
From: Dave Martin [<mailto:bcompany6@comcast.net>]
Sent: Fri 9/22/2006 1:29 PM
To: Krueger, Paul W (UCO)
Subject: 520 critique.doc

Hello:

The attachment contains comments regarding SR520 & DEIS.

David Martin
Paul Demetriades

September 21, 2006

To: SR520 WSDOT Comments Requested

CC: Medina City Council

Subject: Comments regarding SR520 HOV and Bridge Replacement Project, Draft EIS, Executive Summary dated August 18, 2006, and other selected supporting documents.

- I-0480-001** As residents of Medina and participants in numerous SR520 meetings; the SR520 Design Advisory Group; WRIA 8 Forum, we submit the following comments:
- 1 The recent release of revised cost estimates (upward) suggest that the financing assumptions and the related toll rates need serious review. The upward revision calls into question the scope of the most costly alternative (6 lanes and the Pacific Ave. Interchange), as well as the other choices.
- I-0480-002** WSDOT should study further the Seattle Communities proposed submersible tunnel/tube due to its reduced environmental impact, and should be included as an option for consideration to the preferred study choice as proposed by the Seattle neighborhoods.
- I-0480-003** Quiet pavement should be utilized on all alternative bridge/roadway choices.
- I-0480-004** WSDOT must study and adopt the contents/approach of the SR520 Project Corridor Aesthetics Handbook, dated August 30, 2006, which emphasizes neighborhood context sensitive solutions for the project design. WSDOT should proceed with LEED principles for roadway projects.
- I-0480-005** WSDOT plans must specify compliance with site based actions as stated in the Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed (WRIA8) Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan, dated November 12, 2004. Does the SR520DEIS Water Resource design document comply? WSDOT should restore all wetlands disturbed in the construction process.
- I-0480-006** WSDOT should consider reducing lane widths from 12' to 11' (subject to FHA approval) to reduce neighborhood impacts. Shoulder widths should be also being considered for narrowing. Both of the above would reduce cost(s)
- I-0480-007** WSDOT should reconsider the requirement for bicycle/pedestrian access on the 520 Bridge. Are there any estimates of how many bicycles would use the additional 14' in width required to accommodate them? Current larger bicycle racks on the Sound Transit/Metro King County busses should be able solve this question at much less cost.
- I-0480-008** Current existing transit stops at Evergreen Point Road and 92nd St. should be maintained.
- I-0480-009** Any property acquisitions to be the full lot, not slivers; unless the property owner agrees otherwise. Any lot thus created would be considered to be a conforming lot for building permit purposes.
- I-0480-010** During any construction, the hours of work must conform to the local municipality's rules regarding the time of day that work can be done.
- I-0480-011** As SR520 is considered vulnerable to earthquake damage, can incremental safety fixes be made to the current hollow columns e.g., while the project is being considered?

David E. Martin
Paul Demetriades

I-0480-001

Comment Summary:

Funding

Response:

See Section 3.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0480-002

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

See Section 1.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0480-003

Comment Summary:

Noise Walls

Response:

See Section 12.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0480-004

Comment Summary:

Context Sensitive Solutions

Response:

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

I-0480-005

Comment Summary:

Water Resource Effects During Operation

Response:

See Section 15.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0480-006

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0480-007

Comment Summary:

Bicycle/Pedestrian Path

Response:

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

I-0480-008

Comment Summary:

Eastside Concerns

Response:

See Section 24.0 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0480-009

Comment Summary:

Property Acquisitions

Response:

See Section 6.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0480-010

Comment Summary:

Noise and Vibration During Construction

Response:

See Section 12.4 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0480-011

Comment Summary:

Alternatives Development

Response:

See Section 1.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.