the multi-use trail along with maintenance and operating costs of about $28 million/year, we believe it will not be practical for a private party to operate passenger rail in the corridor. Nor is there a public agency likely to fund subsidize operations in the foreseeable future. Certainly Sound Transit 2 does not include such funding.

It's exciting to anticipate use of the corridor as a unique facility for safe and convenient walking and cycling while preserving the option for rail usage in the future should it become practical and desirable. Thank you once again for your work on the report and offering the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Kirkland City Council

By: James L. Lauinger, Mayor

cc: 45th and 48th District Legislators
January 21, 2009

Mr. Charlie Howard, Transportation Planning Director
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035

Subject: BNSF Eastside Corridor Commuter Rail Feasibility Study

Dear Mr. Howard:

We appreciate the effort PSRC and Sound Transit dedicated to producing its feasibility study concerning the Eastside Rail Corridor, and thank you for inviting our comments.

The City of Newcastle continues to advocate for preserving the option for multimodality along the corridor—specifically including commuter rail—because of the added usefulness and regional benefits that could be gained. We were glad to read that commuter rail is feasible along the corridor, although we appreciate that there are still many issues to analyze. Accordingly, we hope that the evaluation will continue so that the issues raised by our neighboring cities are addressed and more detailed budget information is developed.

Respectfully,

Ben Varon
Mayor
City of Newcastle

cc: Deputy Mayor Hubbell and City Councilors
The Honorable Senator Fred Jarrett
The Honorable Representative Judy Clibborn
The Honorable Representative Marcie Maxwell
Ms. Joni Earl, CEO, Sound Transit
January 5, 2009

Puget Sound Regional Council  
Attention: Jennifer Ryan  
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500  
Seattle, WA 98104-1035

Dear Jennifer:

Thank you for the opportunity to include this letter in your report to the Legislature on the future of the BNSF Corridor in King County.

The City of Redmond supports the acquisition and rail-banking of the BNSF corridor through Redmond to preserve it for public use. In the City of Redmond, this corridor is a critical regional trail link between the East Lake Sammamish Trail and the Sammamish River Trail. Public ownership will preserve the corridor for a variety of uses including a regional trail, downtown parks and open space, and other civic improvements that will allow the orderly development of the city. The city has long planned for an improved street system, utility connections, and eventual establishment of light rail in or immediately adjacent to this corridor. With this acquisition and rail-banking, in a few short years, the corridor will be transformed from a deteriorated industrial wasteland to a vibrant amenity in the middle of a growing urban center.

The City of Redmond has had extensive conversations with BNSF, the Port of Seattle, King County and the Redmond community about these improvements. This process has yielded a consensus view of what we can achieve in the corridor. The City of Redmond has established the funding necessary to achieve these plans, and has an agreement with the Port of Seattle to begin negotiations in 2009.

Thank you again for the opportunity to include this letter in your report.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John Marchione  
Mayor

Cc: Charlie Howard  
Redmond City Council  
Craig Larsen  
Nina Rivkin
January 8, 2009

Mr. Charles Howard
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104-1035

Subject: BNSF Eastside Corridor Commuter Rail Feasibility Study Comments

Dear Mr. Howard:

The City of Renton would like to offer comments on the BNSF Eastside Corridor Commuter Rail Feasibility Study that was conducted by PSRC and Sound Transit in response to Substitute House Bill 3224, passed by the 2008 Legislature. Our two main themes are:

- We do not believe that the study offers conclusive evidence that this corridor is feasible for commuter rail use, particularly at the southern terminus.

- We believe that considerable additional analysis and a formal process are needed to replace the officially adopted high capacity transit alternative for this corridor, I-405 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT).

First, the City wants to reiterate its support for the development and integration of this rail corridor into the region’s trail system. We join the many governments, agencies and citizens who have supported the trail and view the trail as the first and foremost use for this valuable corridor. This study, however, appears to cast doubts about the trail development feasibility by identifying potential conflicts between the rail and trail rights-of-way (insufficient width in some sections), and by not including the cost estimates for the trail development on this corridor, either by omission or by carrying an assumption that a regional trail south of I-90 would continue to use the present system of trails or bicycle lanes. The City of Renton supports the development of the BNSF corridor for a trail to either replace or augment the present “trail” system, which, for a variety of reasons is not adequate.

We realize, of course, that the prime purpose of the study was to determine the feasibility of the BNSF corridor for some form of high capacity transit, primarily commuter rail. The City of Renton has the following detailed comments on this:

- During the committee discussions there was some ambiguity about the safety standards assumed for any rail crossings. Our position is that safety cannot be compromised. The assumption should be that the highest standards would need to be met.

- Regarding safe crossings, the committee was also given vague responses on who exactly might bear the costs of such rail crossings. Our emphatic position is that the costs of these safe crossings would be borne by the transit system and not by the jurisdictions in which they occur.
• A termination of a rail corridor at Gene Coulon Park does not appear feasible to us. The report did not identify how any riders would access a terminus at Coulon Park and how they would get to the station. A parking facility at this location appears to be highly problematic given the topographic and land use constraints. The access issue needs to be resolved before any station at this location is deemed feasible.

• Extending the southern terminus to the Renton Downtown or to the Tukwila Commuter Train Station (Sounder) may appear to address some of the concerns about a terminus at Gene Coulon Park. However, it would raise additional concerns about the interface of train and vehicular traffic through the downtown area. Whether the issues are safety or traffic flow, these issues are complicated and require considerable analysis. An extremely important consideration is that the BNSF corridor south of Coulon Park remains in BNSF ownership, and there has been no indication that BNSF would be willing to make it available for public transit purposes. The BNSF track south of Coulon Park serves Boeing’s 737 production line, which represents about 10.7% of the state’s exports and 3% of the state’s domestic product and supports approximately 45,000 direct and indirect jobs. The study (either now or, more likely, in a subsequent iteration) therefore should consider evaluating alternative transit corridors through Renton. This would be a complicated undertaking requiring major approvals from BNSF and Boeing, besides adding time and costs. In addition, the same access issues cited for Coulon Park would have to be evaluated and addressed for any other station in Renton.

