

VERBAL COMMENT #1

I-187-001

VICTOR ODLIVAK: My name is Victor Odlivak.

I have lived 21 years in Seattle, Washington and Wallingford. I've been a bicyclist/vehiclist for 25 years. I say the word "bicyclist/vehiclist" with intention. My bicycle is as big as a BMW. It can carry passengers, and has a 7-and-a-half-foot wheel base and it is 4-feet wide.

It's really important that we do everything we can to encourage cycling and pedestrians. All of these plans involve more cars, more pollution, more waste.

I think the best and the simplest thing to do is take what you have now, make one lane in each direction be bicycles on each side, and then you have the two lanes left over, which you currently have. You have one lane in each direction with your bus and your high occupancy vehicles. That's it.

I-187-002

So only buses and high occupancy vehicles, you know, two or more people, should go on that bridge. And bikes in each direction. Nothing more. To do anything else, will just increase the pollution.

If you did this, there would be a great increase in ridership. The reason so many people — just to go to Kirkland or Bellevue, it's not even 10

I-187-001

The Preferred Alternative includes a 14-foot-wide bicycle/pedestrian path along the north side of SR 520 through the Montlake area and across the Evergreen Point Bridge to the Eastside. Regarding the suggestion in the comment of converting two of the vehicle lanes in the 6-lane alternative for use by bicycles and pedestrians, as described in Section 1.8 of the SDEIS and in Attachment 8 of the SDEIS, Range of Alternatives and Options Evaluated, the transportation analysis performed for the Draft EIS showed that while a 4-lane alternative would improve safety by replacing vulnerable structures and widening lanes and shoulders, it would not satisfy the project purpose of improving mobility in the SR 520 corridor. In 2010, based on SDEIS comments regarding a transit-optimized 4-lane alternative or a 4-lane alternative with tolling for congestion management, WSDOT evaluated these potential alternatives using an updated traffic model. The results showed that these alternatives would provide substantially lower mobility benefits than the 6-Lane Alternative for both general-purpose traffic and transit, and therefore would also not meet the project purpose and need. Section 2.4 of the Final EIS provides more information on the analysis of these alternatives.

I-187-002

WSDOT considered a wide range of alternatives before narrowing them down to those evaluated in the Draft EIS. Reasonable alternatives include those that are practical or feasible from the technical and economic standpoint and using common sense, rather than simply desirable from the standpoint of the applicant. What constitutes a reasonable range of alternatives depends on the nature of the proposal and the facts in each case. FHWA guidance provides additional discussion of the relationship between purpose and need and alternatives consideration, analysis and selection, and states that "alternatives which meet the purpose and need for the project at an acceptable cost and level of environmental impact relative to the

I-187-003

miles. It's 3 and a half miles from University of Washington to Kirkland — is because we do not make it easy for people to use their bicycles.

So, again, very simple. Keep it as it is.

One lane each direction for bikes, with a concrete barrier divide so that the cars and trucks can never

I-187-004

go into the bikes. One lane each direction, buses and high occupancy vehicles only. Do not let single vehicles go across the 520 bridge unless they have a handicapped sticker. But that's it. So that is my proposal.

* * *

benefits which will be derived from the project” should be considered. (<http://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/projdev/tdmneed.asp>)

The Range of Alternatives and Options Evaluated Report, included as Attachment 7 in the SDEIS describes the history of alternatives development for the SR 520 corridor and provides the framework, context, and supporting details for understanding how the project has evolved. It also explains the screening that has occurred to narrow and define the scope of the alternatives and the legislative actions that have influenced the project. The information contained in this report was summarized in pages 1-9 through 1-22 of the SDEIS.

In the Trans-Lake Washington Study, a 47-member stakeholder group evaluated a broad range of potential modes and routes for crossing Lake Washington. The concepts the group considered included new project corridors (for example, a crossing from Sand Point to Kirkland); different crossing methods, such as tubes and tunnels; new travel modes, such as ferries or rail; and the management of travel demand through tolling or land use changes. One of options considered was a bus only configuration. That option was evaluated and screened early in the process because it would cause substantial diversion to other corridors thus increasing congestion throughout the remainder of the freeway system. After all the concepts were screened, the most promising were combined into “solution sets,” which ultimately formed the basis for the alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS (page 1-10 in the SDEIS).

I-187-003

See the response to comment I-187-001.

I-187-004

Comment noted.