

Online Comment by User: DWashington

Submitted on: 9/18/2006 2:06:00 PM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-1

Address: , , 98115

Comment:

I-0167-001 | I support additional funding for quiet pavement if effective and technically feasible, as a number of residences remain above Federal noise abatement criteria even with the Project's proposed noise mitigation.

I-0167-002 | I support additional funding for translucent and/or curved noise walls, if effective and technically feasible, with a surface treatment that discourages graffiti.

I-0167-003 | I support a modest toll surcharge at the Arboretum ramps to cap traffic volumes through the Arboretum at an acceptable level while raising funds for the Arboretum Master Plan, including restoration of the Foster Island loop trail.

I-0167-004 | I support creating a "northern gateway" to the Arboretum at the Montlake lid.

Comment Category: Comments on Construction Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-1

Comment:

I-0167-005 | The entire project needs to be funded and built as one stage. If you try to build it as a partial project, there will be funding for 6 lanes across the lake and then nothing else - no mitigation, no Pacific Interchange. In other words, a disaster for those of us who live north of the Montlake Cut.

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Comment:

I-0167-006 | I support the Pacific Interchange option for SR 520, and oppose all other DEIS alternatives.

Advantages of Pacific Interchange:

Pacific Interchange is the only option that offers a fast and reliable link from buses to light rail at UW, linking two \$3 billion transportation projects. Pacific Interchange is the only option that fixes the Montlake Bridge bottleneck, saving up to 20 minutes for trips from University Village to SR 520. Pacific Interchange is the only option that allows for the restoration of a continuous greenbelt with trails from Portage Bay to the Arboretum, including a Montlake lid park that reconnects the Montlake neighborhood. Pacific

I-0167-001

Comment Summary:

Noise Walls

Response:

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

I-0167-002

Comment Summary:

Noise Walls

Response:

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

I-0167-003

Comment Summary:

Tolling Scenarios, Pricing, and Revenue

Response:

See Section 3.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0167-004

Comment Summary:

Arboretum (Concerns)

Response:

See Section 9.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0167-005

Comment Summary:

Schedule

I-0167-006

Interchange offers the greatest mobility of all the project alternatives, at a reasonable cost, in a way that would improve livability in Seattle neighborhoods.

Disadvantages of 4 lane alternative:

The 4 lane alternative, which is actually 5 lanes across Portage Bay, would fail to provide HOV speed and reliability. The impacts to McCurdy Park and East Montlake Park, as well as the total number of support columns for the highway, are greater with the 4 lane alternative than with Pacific Interchange.

Disadvantages of Base 6 lane alternative:

The Base 6 lane alternative, which is actually 9 lanes across Portage Bay, has a number of critical flaws. As with the 4 lane alternative, it is impossible to make a lid that reconnects Montlake neighborhood with the base 6 lane alternative. There are also far fewer mitigation opportunities for parks impacts of the Base 6 alternative versus Pacific Interchange.

Disadvantages of Second Bascule Bridge option:

This option has most of the disadvantages of the Base 6 lane alternative, and in addition would cause additional irreparable damage to the setting of historic Montlake Bridge, the historic Olmsted-designed boulevard, and the historic Montlake neighborhood, while failing to provide meaningful benefits for traffic congestion and transit speed and reliability. Drawbridge openings would continue to interfere with transit and cause massive traffic backups. The Portage Bay Viaduct would still be 8 lanes wide.

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-1

Comment:

I-0167-007

I support additional funding for quiet pavement if effective and technically feasible, as a number of residences remain above Federal noise abatement criteria even with the Project's proposed noise mitigation.

I support additional funding for translucent and/or curved noise walls, if effective and technically feasible, with a surface treatment that discourages graffiti.

I support a modest toll surcharge at the Arboretum ramps to cap traffic volumes through the Arboretum at an acceptable level while raising funds for the Arboretum Master Plan, including restoration of the Foster Island loop trail.

Response:

See Section 4.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0167-006

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

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

I-0167-007

Comment Summary:

Noise Walls

Response:

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

I-0167-008 | I support creating a “northern gateway” to the Arboretum at the Montlake lid.

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-1

Comment:

I-0167-009 | I am concerned over 3-5 year closure of Lake Washington Blvd. ramps. Please seek a way to shrink this timeframe and come up with a detailed traffic mitigation plan.

I support improvements (sidewalk repaving, etc.) to Montlake Blvd. and 24th Ave. E (Montlake neighborhood business district) at least to Boyer St. as a form of mitigation for construction effects from closure of Lake Washington Blvd. and long term effects of increased traffic volumes on this major arterial due to SR 520 expansion.

I-0167-010 | I support improvements to South Portage Bay Park and the Montlake Playfield as mitigation for construction impacts in the Portage Bay area, with a continuous waterfront trail all the way from Everett St. on Portage Bay to Foster Island on Union Bay.

I-0167-008

Comment Summary:

Arboretum (Concerns)

Response:

See Section 9.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0167-009

Comment Summary:

Traffic Management (Construction)

Response:

See Section 4.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0167-010

Comment Summary:

Park Effects

Response:

See Section 9.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.