• The study touches on some of the procedural steps that would be needed to implement commuter rail operations on this corridor. We believe that a description of the formal selection process for this transit option needs to be addressed much more fully, even if in this study. We understand that the BNSF Corridor is in the regional transportation plan (PSRC) and that the regional plan may be adequate to add this transit facility and service. However, to the extent that Sound Transit is involved—through its $50 million contribution to a commuter rail venture, which would presumably be financed and operated by another entity—or otherwise, the Sound Transit Long Range Vision would have to be revised. The present Sound Transit Long Range Vision identified I-405 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) as the High Capacity Transit (HCT) option for this corridor. This is consistent with the 2002 Record of Decision for I-405. We believe that a number of formal actions would have to be taken to allow Sound Transit to change the HCT alternative. To do this, the commuter rail alternative analyzed in the study would have to be compared to the I-405 BRT “default” option in terms of costs, ridership, community impacts, and other criteria.

• The study appears to offer the impression that the use of the BNSF Corridor for commuter rail is “feasible.” With a potential cost as high as $1.2 billion, even if that number is acknowledged to be highly conservative, “feasible” must be carefully explained. If “feasible” merely means that it can be built and offers some transit ridership benefits, then a finding of feasibility may be supported with some of the caveats above (e.g., station parking). However, there should not be any impression given that a finding of feasibility is anywhere close to a recommendation that this option should be implemented. The study itself correctly states that “it is the purpose of this evaluation to satisfy the requirements of SHNB 3224, and to provide information to support future decisions by the Sound Transit Board of Directors.
regarding the potential funding of facilities and/or passenger rail service...” There should be
a comprehensive identification and discussion of the processes needed to compare this
alternative to other transportation alternatives, particularly since there already is an officially
adopted HCT plan for the I-405 corridor (namely BRT), immediately adjacent to the BNSF
corridor. Absent a comprehensive alternatives analysis and comparison, presenting this study
to the state Legislature is at best only a first step.

• We believe that the corridor, and its potential extension south of Coulon Park, would have to
be analyzed in coordination with the Light Rail Study for the Burien-Renton route (in ST2).
In addition, the corridor should be discussed in terms of far future potential for eastside Light
Rail, particularly a Renton-Bellevue LRT route that could connect with the Bellevue-Seattle
LRT route.

Finally, knowing that Sound Transit set the end of 2011 as a deadline for the availability of its $50
million partnership in a potential transit service on the BNSF Corridor, the City of Renton would
urge Sound Transit to immediately initiate the process of comparing this transit alternative to others
and decide which one should move toward implementation. If this transit option does not in fact
compare well with the other HCT options, then the City of Renton would like to shift the funds to the
ST-adopted HCT option of I-405 BRT (as specified in ST2) and move toward implementation of that
vision.

Sincerely,

Denis Law
Mayor

c: Renton City Council
  Jay Covington, Chief Administrative Officer
  Gregg Zimmerman, Public Works Administrator
  Peter Hahn, Deputy PW Administrator, Transportation
  Joni Earl, Sound Transit
  Sound Transit Board
  Port of Seattle
  Legislative Delegation

09-004/DL:aa
January 8, 2009

Jennifer Ryan, PE, Principal Planner
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Ave, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035

Re: Eastside Corridor Ridership Study

Dear Ms. Ryan:

If you travel to Snohomish during rush hour, you are aware that the need for commuter transit is great. Highway 9 is not enough. Our traffic situation is repeated in many other communities in the area. Repeating history can sometimes be good, such as restoring the 1886 Seattle, Lakeshore and Eastern Railway corridor as Eastside Commuter Rail. One could refer to such an assist to our region’s circulation as “Commuter Passenger Rail,” or CPR for short.

Everett is a logical future extension of this line; its natural link to the existing main north-south passenger rail corridor in Puget Sound has profound implications for an integrated rail and bus system.

Speaking on behalf of the Snohomish City Council, I can state that our Council also endorses Snohomish County Resolution 09-01, which very eloquently describes the many benefits that trail and rail use of this corridor can provide.

A future passenger rail service along this corridor implemented and operated by public and/or private parties, particularly along the portion of the corridor located in Snohomish County outside the Sound Transit District, would be of great value to the City of Snohomish and the region. Sound Transit’s proposed investment of $50 million dollars in this project is applauded.

We are encouraged that the Sound Transit/PSRC feasibility study has concluded that passenger rail on the Eastside BNSF corridor is feasible and would be a meaningful component of the region’s future transportation system. The City of Snohomish strongly supports this public acquisition and implementation of trail with passenger, freight and excursion rail within this corridor.

Sincerely,

Randy Hamlin
Mayor, City of Snohomish
Appendix K: Other Comment Letters Received
Resolution Supporting Eastside Commuter Rail and Bicycle Trail

WHEREAS Sound Transit and the Puget Sound Regional Council has conducted a feasibility study, as required by SHB 3224, to determine whether commuter rail service between eastern Snohomish county and eastern King county can be a meaningful component of the region’s future transportation system, and

WHEREAS the results of that feasibility study show that establishing commuter rail service with a concurrent bicycle and pedestrian pathway is feasible, identified no fatal flaws, and costs much less per mile than several other nearby commuter rail projects, and

WHEREAS the Sound Transit 2 transportation funding package includes $50 million for a demonstration project in the eastside rail corridor if committed by 2011, and

WHEREAS establishing rail and trail service here would enhance the economy and livability of the region by providing green transportation infrastructure along the only level corridor between Snohomish, Woodinville, Kirkland, Bellevue, and Renton, and

