Online Comment by User: 206giff

Submitted on: 10/5/2006 12:58:00 AM
Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98102
Comment:

I-0001-001 We are homeowners in the Eastlake neighborhood. We are strongly opposed to expanding the SR520 bridge to 6 lanes and to the Pacific Street Interchange. We are supportive instead, of the $1.6 billion less expensive 4 lane alternative.

I-0001-002 The cost of the four lane alternative should be reduced even further through the use of current-sized lanes and shoulders, and establishing "congestion pricing" tolls along with rush hour lane conversion to transit and HOV use. As senior citizens on fixed incomes, we are acutely aware of needing to live within a budget. We insist our local and state governments do so as well.

I-0001-003 Environmentally, the adverse impact on the Arboretum, Union Bay wetlands, Foster Island, and most surrounding neighborhoods would be unimaginable. While the Mayor's office is desirous of eliminating ugly viaduct concrete from the Elliott Bay waterfront, the SR520 expansion proposal would be adding a like amount to our own neighborhood. The noise
I-0001-004 levels were unfairly addressed by the EIS. With equal lid treatments, the 4 lane proposal would assuredly produce less noise impact.

I-0001-005 Further consideration of the 6 lane, Pacific Interchange grand scheme will merely compound our existing traffic problems and is counter to our need to reduce greenhouse gases and their contribution to global warming effects. The public must be encouraged to transition from one driver, one car, into HOV and public transit instead. Our very future, not to mention that of our children, depends on it.

I-0001-006 We are steadfastly opposed to the SR520 six lane/Pacific Street Interchange proposal and strongly urge that it be dropped from consideration.

Sincerely,

Mr and Mrs Gifford T. Jones
Seattle, WA

Online Comment by User: A. Stevens Quigley

Submitted on: 10/26/2006 3:14:00 PM
Comment Category: Comments on Construction Effects
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98115
Comment:

I-0002-001

Of the four alternatives, I would most prefer renovating the current bridge. Frankly, I think that repairs are always less costly than replacement. I also suspect that the age of the bridge is being used as an excuse to expand the bridge.

If the decision is to replace it, I would prefer the four lane configuration. I much prefer the smaller footprint from an environmental and visual standpoint.

If the decision is to expand it, I much prefer the six lane configuration to the additional bridge to the UW campus. That octopus monstrosity would be terribly unsightly and ruin the University of Washington. That would be a very, very bad choice.

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Comment:

Of the four alternatives, I would most prefer renovating the current bridge. Frankly, I think that repairs are always less costly than replacement. I also suspect that the age of the bridge is being used as an excuse to expand the bridge.

If the decision is to replace it, I would prefer the four lane configuration. I much prefer the smaller footprint from an environmental and visual standpoint.

If the decision is to expand it, I much prefer the six lane configuration to the additional bridge to the UW campus. That octopus monstrosity would be terribly unsightly and ruin the University of Washington. That would be a very, very bad choice.

Comment Category: Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Comment:

Of the four alternatives, I would most prefer renovating the current bridge. Frankly, I think that repairs are always less costly than replacement. I also suspect that the age of the bridge is being used as an excuse to expand the bridge.

If the decision is to replace it, I would prefer the four lane configuration. I much prefer the smaller footprint from an environmental and visual standpoint.

If the decision is to expand it, I much prefer the six lane configuration to the additional bridge to the UW campus. That octopus monstrosity would be terribly unsightly and ruin the University of Washington. That would be a very, very bad choice.

Comment Category: Ecosystems
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Comment:

Of the four alternatives, I would most prefer renovating the current bridge. Frankly, I think that repairs are always less costly than replacement. I also suspect that the age of the bridge is being used as an excuse to expand the bridge.

If the decision is to replace it, I would prefer the four lane configuration. I much prefer the smaller footprint from an environmental and visual standpoint.

I-0002-001

If the decision is to expand it, I much prefer the six lane configuration to the additional bridge to the UW campus. That octopus monstrosity would be terribly unsightly and ruin the University of Washington. That would be a very, very bad choice.

Comment Category: Other Environmental Effects
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Comment:

Of the four alternatives, I would most prefer renovating the current bridge. Frankly, I think that repairs are always less costly than replacement. I also suspect that the age of the bridge is being used as an excuse to expand the bridge.

If the decision is to replace it, I would prefer the four lane configuration. I much prefer the smaller footprint from an environmental and visual standpoint.

If the decision is to expand it, I much prefer the six lane configuration to the additional bridge to the UW campus. That octopus monstrosity would be terribly unsightly and ruin the University of Washington. That would be a very, very bad choice.

Online Comment by User: a2harris@comcast.net

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 8:20:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-1
Address: , , 98006
Comment:

I-0003-001

I believe the effects of the alternatives which increase width and capacity of 520 have devastating impacts on salmon habitat, the priceless resource of the Arboretum, and the valuable MOHAI building, which is both a modernist building of merit, and a cultural resource of the community, whether or not MOHAI continues to use it. As a region we could reduce traffic volumes by more use of specialized transit, like the Husky football buses, to serve major employers and special events that draw large audiences. These would reduce demand on 520, reduce air pollution, and provide safer, more convenient means of travel to such events as symphony concerts, Bumbershoot, sports events, etc. It would take education and marketing to help people learn to appreciate the convenience of such service. As traffic density has increased, more people have learned to use transit, and recent spikes in gas prices contributed to participation. Once we lose the natural and environmental resources that make our region so special, we cannot regain them.

I support structural repair/replacement of the roadway as needed to secure it in the event of an earthquake, but I believe the increased capacity options have draconian impacts on the environment and the region. I have lived in Seattle and the region for 32 years, and commuted from Seattle to Bellevue for 10 years, lived in Bellevue and commuted to Seattle for 7 years, and lived in Seattle and bused and biked to work in Seattle. I recognize the serious transportation issues in the region, but don't believe adding capacity in the 520 corridor would be as beneficial to the region as improved transit access, specialized transit services, and greater efforts to reduce demand. I believe the visual impacts, environmental impacts, impacts on natural, cultural, and physical environments are too great.

