

**Online Comment by User: rsb**

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 2:41:00 PM

Comment Category: Parks and Recreation

Comment Location: Chapter-11, Page-4

Address: , , 98004

**Comment:**

**I-0842-001** | In order to minimize the increase in impervious surfaces, has DOT considered installing pervious concrete surfaces on the replacement trails, bike paths, and walkways not subject to oil contamination from vehicular traffic?

**Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects**

**Comment Location: Chapter-9, Page-12**

**Comment:**

**I-0842-002** | As the home owner pictured above that will supposedly benefit from the sound walls in the 4-Lane and 6-Lane Alternatives, I am much more concerned with addressing the articulation of the sound walls to improve the aesthetic aspects of 18 foot high slabs of concrete plunked down next to my house, than I am of the possible sound impacts from the widened freeway alternatives. The EIS claims that initially traffic levels are projected to go down in the short term, due to the effects of tolls driving commuters to use other alternatives. None of the illustrations and plans I have seen so far have made an effort to show affected property owners sufficient detail as to proposed sound wall location, illustrate any sound mitigating surface treatments to the wall itself, sensitivity to minimizing views lost by varying wall heights to in certain locations, serious discussion of using sound absorbing wall and roadway surface materials, or how stormwater runoff projects affecting adjacent properties will be handled.

**I-0842-001**

**Comment Summary:**

Stormwater Treatment

**Response:**

See Section 15.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0842-002**

**Comment Summary:**

Noise Walls (Aesthetics)

**Response:**

See Section 12.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.