WHEREAS there are many opportunities to save money in an actual system by building less and by working in a public/private partnership,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Snohomish County Democratic Central Committee declare their support for establishing commuter rail service with a concurrent bicycle and pedestrian trail along the Woodinville subdivision, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Snohomish County Democratic Central Committee transmit this resolution to the Puget Sound Regional Council before January 9th, 2009 for inclusion in the final SHB 3224 feasibility study report to the Washington State Legislature, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Snohomish County Democratic Central Committee finds that this matter is of an urgent nature, and directs that the resolution be approved at the same meeting where the resolution was first proposed.
Petition from the Eastside Trail Advocates
(www.eastsidetrailadvocates.org)

Description/History of BNSF Corridor

The Eastside Rail Corridor currently owned by Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railroad (BNSF) consists of a 42-mile rail corridor stretching from the city of Renton to the City of Snohomish with an additional eight-mile rail spur running between the cities of Woodinville and Redmond.

In May 2008 the Port of Seattle, BNSF Railway and King County signed an agreement that will result in the Port's acquisition of the 42 mile Eastside rail corridor from BNSF for a purchase price of $107 million. BNSF has applied to the Surface Transportation Board to railbank the portion of the line south of Woodinville. The Port is purchasing only the portion of the line from Snohomish to Woodinville for freight and excursion rail use.

According to two independent studies commissioned by the Puget Sound Regional Council and Sound Transit the condition of the rail is very poor. The rail is primarily single-tracked and rests on a very curvy (97 curves) rail bed. There are 24 bridges and 107 at-grade crossings where the rail track intersects with existing streets and roads. Both studies conclude that the corridor would have limited rail transit benefits in the next 20 years due to excessive costs, safety issues and environmental impact.

The Petition

We, the undersigned, support efforts to convert the rail-banked sections of the BNSF Eastside Rail Corridor to a multi-use pedestrian and bicycle trail for recreation and commuting. The Eastside Trail Corridor winds through the five communities of Renton, Bellevue, Kirkland, Woodinville and Redmond and has striking views of Lake Washington, the Olympic and Cascade Mountain Ranges, and the urban centers of Seattle and Bellevue.

By preserving this corridor for pedestrians, bicyclists, and nature lovers of the Puget Sound region, we guarantee future generations will enjoy the benefits of a ribbon of quiet, green oasis in the midst of modern development as well as preserving options for transportation in the future. This type of trail has been shown to contribute to the positive economic growth of the communities along the trail as well as to the improved health and general well-being of the citizens of those communities.

Zlata Milin, Kirkland, WA
Mary Pund, Kirkland, WA
Jennifer Mount, Kirkland, WA
Geoff Lowe, Kirkland, WA
Kim Lowe, Kirkland, WA
charlie billow, bellevue, washington
kevin tisdal, kirkland, wa
sharan tisdal, kirkland, wa
Kat Wood, Snohomish, WA
Linda anchondo, Bellevue, WA
Thomas Ellison, Bellevue, Washington
kip faucett, kirkland, WA
charles brody, kirkland, wa
Cynthia Brody, Kirkland, WA
Sharon Jamieson, Bellevue, WA.