Online Comment by User: adamswhitson

Submitted on: 9/13/2006 10:42:00 PM
Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98112
Comment:

I-0004-001 The "Pacific Interchange" option for improving SR520 is the only option worth pursuing. After reviewing the detriment that the "Base Six" option would incur on neighborhoods, estuaries, and commuters, it is clear that the alternative must be approved for construction. The "Pacific Interchange" option would re-capitate the Montlake neighborhood, ease congestion along Montlake Blvd., and dramatically improve a disabled interchange. The University of Washington must be called to account for their success – they are the principle cause of the congestion north of the Montlake Cut, and Dean Emmert would benefit immeasurably by allowing this plan to go forward.
Best Regards,
James Whitson

Online Comment by User: aday481

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:59:00 PM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98115
Comment:

I-0005-001 The designs I have seen in the EIS do not seem to account for a key impediment to traffic flow, which reduces the carrying capacity of the existing roadway and would impact the capacity of any future bridge system. That is the effect of elevation changes. In particular, as drivers go eastbound and rise to the crest of the hill near Evergreen Point, there is typically the greatest slowdown. Uneven acceleration due to the elevation change is the likely cause. The effects ripple back across the entire bridge, sometimes all the way to I5. A similar effect occurs as westbound traffic approaches the same point. If the elevation change were reduced, for example by cutting deeper into the hill, even four lanes could potentially carry considerably more vehicles than the existing bridge and road.
I have read in other summaries that the bridge levels over Union Bay or Portage Bay could also be quite high. If so then even six lanes may not provide congestion relief.

Online Comment by User: adkerr

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 1:24:00 PM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-1
Address: , , 98105
Comment:

I-0006-001 Our family much prefers the SIX LANE option.

Build the SIX LANE REPLACEMENT 529 BRIDGE ASAP!

Thanks. Art Kerr

Online Comment by User: Adventurewagen

Submitted on: 10/26/2006 9:15:00 AM
Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 339 N 80th St, Seattle, Wa 98103
Comment:

I-0007-001 As a Seattle home owner who lives and works on the east side in Issaquah I have to commute each day across 520 or I-90 to get to work. While traffic is a nightmare and ALWAYS stop and go across 520 I don't see adding more lanes and off ramps as a valid solution. It obviously hasn't worked for I-5, 520 or I-90. More lanes just means more people can sit in bumper to bumper next to one another. We need to spend this money on alternative transportation options such as forms of mass transit. This option is a stop gap solution that will do nothing in the end but harm the environment and create yet another eye sore for Seattle the surrounding community.

I-0007-002 I am particularly opposed to the 6-Lane alternative as I feel it would negatively impact the environment the most. In addition to the environment it will negatively impact the University of Washington with the Pacific St. Interchange and it looks to destroy a historic landmark in the process, the "UW Rock Climbing Structure". This structure was the first artificial climbing wall built in the nation.

I see no provision outlined for the impact on the UW or specifically the UW Rock in the EIS. There will be great opposition if this is not addressed in the EIS by both UW Alumni such as myself and the rock climbing community of Washington. I will make this a personal mission and recruit UW Alumni, the local community and the greater climbing community to see that the environment, the UW and the Historical UW Rock have reasonable and agreeable provisions for them in the EIS.

Evan Cabodi

Online Comment by User: aenfield

Submitted on: 10/17/2006 9:47:00 AM
Comment Category: Comments on Construction Effects
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-16
Address: , , 98103
Comment:

I-0008-001 Closing the west-bound HOV lane for TWO YEARS?!?! I'm sure there are options to make this better, but this'll be crazy.

Online Comment by User: aewebb60

Submitted on: 10/9/2006 9:41:00 PM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98112
Comment:

I-0009-001 I support the Pacific Interchange option. It is the best option for managing traffic through the Montlake area, improve access to mass transit and improving access to the east side via SR 520.

Online Comment by User: ajkphd

Submitted on: 10/24/2006 4:02:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98112
Comment:

I-0010-001 As a Montlake resident and a UW employee, I strongly urge support of the the Pacific Interchange option. The congestion on Montlake Blvd and surrounding areas makes local transportation a disaster. At times it can take 45 minutes to travel from 520 to U Village. The Pacific Interchange option promises to enhance local traffic and ease the access to UW as well. I particularly like the fact that it will make a connection to the eventual Husky Stadium Sound Transit train station. When you look at the impact over many generations, this option is well worth the extra expense.

Online Comment by User: akwatinetz

Submitted on: 8/23/2006 12:26:00 AM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98102
Comment:

I-0011-001 I prefer the Pacific Interchange Option, as the best hope for improving neighborhoods (rather than just opening up a larger pipe to existing congested roadways) and as the best hope for connecting north-south transit to east-west transit--one of the few ways we can really get people out of cars due to real time savings.

Online Comment by User: Al Hallstrom

Submitted on: 10/3/2006 2:55:00 PM
Comment Category: Comments on Construction Effects
Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-20
Address: , , 98102
Comment:

I-0012-001 I currently walk to and from work. I leave the UW, go across the montlake bridge, across marsh and foster islands, underneath 520, through the arboretum, up and over capital hill on interlaken, across 520 at Roanoke and east across I-5 on Roanoke and then down to Fairview where I live. I can't figure out from the information whether this is being more or less completely shut down for most of this period or not. I sincerely hope that such a path could be kept open for all but a few weeks of demolition. Please advise on the availability of this path. I am not the only person who uses this circuit a lot.

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-2
Comment:

I-0012-002 There does not seem to be any analysis of what a no build approach would do to use of alternatives by individuals; would more use public transit? would more who live on the eastside and work on the west move and vice versa? I would like to see some sensitivity analyses using a variety of assumptions about such issues. Most of the text in this report seems to assume people will never get out of their car, never move. That is a self-serving assumption for those that want more and more roads, and, if they are built, then it is self-fullfilling as well.

Has consideration been given to making 520 1 general lane in each direction and 1 transit (3+) hov lane in each direction, together with some large convenient parking structures on both sides and very frequent bus service between. How much would that cost?

Online Comment by User: alan bassingthwaighte

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 4:30:00 PM
Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative Options
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98122
Comment:

I-0013-001

I'm upset and appalled and the idea of a six-lane freeway. Studies and history have shown that Freeway expansion leads to more use and more gridlock while allowing developers to build create unsustainablesprawl that is profitable to make but expensive and inefficient for transportation and general living. The result of construction of this increased flow of traffic on Montlake and 45th, for example, will be even more severe gridlock for more thousands of cars stewing in unmoving traffic.This will not make Seattle more livable or more functional just more filled with unmoving eastside cars.

