

Online Comment by User: pingram

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 12:50:00 PM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-1

Address: , , 98115

Comment:

I-0794-001 Outside of the basic No Change, 4 Lane or 6 Lane options, the alternatives don't appear to consider opportunities to minimize impacts on the Arboretum.

Regardless of the alternatives, the DEIS appears to state a presumption that certain minimum widths and standards are required for the structure without question. For example, why would a new 4-lane bridge, performing largely the same as the old bridge, need to be 60 feet wider as it passes through Portage Bay? Obviously, the existing bridge demonstrates that it is possible to construct a functional facility at a narrower width. While I would agree that some increased width may be appropriate to increase efficiency and safety, how can increase in 60 feet be justified? (Two eight foot shoulders and one ten foot bike lane and divider only add up to 26 feet.) Increases in the facility width and footprint to meet "standards" should not be assumed. To minimize environmental impacts, we should look at ways to reduce those increases as much as possible.

The modifications proposed for I-90 so that it can accommodate light rail will result in reduced lane and shoulder width. Why can't we apply similar reduced land and shoulder widths for SR-520 (which would probably be wider than what's there today)?

DOT should consider 4 and 6 lane replacement options that more closely resemble the current structure's width and footprint.

Comment Category: Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-1

Comment:

I-0794-002 What is being done to make SR-520 attractive? Both the 4 and 6 lane alternatives show large, ugly concrete superstructures with no attempt to be small, slim or attractive in any way. Seek opportunities to limit the amount of concrete. Avoid sound walls, except where essential. Avoid increases in width and footprint, except where essential. Avoid lighting impacts. Create opportunities for natural buffering with replanted vegetation. Create a viewing platform that is part of the ped/bike lane.

Comment Category: Transportation and Traffic

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-1

Comment:

I-0794-003 The 6 lane option should direct the HOV lanes directly to the proposed light rail station.

The Mountlake interchange should be replaced with a Pacific/Stadium bridge and interchange, allowing a reduction in impacts in the Mountlake area and improved traffic connections.

Comment Category: Ecosystems

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-5

I-0794-001

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0794-002

Comment Summary:

Context Sensitive Solutions

Response:

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

I-0794-003

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

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

I-0794-004

Comment:

Why does the 4 lane alternative need to be so much wider than the No Change option? The benefits of additional width at this location (in the Arboretum) aren't worth the impact. The greatest need for additional shoulder space is out in the middle of the bridge where a disabled vehicle doesn't have any place to go. There, the bridge could be wider with little environmental impact. Through the Arboretum, there are several existing shoulder/pull off areas that can usually be used by disabled vehicles. Only increase the width where it is absolutely needed.

Why is the 6 lane alternative 30 feet wider through the Arboretum than the 4 lane alternative. At most, each lane is 12 feet, which adds up to 24 feet for the two additional lanes. Why would the 6 lane configuration need more width than that for the two lanes? Add functionality, but minimize footprint expansion as much as possible.

I-0794-004

Comment Summary:

4-Lane Alternative

Response:

See Section 2.0 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.