Robert Maanaw, Seattle, Washington
Jon Jamieson, Bellevue, WA
Andrea McBeth, Kirkland, WA
JG Stevenson, Kirkland, WA
Steve Hansen, Kirkland, WA
Michael Prise, Kirkland, WA
diana prise, Kirkland, WA
Seth Andersson, Kirkland, Washington
Faizal Kassamall, Kirkland, WA
Jessica Geiser, Kirkland, WA
Cary Granger, Kirkland, WA
Mark Anderson, Kirkland, WA
Michelle Grimm, Kirkland, WA
Rachel Felbeck, Kirkland, WA.
Kitty Ballard, Kirkland, Wa
Paul Fawcett, Kirkland, WA
Jeff Felbeck, Kirkland, WA
Molly Larkin, Kirkland, WA
Sheri Olsen, Kirkland, WA
Scott Smernis, Kirkland, WA
Annie Asmussen, Kirkland, WA
Ellen Reynolds, Kirkland, WA
Lou Reynolds, Kirkland, WA
Jeff Robinson, Kirkland, WA
Nichelle Williams, Edmonds, WA
Jill Geurts, Kirkland, WA
Dave Doane, Kirkland, WA
Wendy Doane, Kirkland, WA
Charlene Chase-Brandmeier, Kirkland, WA
Victor Loehrer, Kirkland, WA
Dave Doane, Kirkland, WA
Shawn Maddox, Seattle, WA
Ashley Lawson, Kirkland, WA
Marc Etchevers, Kirkland, WA
Susan Gordon, Kirkland, Washington
Angela Griffith, Kirkland, WA
Ron Bromfield, Medina, WA
Mike Vega, Kirkland, WA
Devon Beckham, Kirkland, WA
Erin Beckham, Kirkland, WA
Dave Hruska, Kirkland, WA
Betty Haack, Bellevue, WA
Paul Haack, Bellevue, WA
John O'Brien, Olympia, Washington
Sarah Cox, Kirkland, WA
Annette Cox, Kirkland, WA
Alan Skow, Kirkland, Washington
Linda Lee, Seattle, WA
Mary Fieke, Lake Forest Park, WA
Dan Lamarche, Bothell, WA
Timothy O'Neill-Dunne, Redmond, WA
Sarah Watanabe, Kirkland, Washington
Lisa Low, Kirkland, WA
Leslie Amira, Kirkland, WA
Donna Unruh, Kirkland, WA
Stan Wyse, Kirkland, WA
myra rothenberg, redmond, wa
Shawn Burke, Kirkland, WA
Kathi Pierce, Kirkland, WA
Monica Lewis, Kirkland, WA
Beth Billington, Bellevue, WA
kirk newman, kirkland, wa
nora newman, kirkland, wa
Scott Rasmussen, Kirkland, WA
Andrew Greenberg, Kirkland, WA
Valerie Watkins, Kirkland, WA
Matt Pool, Renton, WA
Betsy Pringle, Kirkland, WA
Kevin Lindahl, Renton, WA
C A Mansfield, Bellevue, WA
Mosa Nels, Bellevue, WA
Maiailen Etchevers, Kirkland, Washington
James Davidson, Kirkland, Wa.
Mia Coolege, Kirkland, Washington
Terri Butler, Kirkland, WA
Tania Busch Isaksen, Kirkland, WA
Ellen Beeman, Kirkland, WA
Peter Drabble, Kirkland, WA
David Rumppe, Kirkland, WA
Scott Rethke, Kirkland, WA
Barbara Rumppe, Kirkland, WA
Karen Brender, Kirkland, WA
howe foster, Kirkland, WA.
Mike Russell, Bellevue, WA
Yvonne Vogeie, Kirkland, WA
Tim Riddle, Kirkland, WA
Kristy Raichlen, Kirkland, WA
Chris Raichlen, Kirkland, WA
Franklin Smith, Bellevue, WA
Jill Barringer, Bellevue, WA
Janet Kelley-Jones, Kirkland, Wa
Richard Jones, Kirkland, Wa
Pablo Bernal, Bellevue, WA
Tiffany Bernal, Bellevue, WA
Lisa Chiang, Seattle, WA
Peter Granger, Kirkland, wa
Beau Granger, Kirkland, WA
Kevin O'Brien, Clyde, Hill Washington
Kirstin Peterson, Bellevue, WA
Matt Eldrenkamp, Bellevue, WA
Marjorie Schulz, Kirkland, Wa
Michael Coan, Kirkland, WA
Bob Trenner, Kirkland, WA
Karen Trenner, Kirkland, WA
Mark Doennebrink, Bothell, WA
Lisa Gilmour Wollum, Bellevue, WA
Allison Morton, Seattle, WA
Gregg Olsen, Kirkland, WA
Melinda Skogerson, Kirkland, Washington
Richard Skogerson, Kirkland, Washington
Margaret VanderWaerden, Redmond, WA
Burt Miller, Kirkland, WA
Rochelle Sloan, Kirkland, WA
Santo Criscuolo, Kirkland, WA
Fred Miller, Bellevue, WA
Sally Mackle, Kirkland, WA
Ed Burger, Seattle, WA
CODY O'NEIL, KIRKLAND, WA
PATRICK O'NEIL, KIRKLAND, WA
Patti Owen, Kirkland, WA,
Bill Watson, Kirkland, WA
Ashley Lawson, Kirkland, WA
Missy Lawson, Kirkland, WA
Mike Holland, Kirkland, WA
Jodi Ruhl, Kirkland, WA
Teresa Simmons, Bellevue, WA
Randy Lewis, Kirkland, WA
Kimberly Yantis, Bellevue, WA
Inga McNally, Bellevue, WA
CHARLES DAVIS, BELLEVUE, WA
Zachary Bourn, Woodinville, WA
Linda Kovic-Skow, Kirkland, Washington
David Malcolm, Kirkland, WA
Anthony Cresci, Kirkland, WA
Hilary Williams, Bellevue, WA
Chris Vasilieff, Redmond, WA
Alison Vasilieff, Redmond, WA
David Coffey, Bellevue, WA
Geoff Dunbar, Kirkland, WA
Margaret Etchevers, Kirkland, WA
Barbara Doane, Kirkland, WA
Ken Doane, Kirkland, WA
Lynne Elander, Kirkland, WA
Carol Levy, Bellevue, WA
John Koster, Kirkland, WA
Brita Zeiler, Kirkland, WA
Annalisa Shark, Kirkland, WA
Andrea Pirret, Kirkland, WA
Keith Lashley, Kirkland, WA
Camerin Lashley, Kirkland, WA
Robert Abe, Snohomish, Washington
Pam Phillips, Kirkland, WA
Heather Ross, Kirkland, WA
Hailee Greenberg, Kirkland, Washington
Susan Miller, Bellevue, WA
James Erickson, Kirkland, Washington
Michele Bader, Bellevue, WA
George Pigott, Kirkland, WA
vernon balassanian, kirkland, WA