I say no new lanes at all. Right now there is little incentive to carpool and little done. We need incentives for HOV lanes and carpooling not more reasons to ruin Seattle's traffic flow. As our society, and world, inexorably approaches peak oil production and energy costs skyrocket the need to build a sustainable transportation model will vastly increase. In twenty years, even with population growth, there may well be a substantial decrease in the number of citizens that can afford gasoline or biofuel and hence use the public road system.The freeways will less packed not more. Only HOV lanes or a light rail bridge that eventually will link with the greater Seattle light rail system makes sense considering the billion dollar pricetag at stake. Especially with the local, state and federal government increasingly constrained by deficits and tight budgets. No new lanes at all. This is just a construction boondoggle that will cost vast sums of money while decreasing Seattle's efficiency and livability.

ps-The issue of preserving the Arboretum is a big one as well as I have seen what even the present freeways have done to the original Olmstead vision. I have jogged and canoes ther for years.I wonder if the planners have.Increasing lanes will not only be a boondoggle, but also will permanently ruin one of Seattle's best urban parks. This bridege expansion is just a business-as-usual and desperate solution. Have some vision and guts folks.

sincerely Alan G Bassingthwaighte

Online Comment by User: Alan Borning

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:25:00 PM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 5735 Woodlawn Ave N, Seattle, WA 98103
Comment:

I-0014-001 The 6 lane alternative is too large, and would damage the Arboretum and other environmentally sensitive areas. We should not invest so much money in still more automobile-oriented facilities.

The 4 lane alternative is preferable.

Online Comment by User: Alan Weiner

Submitted on: 9/18/2006 9:30:00 PM
Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 2303 22nd Avenue East, Seattle, WA 98112
Comment:

I-0015-001 I support the Pacific Interchange option.

Online Comment by User: Albert Forget

Submitted on: 10/4/2006 12:33:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-1
Address: , , 98125
Comment:

I-0016-001 I have been keeping abreast of all the proposals for the past 5 years or more and have serious concerns about the impacts of the project on my area of Seattle through which a great deal of traffic flows between Northeastern King County/Southeastern Snohomish County/communities to the North of the Floating Bridge and Seattle.
When the SR-520 is closed, virtually all that traffic diverts to SR-522 (Lake City/Bothell Way). At the conjunction of SR-522 and SR-523 (N 145th St in Seattle) some traffic moves west to 15th Ave NE, Aurora (Hwy-99), Greenwood Ave NW and 3rd Ave NW to access North and Northwest Seattle. Traffic to the UW and downtown diverts to other arterials (Sandpoint Way, 35th Ave, Ravenna Blve, 24th Ave or Roosevelt Way) or continues to I-5. Closure of SR-520 and tolling will result in additional traffic along those corridors.

How will you address the problem and why isn't this part of the EIS?

Online Comment by User: AldenChace

Submitted on: 9/8/2006 10:34:00 PM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-15
Address: 3763 S 194th St, SeaTac, WA 98188
Comment:

I-0017-001

The inclusion of a safe way to ride a bicycle across the new SR 520 bridge is very important to me. The path should be wide enough to allow the passage of single bicycles, tandem bicycles, and bicycle trailers for children and groceries in both directions.

There should also not be any of these dangerous slalom gates like those on the Centennial Trail.

Currently I either ride around the north end or south end of the lake or use the I-90 bridge as the bus option with a tandem bicycle is nonexistent.

Online Comment by User: alimckay

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:03:00 PM
Comment Category: Second Montlake Bridge
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-22
Address: , , 98112

I-0018-001 **Comment:**

I live near the arboretum and find it to be a really wonderful treasure in the city. One of the best parks around. I also commute across 520 to Microsoft and am aware of the need to replace 520 both for safety and for traffic reasons.

I think the Pacific Interchange 6 lane option is too large and takes up too much lake and arboretum. I prefer the 6 lane option which affects 14.1 acres, takes 0.7 acres of arboretum and costs 3.9 billion.

I perceive this as striking the right balance between impact to the arboretum/montlake area and traffic improvement.

Online Comment by User: alowin

Submitted on: 8/22/2006 4:12:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1
Address: 2320 Delmar, Sea, 98102
Comment:

I-0019-001 I vehemently oppose the "Pacific Interchange" alternative that some Montlake people are pushing to be built with other people's money.

Cost: The stated cost of a major high bridge would be horrendous. Plus I surely expect cost-overruns of the sort experienced on the Bay Bridge in SF.

Destroys the waterways: A high bridge is utterly out of place. It it incongruous for the area. A high bridge would destroy the bucolic views along 520, from Portage Bay thru to Lake Washington.

I support the proposed new routing to Pacific Ave, avoiding th eold Montlake Birdge. Most of the benefits the Better Bridge folks claim arise not from a new hifh bridge but rather from the proposed new Pacifc Ave routing.

If a high bridge is chosen I and neighbors will work actively and hard to kill the entire 520 rebuilding project. Wwe would support a lower profile project as less costly and more attractive to our statewide voters.

Online Comment by User: AmandaFranklin

Submitted on: 8/24/2006 1:28:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 5846 57th Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98105

I-0020-001 **Comment:**

I support the Pacific Interchange! I live in Sand Point and commute to BCC for work several times a week. Travelling two miles on Montlake Blvd can often take me more than 30 minutes at peak times. I have tried taking a bus from the UW to BCC, and that took approximately 1.5 hours and involved two bus changes!! The Pacific Interchange is the best plan because it reduces gridlock on Montlake and provides a direct link to the rail and bus transit systems.

Thank you,

Amanda Franklin

Online Comment by User: amdesai

Submitted on: 10/23/2006 10:40:00 PM
Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 1807 145TH PL SE , BELLEVUE, WA 98007
Comment:

I-0021-001 I support the pacific interchange option or any option with more than six lanes. I believe we cannot be short sighted about the expansion of this area and we should not build a bridge that is over capacity before it is finsihed.

Online Comment by User: Andrew R. Goulding

Submitted on: 10/18/2006 8:35:00 AM
Comment Category: Comments on Construction Effects
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 1056 25th Ave East, Seattle, WA 98112

I-0022-001 **Comment:**
Please make accommodation for additional traffic in Madison Valley,
Especially at intersection of Lake Washington Blvd and Madison Street.
Roundabout intersection?

