

From: [Larry Sinnott](#)
To: [SR 520 DEIS Comments:](#)
CC: [Krueger, Paul W \(UCO\):](#)
Subject: 520 DEIS Comments
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2006 1:19:47 AM
Attachments: [Sinnott_520_DEIS.doc](#)

Mr. Krueger,

The attached Word document is my comment on your SR 520 DEIS.

--
See Ya'

Lawrence A. (Larry) Sinnott, Assoc. AIA
M. Arch. + Urb. Design, UW '99
206-523-1465 renzo-1@comcast.net
* * * * *

Project Architect
JM Architects, Kirkland, WA
425-820-3748 larry@jmarchitectsnw.com
* * * * *

Board Member: Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks (FSOP)
Board Member: Ravenna-Bryant Community Association (RBCA)
RBCA Rep: SR 520 Seattle Stakeholders Advisory Committee
* * * * *

*** eSafe1 scanned this email and found no malicious content ***
*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***

WSDOT - SR 520 Project
Paul Krueger, Environmental Manager
414 Olive Way, Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98101

Re: Comments on SR 520 DEIS

Dear Mr. Krueger,

I-1085-001 I am extremely opposed to the so-called "Pacific St" Interchange, which is in fact 90 feet above Marsh Is. in the Washington Park Arboretum. This plan is the most outrageous NIMBY-ism ever seriously considered. The Shelby-Hamlin community would reap all of the benefits, while the Arboretum and the UW would suffer all of the degradation, and the public would pay the extra billion dollars in cost. All for extremely marginal traffic gains!

I-1085-002 You have not optimized the 4-lane and base-6-lane alternatives for bus reliability. You have given Pacific St. dedicated bus ramps and signal priority, but not the other alternatives. This absolutely invalidates your comparisons for bus connections to the future light rail station! A second drawbridge with lane restrictions for the other alternatives would show **no inherent advantage** for mass transit in your Pacific St. plan.

I strongly recommend the following options for either the 4-lane or base-6-lane alternative;

- 1) no ramps into the WP Arboretum! (mitigations identified in your 2002 report are designed into the current base-6-lane plan) The single most environmentally effective option for all alternatives!
- 2) a **second draw bridge** along side the existing one, sensitively designed, (with lane restrictions and bus signal priority)
- 3) no bus flier stops at Montlake, (narrower footprint in Montlake and Portage Bay, and you already know this!)
- 4) a bus only westbound center lane off-ramp with signal priority at the new light signal (separating buses from HOV, which will eventually overwhelm them)

Item 4 is also instead of the "braided" ramps in the base-6-lane alternative, which puts northbound buses on the far right, only to move to the far left before the Pacific St light (WSDOT's design?!), and there would still be HOV and GP on and off-ramps on both sides, while eastbound buses would merge with HOV. The 4-lane plan should have lids. Taken together, these options in both the 4-lane and base-6-lane alternatives;

- 1) reduce the footprint through Montlake and Portage Bay,
- 2) lower the 6-lane cost, (no braided v. bus only center ramp)
- 3) greatly improve conditions in the Arboretum, (not make worse or remain the same, improve!)
- 4) have equal, or better, bus reliability and connection to the Sound Transit station as "Pacific St/Marsh Is Interchange".

These are the right options for **Seattle's future**.

Lawrence A. (Larry) Sinnott
7043 - 21st Av. NE, Seattle, WA 98115
Member, Seattle Stakeholders Advisory Cmte
Member, SR 520 Advisory Cmte (WSDOT)

I-1085-001

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

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

I-1085-002

Comment Summary:

Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning

Response:

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