Betty Balassanian, Kirkland, WA
Jeffrey Richter, Kirkland, WA
Steele Granger, Kirkland, WA
Edward Balassanian, Kirkland, WA
Ashley Pirret, Kirkland, WA
Karen Story, Kirkland, WA
sharan tsidel, kirkland, wa
Kevin Taylor, Kirkland, WA
Kay Erickson, Kirkland, WA
Raymond Marty MD, Kirkland, WA
Richard Pirret, Kirkland, WA
Olympia Granger, Kirkland, wa
Nick Duncan, Kirkland, WA
Joanne Pirret, Kirkland, Wa
Barb Avery, Kirkland, WA
Laurie Hansen, Kirkland, WA
Doris Clancy, Kirkland, WA
William Clancy, Kirkland, WA
Barbee Tucker-Pigott, Kirkland, WA
Kelsey Bourn, Woodinville, WA
Shawn Etchevers, Kirkland, WA
Brittany Granger, Kirkland, WA
Darin Granger, Kirkland, Wa
Sally Maher, Kirkland, WA
Terance Maher, Kirkland, WA
Giurgevca Millin, Bellevue, WA
Bill McNeill, Kirkland, WA
Elana Russell, Bellevue, WA
Lisa McConnell, Kirkland, WA
Kemper Dougall, Kirkland, WA
Travis Dougall, Kirkland, WA
Richard McCormick, monroe, wa
Steve Burns, Kirkland, WA
Kirsten Miller, Kirkland, WA
Annemarie Riese, Bellevue, WA
Carolyn Hutchison, Kirkland, WA
Sydne Rataushk, Kirkland, WA
Kathryne Green, Kirkland, WA
Elizabeth Tedrow, Bellevue, WA
Richard Martin, Kirkland, WA
Robert Routt, Kirkland, WA
Tami Stover, Kirkland, WA
Mehdi Nakhjiri, Kirkland, WA
Karen Tollefson, Kirkland, WA
Jeffrey Hamilton, Kirkland, WA
Lynn Shively, Bellevue, WA
Mia Robinson, Monroe, Washington
Larry Levy, Bellevue, WA
Alex Levin, Redmond, WA
Elizabeth Heckenberg, Bellevue, WA
Emily Hutchinson, Woodinville, WA
Steve Tedrow, Bellevue, WA
William Gerken, Kirkland, WA
Dede Renne, Kirkland, Washington
Linda Heckenberg, Kirkland, WA
Craig Sears, Redmond, Washington
don rasmussen, kirkland, wa
Tanya Bushaw, Seattle, WA
Joe Eldridge, Snohomish, WA
Ray Sutton, Snohomish, WA
mark shank, kirkland, wa
Pamela Hunt, Bellevue, WA
Wes Rataushk, Kirkland, WA
Inna Dernis, Kirkland, WA
Debra Sinick, Kirkland, WA
Cheryl Middleton, Kirkland, WA
Lee Falco, Redmond, WA
Tali Roth, Kirkland, WA
Keith Lashley, Kirkland, WA
Toni Wall, Kirkland, WA
David Wall, Kirkland, WA
Peri Greenberg, Kirkland, WA
Lisa Edwards, Kirkland, WA
Erika Hoagland, Monroe, wa
kate kilby, seattle, wa
Kay Tylla, Kirkland, WA
Frank Tylla, Kirkland, WA
Joseph Peterson, Bellevue, WA
Cass Walker, Kirkland, WA
Arthur Nelson, Bellevue, WA
Donald Staunton, Kirkland, Washington
Maria Sikorski, Kirkland, Washington
Paul Gibbons, Bellevue, WA
Kelli Dole, Kirkland, WA
Audrey Watanabe, Kirkland, WA
Chuck Curran, Kirkland, Washington
Deborah Miller, Kirkland, WA
Dan Walker, Kirkland, WA
Hannah Coan, Kirkland, WA
Robert Maddox, Kirkland, Washington
Karen Rasmussen, Kirkland, WA
dean wilson, kirkland, wa
Kirk McEwan, Bellevue, WA
Judith Radloff, Kirkland, WA
Jeff MacDuff, Kirkland, WA
Gary Fritchman, Kirkland, WA
Marianne Smernis, Kirkland, WA
Gary Roberts, Kirkland, WA.
Marypat Meuli, Kirkland, WA
Charles McCollgan, Kirkland, WA
Ileana Leuca, Bellevue, WA
Liat Ni,v,-Rogozinski Bellevue WA
Ron Rogozinski, Bellevue, WA
Ioan Leuca, Bellevue, WA
Marie Maddox, Kirkland, WA
Marcus Saxon, Kirkland, WA
Dave McKee, Kirkland, WA
Gary Greenberg, Kirkland, WA
Sharon Riddle, Kirkland, Washington
Georgine Foster, Kirkland, WA
Emily Brooks, Kirkland, WA
Brian Staples, Kirkland, WA
### General Public Comments

For Comments Received on PSRC/ST BNSF Eastside Corridor Commuter Rail Feasibility Study, per SHB 3224