Andy Goulding
206 329 6350

Online Comment by User: Andy Kaplowitz

Submitted on: 10/23/2006 8:39:00 AM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-2
Address: 2039 14th Ave SW, Olympia, WA 98502
Comment:

I-0023-001 Regardless of which of the 6-lane alternatives is implemented, it simply makes sense to go with a 6-lane bridge. The incremental cost justifies the increased capacity. However, I do believe that carpooling and mass transit needs to be encouraged much like it has been on the I-90 floating bridge.

Online Comment by User: angelarosoff

Submitted on: 9/21/2006 11:53:00 AM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-2
Address: , , 98105

I-0024-001 **Comment:**

Pacific Interchange = Progress

A simple rebuilding of 520 bridge would lose a great opportunity to create some progress for the horrible traffic situation on 520. The Pacific Interchange would address the much needed addition of lanes on 520 to alleviate the growing traffic problems on Montlake.

Seattle is in desperate need of some progressive traffic solutions like the Pacific St. Interchange. It will not only clear up the horrible U-Village/Montlake backups and get people moving to work from this area, but it will enhance the greenbelt by reconnecting the play field from Portage Bay to the Arboretum. Offering a direct transit connection that is so heavily used with our busin system will be worthy of the upcoming light rail station. In addtion, a direct bicycle link from the Burke-Gilman trail to the Eastside is a dream for getting people out of their cars an onto their bikes. Being one of the fittest cities in the country, people will actually use this option... making the Pacific St. Interchange the best solution for the city. Why not invest in a better solution?

Thank you!
Angela Rosoff
Seattle, WA 98105
angelarosoff@yahoo.com

Online Comment by User: angiekeane

Submitted on: 9/26/2006 1:10:00 PM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-9
Address: , , 98272
Comment:

I-0025-001 6 Lane Pacific Street sounds like it is the best alternative.

Online Comment by User: Ann Hirschi

Submitted on: 10/27/2006 4:37:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-2
Address: , , 98112
Comment:
To Whom it May Concern:

I-0026-001 I am writing to express my concerns about adverse impacts to the Arboretum presented by ALL the alternatives, but especially the 6 lane proposal. DO NOT BUILD the 6 LANE OPTION! This just encourages old technology. A region with the vibrancy and intelligence of ours must look to the future, where mass transit will replace much of the single user, energy inefficient automobilizers.

During the much- touted GREEN CHARETTE held by the City of Seattle last winter, we discsussed the option of adding a ferry at the foot of Madison St. that would replace some of the bridge traffic. Why not include this as an option?

The Arboretum is a wonderful green place and deserves to be treated like a precious jewel...not like a dump for exhaust.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Online Comment by User: Ann Stevens

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 7:58:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-1
Address: , , 98115

I-0027-001 **Comment:**

My priority is that the project does not further impact the Arboretum. Of the two 6-lane alternatives, I prefer the Montlake alternative over the Pacific alternative. We need to do more to reduce traffic such as moving freight to trains, rather than building freeways to accommodate more cars.

Ann Stevens

Online Comment by User: Anna Tamura

Submitted on: 10/6/2006 9:19:00 AM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-1
Address: , , 98112
Comment:

I-0028-001 The Pacific Street Interchange is the best alternative, as it provides alternative routes for traffic to the north and south of the overly congested Montlake area. I support this alternative.

Online Comment by User: annematsen

Submitted on: 10/19/2006 5:16:00 PM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 1853 e hamlin, seattle, WA 98112
Comment:

I-0029-001

I am writing in support of the Pacific Interchange for the 520 rebuild. In considering the alternatives, it is essential that all of us identify the major objectives for Washington State. I would like to share my list of the overarching objectives for the rebuild of 520.

*Linkage of mass transit. All of us living in this region know that no highway solution can focus on automobiles alone. Our metropolitan area has a relatively underdeveloped mass transit system. The State has made a major investment in a bus system and in light rail. The desired solution to 520 must facilitate passenger linkage between these investments to encourage use of transportation other than automobiles. There will be a light rail terminal near Husky Stadium, making an easy connection between buses using the Pacific Interchange and this light rail terminal.

*Congestion on Montlake Boulevard. Southbound Montlake Boulevard has backed-up traffic many hours each day. This leads to lost time, personal aggravation and poor air quality.

*Access to the University and Medical Center. For students, faculty, staff, patients and families, it is becoming increasingly difficult to get to the U. The Pacific Interchange bus station would put these individuals within easy walking distance.

*Preserving the Montlake Bridge as is: This bridge can be a bottleneck, but an additional bridge would be a blight on this historic bridge. The 520 solution must provide a "way around" the Montlake Bridge.

Connecting the Burke Gilman Trail to the Eastside. The Pacific Interchange will have a direct link from the Burke Gilman trail across the lake. Bike commuting and recreation are growing increasingly. Biking enhances the health of the public through exercise and improved air quality. Making it easy and safe to commute to and from the Eastside will encourage more bikers and fewer cars.

*Minimizing air pollution. Many of us in the area suffer from asthma and other chronic respiratory conditions. Each lane of traffic on 520 contributes to further deterioration of our air quality. The Pacific Interchange would improve air quality in Montlake.

*Maximizing parks. The Pacific Interchange would maximize and connect parks and trails, not only to the Arboretum but throughout Montlake neighborhood as well. Imagine a greenbelt in Montlake!

In consideration of each of the points above, the Pacific Interchange choice is the best solution to the single-car problem. It would bring our city into the 21st century. Thank you for your consideration of the Pacific Interchange.

Sincerely,

Anne Matsen

Online Comment by User: annestanford

Submitted on: 9/7/2006 9:04:00 AM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-1
Address: , , 30315

I-0030-001 **Comment:**

I support the Pacific Interchange option for SR 520. It seems to me that this is the only solution that can fix the Montlake Bridge bottleneck issue among others. This has been a long time coming and I hope it can be solved soon so we can all enjoy a less stressful commute. Thank you.

