

To: City of Bainbridge Island
Christine Brown, City Clerk
Annie Hillier, Planning & Community Development,

January 26, 2018

Dear Ms. Brown and Ms. Hillier,

This is commentary regarding the project: Miller Rd Shoulder SUR PLN51009. It is being submitted on January 26, 2018 via email. Please confirm receipt by email. Thank you.

The Notice of Application/SEPA Comment Period is too vague and does not provide information as to who and how the public should submit commentary. Thus, a new notice should be constructed and provided with a new appropriate deadline.

The proposed width is unnecessarily too wide. The Notice does not inform the community that the 6-foot width applies to each side of the road. It appears to indicate only 6 ft. total. Thus, the environmental impact cannot be properly assessed by the commentators and there would be more commentators had there been a proper description of the project description.

There is no description of the proposed improvements to existing water storm drainage/water quality systems.

Project information, which is pertinent to the Miller Road shoulder, is absent and there is no reference for the public to access detailed information about the project on-line or otherwise beyond a contact for "any questions". The questions would be generated had the important project information been provided. So apparently the City is not provided key information in order to dissuade folks from commenting.

The prior Core 40 decision should not be such that the design, such as the width cannot be considered. It makes the best environmental sense (to save trees and habitat and to keep the rural environment for the animals and plants and to keep the rural quality of life for the community and property owners and residents and for the greater community) to limit the width as much as possible.

Also, it would be better if only one side of the road was impacted to lessen the overall width and impact to the environment. A safety barrier/rail could be considered and fit into the design in that case. Whereas with lanes on both sides, there is a super high probability for high speed, high impact accidents between cars and bike riders or joggers/walkers. Please keep in mind

that children and mother with strollers and families will use the path along Miller Rd. NE and will be highly suspect to be impacted despite any conservative speed limits for vehicles. There are now more visitors and users of feeder lanes into the Miller Rd. segment and so safety issues are heightened above the time of the prior Core 40 decision making. The number of users for the road and shoulder network for bikes has increased significantly as seen daily.

The bike land width requirements for other similar roads in Washington and other states are narrower and separated from the vehicle roadway by space. Refer to:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/design/manuals/hdm/chp1000.pdf>

Thus, to reduce the environmental impact from a safety standpoint and from a damage to existing plants and animals standpoint and from a keep our rural quality of life standpoint, the bikeway should not be built (best for the environment), or the proposed width should be decreased and only one side of the road should have a bike path. Clearly the word “improvement” does not apply to this project.

There is a runoff problem along Miller road causing erosion to the shoulders and adjacent properties. The increased road surface that this project entails will create greater runoff leading to greater erosion and nearby flooding especially during heavy rains.

There needs to be consideration for the island’s at least 35 at-risk species which we have seen do live along the Miller Rd. area and so will be impacted and killed. Refer to environment expert sources including: <http://naturemappingfoundation.org/natmap/projects/bainbridge/>

The associated impacts and issues of this project such as crosswalks, speed limit, signage, road markings, new traffic rules, etc. are not explained or referred to.

There are growth issues since the Core 40 decision that apply especially to the Miller Rd section that should be newly considered for safety reasons. For example, the increased use of cell phones while driving, the greater propensity for drivers to ignore speed limits, the greater number of tourists, the use of bike lanes by pedestrians, and alternative hard-to-see or maneuver types of vehicles such as very low bikes propelled by hand cranks or pull-handles, etc. Also, what about increased project associated costs?

There is much more traffic along Miller Rd and the connecting roads since the Core 40 decision. A bike lane can lead to greater congestion and does not allow cars to safely pass when one is stalled or pull over when one needs a shoulder to do so. The bike lane will not eliminate cars and the number of cars has increased significantly.

The map on the Notice has a “subject site” with arrow that indicated a point along or next to Miller Rd NE. It does not indicate the full segment of Miller Rd NE that is affected. It does not explain the red line either. How is one to understand when Tolo Rd. and Peterson Hill Rd are not indicated on the tiny map?