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Comment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Gary Greenberg, Nov. 19th Adv. Meeting</td>
<td>Concern with ridership estimate compared to WSDOT estimate mentioned in Phase I report (1800-1900 daily?) between Tukwila and Kirkland.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Gary Greenberg, Nov. 19th Adv. Meeting</td>
<td>How many riders will service in the corridor take off of traditional transit? (Appears to be asking, &quot;How many 'New Riders'?&quot;)</td>
<td>Not clear that forecast technique could answer this. Not relevant to the question of &quot;feasibility.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Gary Greenberg, Nov. 19th Adv. Meeting</td>
<td>How many bicycle commuters will use the trail?</td>
<td>Forecast technique cannot answer this. This could be the subject of future study. King County provided data regarding use of other trails. This was included in the report as illustrative information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Gary Greenberg, Nov. 19th Adv. Meeting</td>
<td>How many bicycle commuters will use the train?</td>
<td>Forecast technique cannot answer this. This could be the subject of future study. Sound Transit provided data regarding Sounder rider patronage and bicycle commuters which was included in the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Gary Greenberg, Nov. 19th Adv. Meeting</td>
<td>What is the travel time from Snohomish to Bellevue? (And other sections?)</td>
<td>Travel time was added to the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Various, Nov. 19th Adv. Meeting</td>
<td>Expand the comparison of the rail costs to peer systems.</td>
<td>Information about costs of peer commuter rail systems was added to the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Doug Edwards Nov. 27th email</td>
<td>Commit (support) on the BNSF eastside rail/trail corridor proposal</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Doug Edwards Nov. 27th email</td>
<td>Commuter rail/bike trail option makes sense...especially if there were bus links to popular destinations.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. Bus connections would be a topic for the next study to evaluate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Doug Edwards Nov. 27th email</td>
<td>it would be possible to complete the bike trail quickly then close it in sections if the rail portion is constructed.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response/Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 George &amp; Diana Pressley</td>
<td>...request to include pedestrian and bicycle access in whatever option is selected.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 John Worthington</td>
<td><strong>LevX</strong> (alternative mode of magnetic levitation using a fixed guideway) was made for the eastside rail corridor...fraction of the cost...can be linked to affordable parking...elevated so corridor can be used for both transportation and recreation.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Megan Sweaters, Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>A Federal Government grant for rebuilding of the track and bridges along the Eastside Rail Corridor would likely be a source of funding.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. Funding source could be considered by a group proposing commuter rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Megan Sweaters, Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td><strong>Train Depots</strong>, located in central town areas, would be replicas of the original town depot of the late 19th century...</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. Could be considered by a group proposing commuter rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Megan Sweaters, Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td><strong>Train Depots</strong> would be located at the PSRC study terminal site locations with <strong>Whistle Stops</strong> located at other locations. Both the train depots and whistle stops would be located within the 100's right-of-way with the traditional train depots typically not more than 30 feet deep.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. Could be considered by a group proposing commuter rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Megan Sweaters, Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>Funding would be obtained through a joint partnership between Sound Transit and community leaders within communities along the Eastside Rail Corridor. The partnership would be created through a Limited Liability Company (LLC) with 50% interest held by Sound Transit and 50% interest held by community leaders through a Private Subscription process. The newly formed LLC would obtain a ground lease from the Port of Seattle for the Train Depot/Whistle Stop property locations and provide funding for the cost of building the respective structures, parking and platforms with coordination of the Historical Society, which also may provide investors historical tax credits for their investment.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. Could be considered by a group proposing commuter rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Megan Sweaters, Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>Following the historical vision of my proposal, locomotives would be used to transport passenger cars along the Eastside Rail Corridor. Possibly historic coal-fired steam-powered locomotives could run by means of “green” coal technology.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. Could be considered by a group proposing commuter rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response/Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Sweeters, Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>Funding for the vehicles could come from a newly formed 501(c)(3). ...nonprofit organization would be to support regional rail transportation including the cost of the vehicles and on-going maintenance of the rail lines. Naming opportunities for the locomotives and rail cars, along with matching funding provided by Sound Transit, would provide the source of funding.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. Could be considered by a group proposing commuter rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Sweeters, Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>With...removal of Wilburton Tunnel,... I would recommend a demonstration project that would run commuter rail service from Snohomish to Bellevue with three Train Depots at Snohomish, Woodinville and Bellevue and Whistle Stops at Matby and 85th Ave in Kirkland.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. Could be considered by a group proposing commuter rail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Cushman Dec. 9th, 2008 Memo</td>
<td>Rail Feasibility. The results of the study appear consistent with most prior studies conducted over the past 10-15 years regarding options and opportunities for additional transportation uses for this eastside BNSF corridor.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Cushman Dec. 9th, 2008 Memo</td>
<td>...a basic cost-effectiveness analysis of technical findings comparing cost estimates and ridership potential leads one to conclude that these relatively low (and even optimistic) rail ridership projections (5,000 - 6,000 daily) hardly warrant the significant expense for commuter rail. It would be interesting to ask for a cost-per-daily riders calculation. This is still a good bus corridor and as it already has high frequency bus service, it would seem redundant to put in rail at these high costs.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. A daily ridership of 5,000 would put the proposed corridor in the top 20 bus routes in the 4 county region with a daily ridership of 6,000 putting the corridor in the top 10 bus routes (ref. 2006 4 County Bus Route Analysis for Destination 2030 Update). Annualized capital cost per trip table was included in the final report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Cushman Dec. 9th, 2008 Memo</td>
<td>Given this corridor has been recommended to eventually include trail + rail, a true sense of the most &quot;feasible&quot; initial option could be found by calculating the probable cost per daily multi-use trail trip (non-auto trip, i.e. bicyclists and pedestrians).</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. Could be considered in a future study, not part of the scope of the Commuter Rail Feasibility Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Cushman Dec. 9th, 2008 Memo</td>
<td>One problematic assumption in the study suggested no need for the trail in BNSF corridor south of I-90 because there is an existing trail. Please consult WSDOT's adopted I-405 South corridor EIS and design studies for this freeway section as the current trail south of Coal Creek Parkway down to north Renton will be the right hand travel lane of the future expansion of I-405.</td>
<td>Study coordinated with WSDOT on proposed I-405 Trail south of I-90. Report was updated to include the cost of a rail in the south part of the corridor between south Bellevue and Renton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response/Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Cushman Dec. 9th, 2008 Memo</td>