Online Comment by User: apayne

Submitted on: 9/12/2006 9:33:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-5
Address: 2070 23rd Ave. E, Seattle, WA 98112

I-0031-001 **Comment:**
The Pacific Interchange option is the sound choice for improving 520 without impacting existing neighborhood to the degree other option would.
Amy

Online Comment by User: arthurd73

Submitted on: 9/12/2006 11:20:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98112
Comment:
To WSDOT,

I-0032-001

I, and my household, strongly support the Pacific Interchange option for SR 520. As you know, it provides extremely positive solutions to many issues--elimination of backups and alleviation of traffic issues connected with the majority of traffic served by the interchange that otherwise would be bottlenecked as currently, particularly in crossing the Montlake Bridge. It also facilitates more than any of the other options: interconnections of mass transit (a hub with rail stop by Husky Stadium), and park links that would provide new corriders and alternate pedestrian routes, among other exceptionally positive outcomes.

Please lend your support and go ahead with the Pacific Interchange option.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.
Sincerely,
Arthur Dorros and Dorros family
Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Comment:
To WSDOT,

I, and my household, strongly support the Pacific Interchange option for SR 520. As you know, it provides extremely positive solutions to many issues--elimination of backups and alleviation of traffic issues connected with the majority of traffic served by the interchange that otherwise would be bottlenecked as currently, particularly in crossing the Montlake Bridge. It also facilitates more than any of the other options: interconnections of mass transit (a hub with rail stop by Husky Stadium), and park links that would provide new corriders and alternate pedestrian routes, among other exceptionally positive outcomes.

Please lend your support and go ahead with the Pacific Interchange option.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.
Sincerely,
Arthur Dorros and Dorros family

Online Comment by User: arychel

Submitted on: 9/5/2006 9:22:00 PM
Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1
Address: , , 98112

I-0033-001 **Comment:**

I very much support the pacific interchange option. As a daily commuter between the UW and capitol hill, I travel every day along this corridor. The backups are a nightmare that can add very serious time to my commute (a commute, I might add, that should be quite short).

Between the drawbridge opening and the back up for cars entering and leaving 520, there is rarely a time when it is not a major problem to travel between cap hill and u villiage.

the pacific interchange nicely addresses all of these issues and will integrate nicely with the sound transit light rail stop, which I think is a major bonus.

Don't let the UW dictate how this project is run just because they don't like the traffic closer to their precious stadium and parking lot. For the UW, it would much improve things on game day if this option were in place.

Online Comment by User: Aslutsky

Submitted on: 10/29/2006 3:00:00 PM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98105
Comment:

I-0034-001 I see no point in rebuilding what we have. The transportation needs have changed since the original bridge was built. The high end option, involving the University area will have too much an impact on an area already inundated with traffic. Ultimately one has to keep in mind that it is the north/south interstate roads that limit the free flow of traffic on the bridge and that is not going to change. I think the 6 lane option with no Montlake interchange is the best of what has been offered. Ann Slutsky Laurelhurst prisoner

Online Comment by User: atufel

Submitted on: 9/10/2006 5:12:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98112

I-0035-001 **Comment:**
I've read and considered the proposals for the sr520 upgrade. I support the Pacific Interchange Option.

Alben Tufel
resident

Online Comment by User: azankich

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 4:00:00 PM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-1
Address: 172 - 17th Avenue, Seattle, WA 98122
Comment:

I-0036-001 You should consider an option that is a stacked freeway in part or all of the replacement plan. In the same footprint as the four lane option you could fit eight total lanes if the freeway were stacked. This would save a major portion of the arboretum. With four lanes in each direction, you could have two general purpose lanes, one HOV lane, and one light rail lane. With slightly more width you could add a bicycle or walking lane - all using a minumum foot print.

Online Comment by User: ballbach

Submitted on: 9/13/2006 9:41:00 AM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98112

I-0037-001 **Comment:**

I strongly support the Pacific Interchange Option for SR520 reconstruction. This is the only solution that works and is the most forward-thinking. It will leave a legacy that the next generation(s) can be proud of. Of all the options it fixes the most problems and represents the most effecient transportation solution. It is the best for mass transit integration (and which will ultimately get people off the road as the population of the area balloons in the future); it is the best for cleaning up the daily Montlake Blvd/UW local traffic bottleneck; it is the best for the local affected neighborhoods (with the lid option as opposed to an even more disasasterous swath of concrete through the neighborhood and beautiful parks); and it is the best for creating a legacy greebelt, park, bike trails along an entire section of prime Seattle shoreline. Why wouldn't we do this?

The Pacific Interchange Option is the responsible solution for SR520. I applaud you for considering this grassroots approach and I strongly encourage you to adopt this option.

Thank you very much.

Brett Ballbach
bballbach@comcast.net
206-709-4162

Online Comment by User: balsamoma

Submitted on: 9/21/2006 1:54:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 2680 139th Ave SE #34, Bellevue, WA 98005
Comment:

I-0038-001 Please be sure to add bike lanes.

Online Comment by User: barb s.

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 7:01:00 PM
Comment Category: Environmental Justice
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98107

I-0039-001 **Comment:**

The 6-lane option for replacing the Evergreen Pt. bridge presents an overwhelmingly negative situation for the Arboretum. The Arboretum is a resource which simply cannot be replaced. Once it is damaged, that damage is permanent, as can be seen from the presence of the current bridge in this preserve. Increasing the traffic, noise, air pollution, and physical size of the vehicle corridor will do permanent and irreparable harm to the varied life forms which try to make the Arboretum their home. There is no where else for these life forms to go. Do we, as educated and aware human beings, continue to destroy valuable habitat? Does ease of traffic take precedence in a life-or-death situation for other species?? I think not. Putting six lanes through the most beautiful, and possibly most valuable, of all Seattle's parks is apalling in the extreme, and it is willfully ignoring the detrimental effects that will result. Do not commit this terrible mistake. You will devastate the environment of the park, and future human generations will curse your stupidity and wonder at your selfishness.

Online Comment by User: Barbara Culp

Submitted on: 10/30/2006 4:21:00 PM
Comment Category: Transportation and Traffic
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98111
Comment:

I-0040-001

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the SR520 Bridge Replacement and HOV project.

