



Summary of Written Comments #5
Range: May 22, 2004 – June 2, 2004

173rd from Walker to Cornell is not conducive to having 2 arterials flow into it. Why connect 173rd & 170th – far too expensive and for what purpose? Widen 173rd from Baseline to Walker without a 170th connection. Allow 170th to be a neighborhood street that serves the residents on the street and the school but not a thoroughfare. Saves money and serves the residents safely, less noise and a lot less confusion! Both of the proposed alignments will create mass confusion for drivers and be far too costly without providing decent traffic flow. All the time and money spent so far has been a waste of taxpayer money because the results are horrific.

Keep surface of road between Cornell & Walker smooth as to keep road noise down from heavy traffic. Need resurfacing now. Traffic backs up and unable to get onto 173rd when traffic is heavy between 4 – 7 p.m. Access Highway 26 sooner, traffic @ 158th and Walker getting very congested.

The PAC should re-consider the couplet to save Elmonica School from having 20,000+ cars a day passing by the school. The couplet would improve both 170th & 173rd (most of 173rd will not get sidewalks or bike paths) and cut traffic by (approximately) 50% by Elmonica. Minimal right-of-way problems with the couplet. Please reconsider. Alternative 2 – minimum r-o-w: Best of the two because it keeps traffic away from Elmonica Elementary School & will result in a little less air pollution. This design will have the least negative impact on the center of our neighborhood.

Alternative 1 – alternate 173rd connection: Best choice & least costly of the two

I strongly encourage the project to not take (minimize) property or homes in the development of this project. Presuming the 170th route passes adjacent to Elmonica Elementary, I urge the County to install flashing caution lights to mark the school zone clearly, as this will be a busy street.

Alternative 1 – 74' r-o-w: Would prefer narrower approach to reduce speed

Alternative 1 – minimum r-o-w: Best choice for a clean direct route with minimal property impact. Requires school zone to be clearly marked with flashing yellow lights.

Alternative 1 – alternate 173rd connection: Takes too much property- prefer capping 173rd so it is not a major shortcut.

Alternative 1 – revised alignment: Best use of connection from a space point of view – needs low speed limit for safety – would prefer 173rd be capped altogether, though – will be heavily used short cut.

Alternative 2 – 74' r-o-w: Takes entirely too much property, destroys homes – wastes space with the road as well.

Alternative 2 – minimum r-o-w: Takes too much property, destroys homes – very poor choice.

Alternative 2 – alternate 173rd connection: Takes way too much property – destroys homes – utterly inappropriate.

The couplet alternative is the least impact alternative. I am upset that it was dropped from consideration.

Alternative 2 – minimum r-o-w: This is my preferred alternative as it avoids impacts to Elmonica and the heavy traffic impact to homes (more involved) along the 170th r/w.

Taxpayers will not want to spend money to buy land. Alt 1 with minimum road is the most cost effective choice.

Let's also in the future look to build park & ride parking lots to save congestion.

Alternative 1 – minimum r-o-w: Best choice because land is already bought.

Speed – traffic – safety for emergency vehicles.

I have invested all of my financial efforts into my property knowing that for the last 14 years that 173 is 173rd and 170th would go thru (the back of my property not the front where I have added on to my house) – 1800 sq ft. I would not have done this if 170th was in front of my house!

Option 1, yes

Option 1, yes