<td>Given regional and local policies to provide effective alternatives to auto travel, and the concerns to reduce VMT to deal with climate change, it seems the region would be wise to advocate to immediately begin eastside BNSF trail development.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Larsen Dec. 4th, 2008 Email</td>
<td>In general I thought it (2008 BNSF Study) was a well thought out report.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Larsen Dec. 4th, 2008 Email</td>
<td>Page 30 I had concern with the conclusion that there is no future potential to support TOD based on existing land uses.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. The TOD section was revised to clarify that some stations do have potential for TOD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Larsen Dec. 4th, 2008 Email</td>
<td>Page 54 on your ridership forecast, was the growth of the University of Washington Bothell campus taken into consideration for the ridership to Woodinville?</td>
<td>No, not specifically. The 3 park and rides in Woodinville were assumed to provide access to UW Bothell for the basis of this conceptual study. Overall ridership was assumed to grow at a 2% rate to 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sarah Larsen Dec. 4th, 2008 Email | **...typo nits you may not have caught yet:**
  a. Page 27 and page 52 don't agree on # of parking facilities for three Woodinville stops.
  b. Page 60 Table 5.3, how can peak and all day numbers be compared? It seems like apples and oranges. If some routes only operate at peak, then only peak data should be used for all routes, or the data should be on two separate tables.
  c. Pg 38, I believe a third party operator has already been determined (http://www.portseattle.org/news/press/2008/09/25/20080925_factsheet.shtml) although the details haven't been worked out | a. Corrected in final report.
b. Comment acknowledged. Data in the table is for context, not decision-making. The Eastside Commuter Rail ridership estimates are strong all day, with less of a peak ridership than on the Sounder routes, so both peak and off-peak data are useful comparisons.
c. Correct. Report was corrected. |
<p>| Thomas Payne, GNP Railway, Inc. Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter (note: GNP selected as TPO by BNSF in Sept 08) | During the actual working phase of the study, we (GNP Railway) were not contacted either by Sound or Parsons Brinkerhoff, which,...would appear to be a significant defect. | Mr. Payne and other staff from GNP Railway participated in the Snohomish Stakeholders meetings held during the Summer 2008 as well as commenting during the Public Comment section at all three Ad Hoc Advisory Committee Meetings held at PSRC. GNP's agreement with Snohomish County was referenced in the Phase 1 Technical Memorandum: Review of Previous Plans, Studies and Other Documents. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Comment</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Payne, GNP Railway, Inc. Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>We (GNP) find the menu of costs .... significantly overstated. Both our research and that of Cascadia indicate that the actual costs to be less than half of those presented.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. The cost estimates are on the high end of the range of other commuter rail projects in the Western US. These costs were developed using Sound Transit's ST 2 methodology which was reviewed and approved by an independent expert review panel. Please refer to the list of assumptions in the report upon which the capital cost estimates for a representative system were based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Payne, GNP Railway, Inc. Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>The operating and planning practices contemplated and prescribed are designed to produce the highest cost solutions in all cases with the greatest delay.</td>
<td>A single representative operating plan was utilized in the study as a starting point for establishing feasibility of commuter rail on the corridor and individual segments. This study found those segments and the overall corridor to be feasible for commuter rail. A group proposing commuter rail on the corridor would likely develop and optimize an operating plan to best fit an initial operating segment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Payne, GNP Railway, Inc. Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>It was noted that a commercial service provider could realize significantly lower costs. We would request that this significant finding be appropriately addressed in the summary which will accompany the report.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. The report notes that it may be possible to implement commuter rail on the corridor differently and at a cost lower than the estimate developed for the representative system included in the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Agnew Cascadia Institute Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>We do not find any fault with the accuracy of the (costs) estimates.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Agnew Cascadia Institute Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>We urge that when explaining the cost estimates, language be added similar to that found in the slide presentation made in explaining the estimates to the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee. That presentation stated that the study did not identify the optimal solution or the preferred alternative nor the lowest cost or most cost-effective option. We understand that the $1.23 billion total to rebuild the corridor represents the upper limit of what could be expended.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. This language was added to the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response/Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Agnew</td>
<td>In our opinion, some review and prioritization of the PSRC/ST cost estimates seem warranted. We suggest the inclusion of improved descriptions of the basis and philosophies on which the estimates are based. We also feel that a description of the &quot;interrelatedness&quot; of the cost estimates should be discussed. (One prime example is the number and location of stations)</td>
<td>This is beyond the scope and limited by the available time to complete the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia Institute</td>
<td>Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Agnew</td>
<td>The PSRC/ST (track) cost is 80 percent higher than that estimated by Cascadia. We cannot understand the discrepancy and believe a review of the track replacement costs are in order.</td>
<td>See Comment #30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia Institute</td>
<td>Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Agnew</td>
<td>Cascadia and PSRC/ST analysis used different logic in placing the location of their sidings. Cascadia sought to place their sidings between stations while PSRC/ST sought to locate their sidings at stations. The PSRC/ST data is insufficient to identify the cost impacts of these different approaches, but significant cost reductions would be obtainable.</td>
<td>See Comment #30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia Institute</td>
<td>Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Agnew</td>
<td>The PSRC/ST did not identify the cost of drainage work. Since the ST2 project will be new construction, it is possible that ST does not have an item for &quot;updated&quot; drainage work in their standard cost library.</td>
<td>Correct. The &quot;Guideway: At-grade semi-exclusive (allows cross-traffic)&quot; includes drainage as part of the build-up costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia Institute</td>
<td>Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Agnew</td>
<td>The PSRC/ST approach to the trestles was to replace the individual pieces showing signs of stress. The percentage of replacement ranged from 30 to 50 percent. This approach to the trestles is not consistent with the avowed standard of permanent level of infrastructure investment quality, but would be both cheaper and expedient. At minimum the final study report should provide a range of costs and identify different &quot;philosophies&quot; involving this and other bridge replacement costs.</td>
<td>A detailed bridge evaluation and replacement costing/upgrades would be a topic for a future study. Since the trestle was in the floodplain, a minimal upgrade approach was taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia Institute</td>
<td>Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response/Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Bruce Agnew Cascadia Institute Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>The PSRC/ST study declared the condition of the Snohomish River bridge to be &quot;poor&quot;.....The study did not identify the load rating of this bridge, despite so doing for most of the other steel or concrete bridges. The ST consultant did not inspect the steel portion of the structure, instead they chose to &quot;write-it-off&quot; and assign it to trail use (page 17). This is indefensible considering that by simply cantilevering a wider than railroad standard walkway, the trail could be carried on the existing structure and both could enter the downtown area with minimum disruption.</td>
