
From: Roger Pence [mailto:rpence@cablespeed.com]
Sent: Tue 10/31/2006 10:59 PM
To: Swenson, Michael/BOI
Subject: Comments on SR 520 DEIS

I tried mightily to make your complicated Web comment system work, but alas, I could not get it to accept my comments. I work on a late-model Mac.

Please accept the following comments via this email message. Thank you.

I-1068-001 I am completely opposed to the Pacific St. interchange version because of the obvious detrimental impacts on the Arboretum and the wetlands and waterways to the north of the Arboretum. It is entirely too much concrete, too tall, too massive, and too widespread over the water. No funding plan is in place for this, the most expensive alternative.

This alternative also removes entirely the existing connection with Montlake Blvd. south of the Montlake Bridge. Traffic from SR 520 that now goes south on Montlake Blvd will have to cross the Montlake Bridge, whereas under the current design it does not. That traffic will also have a longer and more circuitous route.

Traffic destined from Montlake Blvd to and from the west (Portage Bay viaduct) will also have another MUCH longer and more circuitous route.

I cannot grasp what the designers had in mind with they laid out these lanes and intersections. Are they deliberately trying to aggravate motorists?

I-1068-002 Recommendations:
1. Design and build a 6-lane facility with 4 GP lanes and 2 HOV lanes, generally in the configuration of the original corridor. Limit the footprint to the smallest possible.
2. Widen the Montlake Bridge from 4 to 6 lanes, and do that in a way that preserves 100 percent of the current bridge design. The rebuilt bridge should appear exactly as it does today, only wider by enough to accommodate six 11-foot lanes.
3. Instead of the massive Pacific St. exit facility, provide only two HOV lanes from the new SR 520 bridge to Pacific St. This will simplify the Husky Stadium interchange and provide fewer impacts to Sound Transit's Link light rail station. Providing direct HOV access from the UW campus to eastbound SR 520 will enhance HOV service between the campus and the East Side and more importantly, NOT provide a similar and unwarranted improvement for SOV traffic.

I-1068-003 I appreciate the work that local communities on each side of the lake have put into this project, but taxpayers from around the region and state will be paying for it, not just the locals. Outside of the local communities, citizens have NOT had adequate opportunities to weigh in on this enormously important project. That is regrettable.

-Roger Pence-
Beacon Hill (Seattle)

I-1068-001

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

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

I-1068-002

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-1068-003

Comment Summary:

Coordination with Other Transportation Projects

Response:

See Section 1.0 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.