

Online Comment by User: paullippert

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 3:57:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-12

Address: 522 31st Ave E, Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

I-0782-001 | I favor the alternatives that provide the most capacity for multi-occupant vehicles, i.e. buses and carpools. With only 4 lanes, bus and carpool traffic has little if any advantage over single-occupant cars, and congestion will only get worse for all.

The six-lane options seem absolutely necessary to address not just current but future congestion.

I-0782-002 | The graphics about current congestion do not include congestion on southbound I-5 in the afternoons caused by people entering I-5 at 45th or 50th and then crossing all lanes of traffic to get to the 520 westbound. Several of the design alternatives, especially Pacific St, address this source of chronic congestion.

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-49

Comment:

I-0782-003 | I walk almost every day in the Arboretum. Traffic noise in the Arboretum is already so loud, mostly from Lake Washington Blvd running through the park but also from the current 520 traffic, that I believe all of the design alternatives will likely have little impact on noise levels, or may even reduce noise somewhat for pedestrians and visitors.

Noise abatement for the new 520 will likely help make the northernmost part of the Arboretum a bit more quiet, but I think the only way to significantly reduce overall traffic noise in the Arboretum is to change the road material of Lk Wash Blvd, or to significantly restrict traffic. How about one weekend day closed (like Rock Creek Parkway in Washington, DC) as a beginning?

I-0782-001

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0782-002

Comment Summary:

Freeway Operations (I-5 Area)

Response:

See Section 5.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0782-003

Comment Summary:

Arboretum (Concerns)

Response:

See Section 9.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.