<td>Due to the short study timeframe, Sound Transit's consultant had very limited access to the BNSF's bridge records and their bridge engineers had only a limited hi-rail visit to the corridor. The Snohomish River bridge is not within the Port of Seattle's purchase and had even less bridge data available. With a &quot;poor&quot; rating for the Snohomish River bridge, it was determined that for costing purposes it would be prudent to cost a new bridge for the commuter rail. In future studies, with more bridge structural data and detailed inspection results, a joint use of the existing bridge may be determined to be feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Bruce Agnew Cascadia Institute Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>A current project most comparable to the Wilburton trestle is the 'new Boone High Bridge' that the Union Pacific is building in Iowa....We urge that our suggestion (build a similar bridge to the Boone High Bridge in replacement of the trestle) be identified as a second approach and be included in the final report.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. This is beyond the scope of the study. A detailed bridge evaluation and replacement costing/upgrades could prepared by a group proposing commuter rail on the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Bruce Agnew Cascadia Institute Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>These (bridge) costs may be overly exaggerated by &quot;scrapping&quot; perfectly good structures and using unreasonable, albeit undisclosed, unit costs for everything else.</td>
<td>See responses to Comments # 30 and #40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Bruce Agnew Cascadia Institute Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>The difference in scope (Cascadia's 11 stations vs PSRC/ST's 16) reflects Cascadia's attempt to develop the cost of a 'most likely' system versus PSRC/ST's decision to include stations requested by every jurisdiction along the corridor.</td>
<td>For the Feasibility Study, potential stations were included if they served existing Transit Centers, park and rides, Central Business Districts (CBD's) or existing regional centers. Potential station locations would be part of a proposal for commuter rail on the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response/Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Agnew</td>
<td>...this plan requires that all <strong>transferring passengers</strong> to walk at least 800 feet between a <strong>South Woodinville station</strong> on the Woodinville Subdivision and a South Woodinville station on the Redmond spur. Passengers would have to cross the Woodinville Redmond Road to make this transfer. ..... Time savings gained by reducing redundant mileage for passengers moving south would be more than lost in making this unnecessary walk, often in the rain. Passengers moving north would not save any rail travel time and would be subject to the time loss in making this unnecessary walk. The PSRC/IST scenario would also adversely affect passenger convenience. Adding an 800-foot long &quot;foot transfer&quot;, plus the cost of building low unnecessary stations should be reconsidered.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. This could be considered by a group proposing commuter rail on the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia Institute Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>Various station site optimization suggestions: Renton, Bellevue, Kirkland, Woodinville, Snohomish CBD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Agnew</td>
<td>....Snohomish River Bridge. The PSRC/IST study makes no mention of the need to <strong>purchase right-of-way</strong> into downtown Snohomish and the bridge.</td>
<td>Final report includes this information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia Institute Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>PSRC/IST projects $69.88 M in <strong>construction cost items</strong> in Account Group 40 (Streets and Special Conditions), excluding accounts 40.06 (Pedestrian/bike access and accommodation, landscaping), and 40.07 (Automobile, bus, van accessways, including roads, parking lots). As explained earlier, we believe costs in these other accounts could reasonably be expected to be substantially lower, given that the &quot;reconstruction&quot; of an existing facility is involved.</td>
<td>The conceptual cost estimates included in the report were developed for a representative commuter rail system. These would likely be refined in the future by a group proposing commuter rail on the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Agnew</td>
<td><strong>Roadway Crossing Signals</strong>... PSRC/IST planned to remove the existing crossing protection at public crossings and replace them with more elaborate systems. Normally, a railroad would require the local jurisdiction to install that protection at its own expense, not the railroads. Politically that might not occur in this circumstance, but if that is the reasoning, it should be noted in the report.</td>
<td>The cost estimate developed for the representative system includes upgrades to all at-grade crossings. It may be possible to implement commuter rail in a different manner and potentially reduced cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia Institute Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response/Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Bruce Agnew Cascadia Institute Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td><strong>Private crossings</strong> (for example driveways) existing by contract between the owner of the crossing, typically the landowner who uses it, and the railroad. The cost of protection, typically a stop sign, is borne by the crossing owner. The typical contract provides that the railroad will maintain the crossing surface but at the expense of the owner and that the owner will provide protection and insurance to the railroad. ...It may be unrealistic to assume however, if the railroad were taken over by a public entity even though it continues to be operated as a freight railroad) that the entity would not be expected to pick up these costs. The PSRC/ST estimates however, explicitly planned to install active crossing protection (gates and signals) at all private crossings which has not been the obligation of the BNSF railroad.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Bruce Agnew Cascadia Institute Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>PSRC did not consider...the cost of rebuilding public roadway crossings surfaces in the item <em>Crossing Surfaces</em> which covers only public crossings.</td>
<td>The grade crossing surfaces are assumed in Category 10.02 Guideway: At-grade semi-exclusive (allows cross-traffic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Bruce Agnew Cascadia Institute Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>...PSRC/ST's $69.34 M for line side signals, budget line 50.01 (<em>Train Control and Signals</em>), is over 10 times our estimate, and should be validated.</td>
<td>The Train Control and Signals includes positive train control systems such as Cab Signals, which tend to be more expensive. With the recent change in FRA standards on this topic, a conservative approach is recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Bruce Agnew Cascadia Institute Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>After our estimates were made we found out that the Escondido shop had cost $25 M. We believe that the shop costs should be increased to $29.5 M (from the current estimate of $17.99 M)</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Bruce Agnew Cascadia Institute Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>The PSRC/ST estimate reflects a complete and total replacement. We urge that the PSRC/ST costs be identified in that way in the report and that other cost &quot;options&quot;, as those we have identified, also be mentioned.</td>
<td>See response to Comment #34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Bruce Agnew Cascadia Institute Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td>As a general comment, Cascadia believes that the trail cost estimates included in this study may be accurate and are comprehensive and complete, but reflect the top end maximum cost that a trail within the corridor could cost.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response/Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Agnew</td>
<td>We believe that the study report should clearly indicate the extensive nature of the &quot;higher costs (trail) option&quot;. This 29' wide option, proposed by King County Parks Division, would be three times wider than most of the Burke-Gilman Trail, would be wider than a normal two lane road, and be double the standard width pedestrian/bike trail adopted by the national RailsToTrails Conservancy in their publication 'Trails for the 21st Century'.</td>
<td>The study's focus is on the feasibility of commuter rail in the corridor. King County and Snohomish County will make decisions about trail widths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Agnew</td>
<td>We believe these examples (Austin, TX trail study and Oceanside/Escendo, CA trail with rail) indicate higher than average cost for trail development in the BNSF corridor and urge the inclusion of qualifying language in the final report.</td>
<td>Comment acknowledged. Additional language and costs will be added to the final report concerning the section of the trail south of I-90.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 5th, 2008 Letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>