

Online Comment by User: kimmrr

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:40:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-12, Page-9

Address: 2310 14th Ave E, Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

I-0658-001 | I was unable to review and comment on the Appendices, They don't appear to be available as part of this draft EIS (I wanted to review "W" in particular).

Will you be providing these online, with an additional review period?

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-11

Comment:

I-0658-002 | Please elaborate on "provisions for high capacity transit". Does this include the roadway being stiff enough to accommodate rail tracks?

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-13

Comment:

I-0658-003 | Of the options, this one is the best choice.
- It minimizes visual impact in Portage Bay (and for all southerly vistas into Portage Bay)
- Along w/ the lid, it makes for a relatively small "visible concrete" footprint in Montlake.
- It more efficiently moves traffic to/from the north side of the cut.
- Allows us to keep the historic small-scale look of the current Montlake bridge over the cut.

However, the Union Bay bridge as you have shown it is quite ugly. I realize that these are conceptual designs, but this visual depiction, and description of it having a number of vertical supports will lead many to vote against this option, solely for the reason that it has such a negative visual impact.

If presented with a beautiful, striking design, I think you would get more support for this smart option.

I propose that you develop more elegant designs for this VERY visible structure that many drivers, boaters, walkers will have to live with on a daily basis. Specifically, use a minimum number of piers and go either with cantilevered or cable stayed supports.

Anotherwords, since we can't hide this new structure from view, then let's make it really beautiful to look at and proud to have in Seattle.

Maybe the best idea is to engage one of the design firms / architets that specializes in the newer cable stayed bridges.

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-9

Comment:

I-0658-004 | Two comments.

I-0658-001

Comment Summary:

Public and Agency Outreach

Response:

See Section 1.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0658-002

Comment Summary:

Light Rail Transit

Response:

See Section 2.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0658-003

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0658-004

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0658-004 | First regarding the 8 lane alternative. The impact of this to the Seattle neighborhoods, and to the Bellevue neighborhoods as well, is too drastic to consider, even without the choke point limitations. Those motorists who use SR520 everyday would clearly prefer it, but there has to be a limit to accomodating personal car use at the expense to our neighborhoods.

Second regarding the width of the 6 lane option. The inside shoulders should be eliminated. Yes, they would be ideal for breakdowns in the HOV lane. But if we eventually install light rail in these lanes, we won't have needed it.

I think the luxury of these extra shoulders for inside lane breakdown contingencies does not outweigh the benefits gained by reducing the width and hence the visual and environmental impact and cost of the 6 lane option.

Comment Category: Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-20

Comment:

I-0658-005 | The lids for the 6 lane option are very important for the reasons stated. An additional consideration is that these lids will directly lead to increased property values and prevent the erosion of property values for those houses that border 520.

Please consider adding lids to the 4 lane option. I won't lobby too hard for this, because I think its clear that the 6 lane option is going to be the right decision. But, if the 4 lane option is selected, it would bring back the property values along 520.

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-24

Comment:

I-0658-006 | Regarding the Madison Park bicycle connection: Both options discussed do indeed improve bicycle connections with Madison Park. However, this is the wrong objective.

Much of the bike traffic connects to points south of Madison Park. Putting it through Mad Park slows it down (Mad Park has lots of small residential streets), and negatively impacts these neighborhoods with this through-traffic.

What makes the most sense is to put this traffic on a bike path through the Arboretum, parallel to L. W. Blvd, where it can connect easily to points south of Mad Park, the Central Area and First Hill. THIS is the option that the neighborhoods pursued in the 1990s. It benefits the most bikers; provides them with the fastest flow; and it keeps the character of Mad Park intact. Furthermore, in regards to these SR520 connections, it resolves the issue by having neither built, and instead, use the connector to LW Blvd.

Comment Category: Second Montlake Bridge

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-27

Comment:

I-0658-007 | This option, even if executed with a bridge that matches the current bridge in design, will visually interfere with it; the Montlake bridge has great character and visual integrity, and a second bridge next to it will give a cluttered industrial look to the Montlake cut.

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-30

Comment:

I-0658-005

Comment Summary:

Economic Effects

Response:

See Section 6.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0658-006

Comment Summary:

Madison Park Bicycle/Pedestrian Connection

Response:

See Section 24.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0658-007

Comment Summary:

Visual Quality Effects

Response:

See Section 10.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

- I-0658-008** | Consider covering the bike lanes over the lake to provide a dry ride on rainy days.
Comment Category: Ecosystems
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-41
Comment:
- I-0658-009** | I think I read that the creation of new wetlands may have to take place elsewhere, such as the Skagit River.
- The wetlands, wildlife habitat, and greenery in general are important to the look and feel of our neighborhoods, and we need to (a) preserve as much as possible, and (b) perform restoration locally. Maybe this requires a solution such as DOT purchasing private property near SR520 and reverting it to wetland / wildlife use. (Consider auction; I'm not proposing eminent domain)
Comment Category: Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-2
Comment:
- I-0658-010** | Making aesthetically pleasing sound walls will be very important, as the visual impact of this big flat sided structure will be substantial. The usual approach is to use patterned concrete. I would propose that DOT work with a leading design firm to find alternatives to simply patterning the walls -- perhaps paintings? Perhaps mixed media using large bolt on wood surfaces which themselves have designs?
- It is important that we find some visually compelling alternatives that complement our city's beautiful natural vistas.
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-4
Comment:
- I-0658-011** | The reduced visual impact to Portage Bay of fewer lanes due to the Pacific Street Option is very important. Already, the visual impact of all the build alternatives is quite negative, so anything to minimize such impact is important.

I-0658-008

Comment Summary:

Bicycle/Pedestrian Path

Response:

See Section 2.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0658-009

Comment Summary:

Wetland Mitigation

Response:

See Section 16.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0658-010

Comment Summary:

Noise Walls (Aesthetics)

Response:

See Section 12.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0658-011

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.