Because there is no current facility for bicyclists and pedestrians on SR520, it is true that either the 4-lane or the 6-lane alternative would improve the capacity, circulation and travel times for bicyclists and pedestrians by providing a continuous path across the SR520 Bridge from the Montlake interchange to NE Points Drive in Kirkland

However, the Bicycle Alliance advocates for wide-ranging and thorough bicycle/pedestrian connections from Portage Bay across Lake Washington to connect on the east side with the existing SR520 Trail. Only then will the trail across the lake truly add a "key element to the regional non-motorized system by providing another link across Lake Washington."

Improved Trail Connections:

- A trail to the 43rd Street street-end in Madison Park for southbound cyclists.
- A connection on the Union Bay Bridge for northbound riders
- Westbound cyclists continue on bridge alignment across Portage Bay
- Ability to exit at the existing MOHAI location
- Incredibility important to link new SR520 Bridge trail to existing SR520 Trail in Bellevue currently missing and not deemed as part of this project.

I-0040-002

In addition, the Bicycle Alliance offers these comments to the bridge replacement project on the proposed Union Bay Bridge:

Union Bay Bridge/Pacific Interchange

- Eliminate access to Washington Park Arboretum.
- Reduce the height of the Union Bay Bridge to 70'.
- Reduce the width of the Pacific Street Interchange.
- Limit Union Bay Bridge / Pacific Interchange to transit/3 person HOV.
- Reduce grade to ADA acceptable standard.

I-0040-003

Bridge Replacement and Transit Plan

- Prioritize transit access, reliability and future conversion to light rail.
- Prioritize transit access at 23rd Avenue East and Montlake Blvd.during peak travel times.
- Truly advocate for transit priority.

Further analysis needed in EIS

- No increased general purpose capacity regardless of alternative chosen.

- Additional study of 4-lane alternative must be undertaken: global warming issues and carbon assessment examined.
- System wide pricing must be addressed (I-90, 520 Viaduct, etc.).
- Trail connectivity critical east to existing SR520 Bridge.
- Critical re-examination of air and water quality; and
- Congestion pricing and tolls on bridge and corridor.

SR 520 provides a critical link between Seattle and the communities east of Lake Washington. We are planning for the future of this region, and it's a future with scarce resources. Our future contains radically diminished access to fossil fuels and one where water is an increasingly precious resource. Our decisions today must not promote driving alone across Lake Washington.

Sincerely,

Barbara Culp
Executive Director
Bicycle Alliance of Washington

Online Comment by User: Barbara J. Geiger

Submitted on: 9/15/2006 4:23:00 PM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98105
Comment:

I-0041-001

I strongly support the Pacific Interchange NOT the base 6-lane.
A 70 foot clearance for the Union Bay Bridge would be sufficient for boat traffic and would work better than a 110ft. for traffic operations, transit and bicycles.
A bicycle trail link should be made from the proplsed SR520 bicycle trail to Madison Park.
The Union Bay Bridge should be a beautiful structure that befits its setting.

I support the Pacific Interchange option for SR520. The Pacific Interchange is the only solution that fixes the Montlake Bridge bottleneck, connects SR520 bus service directly to light rail at UW, creates a continuous new park and trail system from Portage Bay to the Arboretum.

Online Comment by User: Barbara Mahoney

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 9:23:00 PM
Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-1
Address: , , 98105
Comment:

I-0042-001

Dear Governor Gregoir: In addition to my opposition to the damage to be caused by the larger 520 structures on the Washington Park wetlands I am also opposed to the large Pacific Street intersection.

The costs to the University would be huge. The design, proposed by our Montlake neighbors who very much dislike the University located so close to their neighborhood, is another example of folks thinking that the University deserves no voice and should serve as the dumping ground for all unpleasantness. The support of the proposal by those from the Eastside is also selfserving and near sighted.

The Pacific interchange option is of particular concern for numerous reasons. The years that the intersection would be under construction will cost the University and particularly the Health Sciences huge losses that will stretch far beyond the construction period.

- Access to health care is huge issue in the State. The UW Medical Center and Dental school serve a large number of citizens who can not afford to pay. To serve these people they must have physical access to the Medical Center and the Medical Center must have access to excess funds from paying patients to cover uncompensated and under compensated care like Medicaid. Those who can afford to pay will not be to physically reach the UW Medical Center or be so inconvenienced that they will go to other hospitals leaving the UWMC no longer in a position to be able to support itself. In future years these paying patients will be slow to return to the UWMC if they return at all. Patients tend to recieve all their healthcare at one facility and rarely change.

- The UWMC engages is a tremendous amount of research, much of it involving human subjects. As physical access to the UWMC becomes more difficult patients will not be as interested in participating in research. As research subjects become less available we will see a loss of some researchers. This too will be difficult to reverse when the construction is complete.

- As the UWMC loses personnel and patients the educational mission runs the risk of being compromised for the lack of patients with the right mix of ailments available for learning.

- The UWMC has some of the nation's best nurses. They are very dedicated to the mission and work at the UW. But as it becomes more difficult to get to and from work (their parking lot is a proposed construction lay-down site) they will move to other hospitals. This is also true for other Health Sciences staff, technicians, etc.

- Over the construction period the losses to the University will be terrific, and sadly the recovery could take decades. Is the State willing to compensate the UW for their losses? Does the State want to participate in the potential loss of research funding and related

I-0042-001

employment? Does the state want to be party to the potential denegration of the prestige of the UW and the accompaning loss of federal and private research funds?

As you know UW funding is a percarious balance of reputation that leads to outstanding recruitments that lead to research funding that leads back to enhancement of reputation, etc. The same holds true for attracting students, staff and patients. The web is complex and all parts must contribute or the web fails.

I ask that you consider the huge impact the Pacific interchange and the long construction process will have on the UW. Additionally, please consider that the impacts are likely to be long-term and possibly permanent losses.

Please do all that can be done to perserve the UW and allow it to continue to grow and be an increasingly important part of yur state.

Thank you for allowing this comment.

Barbara Mahoney
206.524.6177

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-1
Comment:
Dear Governor Gregoir: In addition to my opposition to the damage to be caused by the larger 520 structures on the Washington Park wetlands I am also opposed to the large Pacific Street intersection.

The costs to the University would be huge. The design, proposed by our Montlake neighbors who very much dislike the University locted so close to their neighborhood, is another example of folks thinking that the University deserves no voice and should serve as the dumping ground for all unpleasantness.

