

From: [Laurel Preston](#)
To: [SR 520 DEIS Comments](#)
CC:
Subject: SR520 comments
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2006 9:00:53 PM
Attachments:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the design elements and the Draft EIS for the 520 alternatives.

I-1069-001 1. Metro service
I support preserving as many bus stops as possible. In particular, since I walk to the Evergreen Point Freeway Station and use it on a daily basis for my commute to UW, if that stop were to be eliminated in favor of a stop at 92nd only, then I would probably go back to driving. My current commute is a 3 minute walk to the stop followed by a 10-ish minute bus ride. Having to walk to 92nd would almost double my commute.

Regarding the design for the lid and the metro stop under the 6-lane alternative, developed in conjunction with neighborhood input, I was glad to see at the open house that the stop was located out from under the lid. I would not be comfortable walking down an enclosed staircase or using an elevator to reach the stop. In addition, please keep in mind that the Bellevue Public schools do not provide school bus transportation for high-schoolers; they provide Metro passes for students who will use them. The reason I mention this is that as a parent whose son did use metro, I would have been hesitant to allow him to use an underground stop. As it is currently configured, the path to the stop is visible pretty much all the way from the small drop-off area on Evergreen Point Road. I think this is a feature that would be good to have at any stop.

Practically speaking, the majority of Bellevue High students drive or car-pool; but it would be nice to be able to encourage them to use Metro with safe stops and frequent service conveniently located.

I-1069-002 2. Although I recognize the need to mitigate sound, especially in residential neighborhoods, I just want to say that I am concerned that the visual impact to drivers is negative on balance. In addition, although the areas that have lids in the 6-lane alternative do get the benefit of that reconnection, the expansion of the rest of the highway that isn't lidded simply creates a larger chasm than the one that

I-1069-001

Comment Summary:

Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning

Response:

See Section 2.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1069-002

Comment Summary:

Context Sensitive Solutions

Response:

See Section 10.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1069-002 | already exists. I feel that the wide footprint will be even more of a detriment than the current footprint.

Laurel Preston
Medina, WA
425-462-8907
laurelpr@seanet.com