

1

2

STATEMENT OF DWIGHT BAKER

I-0382-001

My name is Dwight Baker. I'm a resident of Kirkland.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm active in transportation matters as an advisor on the King County Transit Advisory Committee and also am a member of the Eastside Transit Sounding Board, and I've been active in engineering for most of my career.

I have some general comments at this point, and I will be offering some further comments during the remainder of the period until the deadline of October 31st. But my primary comments, in general, on the SR 520 project studies are:

One, the work done on the bridge studies and approaches and alternatives at the west end and approaches to the University of Washington campus and to I-5 are very well done.

I have the following general comments. I believe that there should have been a detailed analysis of options to improve the connections at the I-5 west end of the SR 520 corridor where it connects in these studies with a two-lane express lane connection to the lower level where the upper main level, where most of the auto and truck traffic is, does not have any recognition of the inherent design flaws that have existed since I-5 was built. And namely, that is lanes approaching from the east and merging into the east-lane side of I-5 at that surface level and forcing all vehicles with a destination west of I-5 -- and between that merging point and

I-0382-001**Comment Summary:**

Freeway Operations (I-5 Area)

Response:

See Section 5.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0382-001 1 the downtown Seattle area most destinations of people are on
2 the west side, peeling off successively into the different
3 westbound off-ramps. And that's a highly hazardous situation
4 in a half mile for forcing people to cross over a braided
5 crossover of four to five lanes, often in a dangerous
6 situation. And that, I believe, should be incorporated in
7 the studies for I-405 because these are inherent engineering
8 flaws in the deterioration of I-5 since it was built -- would
9 be corrected -- and some of those design flaws would be
10 corrected by providing more overfly and underfly routes for
11 the surface traffic to get to the west side of I-5 properly.

I-0382-002 12 In addition, I am concerned that Sound Transit plans
13 for tunneling under the Mountlake area and building a huge
14 station at Husky Stadium to serve the UW Medical School area
15 and traffic going in the southeast corner of the university
16 and Mountlake is an error which has been imposed by Sound
17 Transit.

18 And I believe they should restudy the option of doing a
19 crossover under the Union Bay area somewhere closer to
20 University Bridge and to access either Brooklyn Avenue area
21 northbound or 15th Avenue with a major station connection
22 close to the west -- northwest end of the university medical
23 campus. And the entire population of travel to that medical
24 school and the entire campus would be served by one major
25 station there, not necessarily clear up at 45th Street. But

I-0382-002**Comment Summary:**

North of Montlake Cut

Response:

See Section 2.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

~~I-0382-002~~ 1 trade studies could be done to merge that and continue on
2 north to Northgate.

3 I think Sound Transit plans are unnecessarily hindering
4 and limiting these engineering studies such as are being done
5 for the SR 520 by WSDOT and Sound Transit and others. So we
6 need to rethink that in my opinion and do some real
7 engineering long-range studies. And also take into account
8 the new financing planning which is imposed by the Seattle
9 viaduct replacement and the seawall replacement and the
10 proposed tunnel option for downtown Seattle and waterfront
11 area.

12 And I'm in favor of that downtown waterfront removal of
13 the viaduct entirely and using a plan which is favored by the
14 City of Seattle and especially with the new estimate of
15 future costs and inflation values which was just released on
16 the 20th of this month and have not been factored into the
17 studies now for this 520 presentation.

~~I-0382-003~~ 18 On the whole, I think it's an excellent job being done
19 on the presentation of studies by the state and the
20 consultants involved. Appreciate this chance to make some
21 comments, and I will do some more detailed comments from the
22 EIS data. I'm happy that you have extended your time limit
23 to the end of October. Thank you very much.

24 [Hearing ended at 7:00 p.m.]

25

I-0382-003

Comment Summary:

Coordination with Other Transportation Projects

Response:

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