The interchange in particular is a concern for numerous reasons. The years that the intersection would be under construction will cost the University and particularly the Health Sciences huge losses that will stretch far beyond the construction period.

- Access to health care is huge issue in the State. The UW Medical Center and Dental school serve a large number of citizens who can not afford to pay. To serve these people they must have physical access to the Medical Center and the Medical Center must have access to excess funds from paying patients to cover. Those who can afford to pay will not be abo to physically reach the UW Medical Center or be so inconvenienced that they will go to other hospitals leaving the UWMC no longer is a position to be able to support itself. In future years these patients will be slow to return to the UAWMC if they return at all. Patients tend to recieve all their healthcare at one facility and rarely change.

I-0042-001

- The UWMC engages is a tremendous amount of research, much of it involving human subjects. As physical access to the UWAMC becomes more diffucult patients will not be as interested in participating in research. As research subjects become less available we will see a loss of some researchers. This too will be difficult to reverse when the construction is complete.

- As the UWMC loses personnel and patients the educational runs the risk of being compromised for the lack of patients with the right mix of ailments available for learning.

- The UAWC has some of the nation's best nurses. They are very dedicated to the mission and work at the UW. But as it becomes more difficult to get to and from work (their parking lot is a proposed cionstruction lay-down site, they will move along to other hospitals. This is also true for other Health Sciences staff, technicians, etc.

- Over the construction period the losses to the University will be terrific, and sadly the recovery could take decades impacting patient access.

Online Comment by User: Barbc

Submitted on: 10/24/2006 1:20:00 PM
Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1
Address: , , 98005

I-0043-001 **Comment:**

I would like to offer our preference for the 6 lane alternative with a bike lane for students commuting to and from the UW. Additionally we believe that an HOV lane would encourage people to carpool as well as mitigate some of the heavier traffic around the rush hour and during game days or special events.

I have lived on the east side and commuted to Seattle for several years; the traffic across the 520 bridge is getting to the point of being unbearable during the rush hour commute. One used to be able to leave early (7:00) in order to avoid the huge back ups getting to the bridge deck, however one must be at the bridge no later than 6:30 to have a reasonable commute. The reverse commute is absolutely impossible! This is not going to get better and, although the City will continue to build more urban housing, it is unreasonable to think that people will give up their cars or be able to locate to an area which they find not to be afordable to be closer to their jobs. The job market is also not like it was 25 years ago when people stayed with one company for their entire career. People change every 2 - 3 years on the average and they must be able to commute to any location. The City of Seattle takes a back seat to many other cities in the nation who began to address their traffice concerns years ago; it is unconscionalbe that we are encouraging people to vacation here and send them on various day trips in our traffice jams.

The 520 bridge is a must for the foreseeable future; one bridge across Lake Washington will not be enough and 520 is in dire need of repairs. Before this comes down on us all like a huge nightmare and citizens are hurt or killed, I suggest this alternative. It is the only one that makes sense.

Thank you.

Online Comment by User: barrettmw@msn.com

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:28:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98133
Comment:

I-0044-001

A highway, like a vacuum, will always be filled. Whether you build 6 lanes or 8, SR 520 will have traffic jams and slowdowns. The unreliable conveniences of a bigger bridge will not balance damage and loss to a wetland and arboretum which together make a city jewel. Forget it. Any tiny remaining pieces that remind of of what once was, or that give respite from the urban setting, must be protected.

Instead, consider a different kind of bridge. Is a floating bridge, which must be replaced in such a short lifetime, the best choice? And this is a choice which prohibits a double decker bridge, which could double carrying capacity and/or allow bike and public transit lanes.

A wider bridge is not a good solution. Especially if it ruins Foster island, Marsh island, and the Arboretum.

Yours truly,

Susan Ward

Online Comment by User: barrie

Submitted on: 10/4/2006 9:01:00 AM
Comment Category: Transportation and Traffic
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1
Address: , , 98257
Comment:

I-0045-001 I have lived in King County over 65 years but no live in Skagit County. I still use 520 more than I 90. I think the "Pacifiic Interchange" would be the best choice for this project.

Online Comment by User: bayshore association

Submitted on: 10/28/2006 12:06:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 2524 Boyer Ave. E., seattle, washington 98102
Comment:

Portage Bayshore Association
2524 Boyer Ave. E. -- Seattle, Washington 98102
www.portagebayshore.org

October 28, 2006
TO: WSDOT SR 520 Project Management
FR: Pete DeLaunay, Secretary, Portage Bayshore Condo-Marina Association
2524 Boyer Ave. E., Seattle, WA. 98102
(www.portagebayshore.org)
RE: DEIS Comments/Mitigation -- Bayshore property and neighborhood

The Bayshore property is located in the Portage Bayshore neighborhood of Seattle -- and just south of the existing Portage Bay viaduct – on Boyer Ave. E. The Bayshore property is a community of 24 condominium units and 30 moorage slips, 15 of which are located under the building which extends over the water. The building's foundation/marina footings were installed when the building and marina was constructed in the early sixties.

The Bayshore property owners Association represents a condo-marina complex with 40 owners including 24 condo owners/14 with slips, and 16 slip owners. It is administered by a board of directors (www.portagebayshore.org), operating as a non-profit corporation in the State of Washington.

In summary, our immediate comments/ concerns about the SR 520 DEIS are as follows and in no particular order:

I-0046-001 1. Noise Mitigation - The draft EIS graphically shows that pile driving needed to install supports for temporary and new bridge piers will create a decibel level of over 100 dBA for a distance of about 300 feet. The Bayshore property is well within 300 feet so we request clarification on construction processes for noise mitigation during construction.

I-0046-002 2. Bayshore Property Impacts: There will be dust from bridge removal as well as vibration -- the distance of impact is not discussed – and needs to be addressed; particularly with the Bayshore construction footprint/ pilings and the impact on the foundation and marina moorings.

3. Bayshore Marina Impact/ Access: The Bayshore property includes 30 moorage slips that accommodate recreational, non liveaboard, boats from 24' to 40' in length. While the Queen City Yacht Club's moorage impact is discussed, the Bayshore marina is not. Will bridge construction hamper or prohibit access to the marina? With many slips rented, mitigating financial impacts is one of several concerns we have about the SR 520 project on the Bayshore marina.

I-0046-002

4. Parking/Boyer Ave. Disruption: The Bayshore property owners and renters will be impacted by parking, congestion and potential closures of Boyer Ave. With Delmar closed for 9-12 months, increased traffic on Boyer Ave. should be mitigated.

5. Alternatives – We encourage more study of the 'tunnel concept' as the most environmental sound of alternatives explored to date; short of the no-action upgrade maintenance and retrofit as the most cost effective option. Imposing the toll immediately would help raise additional funds that may be needed for more environmentally and aesthetically responsible alternatives.

6. State Environmental Policy Act intentions – South Portage Bay has long been the refuse area for WSDOT projects over time. Wetlands, species, native plants, salmon habitat have all been affected by highway right-of-way considerations – all valid but until recent times not a top priority. Reclaiming South Portage Bay with removal of silt, invasive plant life, restoration of shoreline (see www.fabnia.org) and better recreational access.

Thank you for your attention and response to the issues we've raised on behalf of 40 owners who respectfully request your vigilance to mitigate impacts of the SR 520 project fairly.

Online Comment by User: beeson

Submitted on: 9/12/2006 10:13:00 AM
Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-3
Address: , , 98112

I-0047-001 **Comment:**

The Pacific Street Interchange option looks to be the best overall, certainly keeping Montlake much more liveable for those who live in and around the area -

Online Comment by User: BetinaF

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 8:16:00 AM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-9, Page-6
Address: , , 98004
Comment:

I-0048-001 This is my favorite option. A six-lane bridge with the Pacific Street Interchange.

I-0048-002 As someone who lives on 108th Avenue NE between 12th and 14th, my only concern here is trying to limit cut-through traffic to 520. This should be a 25 mph residential street, but during commute times I can't even back out of my driveway. I'm not sure what the solution for this is, but I would like to see better signage on 104th and 112th leading to 520/405. As these should be the preferred streets for commuters to get to 520 going north from downtown Bellevue.

Online Comment by User: Betsy Kirby

Submitted on: 10/29/2006 8:06:00 AM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 5656 N.E. Keswick Dr., Seattle, Wa 98105

I-0049-001 **Comment:**

We understand that the 520 bridge needs help BUT we strongly oppose the idea of a bridge going over Union Bay (Pacific Street Interchange) as it would negatively affect wetlands, the Arboretum, Union Bay, surrounding neighborhoods, traffic patterns in the entire area of the UW, University Village, ...it is a BAD IDEA!

Dr. and Mrs. Richard Kirby

Online Comment by User: BetsyDavis

Submitted on: 10/27/2006 5:29:00 AM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 1817 E. Shelby St, Seattle, WA 98112

I-0050-001 **Comment:**

I want to express my strong support of and preference for the Pacific Street Interchange option. I think it is essential to optimize transit solutions and creating a new bus and rail transit hub at the University of Washington makes great sense. I believe that the Pacific Street interchange option best addresses the urgent need to foster improved transit options for people throughout the city. What an opportunity for this region. We can't pass it up!

Online Comment by User: bglick

Submitted on: 10/20/2006 2:37:00 PM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-5
Address: , , 98103
Comment:

I-0051-001 I feel that closing the westbound HOV lane for any amount of time will be an unreasonable burden on commuters, especially for those (like me) who take the bus.

I-0051-002 Similarly, I use the Montlake freeway station every day to board a bus - so I'm concerned about removal of this station.

Online Comment by User: bhaspedis

Submitted on: 9/11/2006 12:37:00 PM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 2065 McGilvra Blvd W, Seattle, WA 98112

I-0052-001 **Comment:**

I support the Pacific Interchange Option. Please give serious consideration to this solution as I feel it is in the best interest of our community for the following reasons:

- No more backups between University Village to Montlake. Finally, a solution to the "Montlake mess"! Pacific Interchange dramatically improves local traffic circulation on arterials in Seattle. Compared with the other options for SR 520, Pacific Interchange does not differ substantially in the number of vehicles coming into any Seattle neighborhoods.
- A continuous green belt reconnecting the playfield on Portage Bay to the Arboretum – a great new park for the whole city!
- A direct transit connection between express bus service on SR 520 (which will quadruple to 47,000+ riders/day by 2030) and the planned Sound Transit light rail station at UW, which will be the most heavily used stop outside downtown Seattle (about 21,000 boardings/day.)
- A direct bicycle link from the Burke-Gilman trail to the Eastside.

Barbara Haspedis

Online Comment by User: bhuff

Submitted on: 9/22/2006 10:22:00 PM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-1
Address: 3834 175th NE, Redmond, WA 98052

I-0053-001 **Comment:**
I-5 southbound is approaching gridlock during 'rush hour. Replace SR520 not with an eye to increase capacity for commuter cars but decrease their need with a 'mag-lev' type elevated monorail from SR520 at Redmond (Avondale Road Sound Transit) to Seattle (Pine Street Light-Rail Tunnel)'

Comment Category: Transportation and Traffic
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-1

I-0053-002 **Comment:**
Where will additional capacity on SR520 be displaced on I-5 Southbound at Convention Center or Roanoke when we are approaching gridlock there already?

Online Comment by User: bill clark

Submitted on: 10/27/2006 4:21:00 PM
Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-1
Address: , , 98115

I-0054-001 **Comment:**

As someone who works at UW and lives nearby, I am strongly opposed to the proposed Pacific Street interchange. It would be a concrete monstrosity that would eliminate valuable green space along the Montlake Cut, overshadow the trail and wetlands between MOHAI and Foster's Island, and blight the view of Union Bay, which is now one of the most pleasant aspects in the city.The EIS does not show a rendering of what the proposed Union Bay Bridge would look like from Foster's Island or the middle of the bay.

Online Comment by User: Bill Keller

Submitted on: 10/30/2006 10:03:00 PM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 2603 Lake Washington Blvd E, Seattle, Washington 98112
Comment:

I-0055-001 The Pacific Interchange alternativeis the most palatable option for the bridge through the Montlake area. Two Montlake bridges won't solve any of the existing trafiic problems.

I really don't think that a wider bridge is the best solution, as the condestion on will continue to create trafiic backup on the 520. The only diffrence is, they will be shorter wider backups, still as time consuming. Having experienced Washington, D.C.'s attempts to solve traffic congestion by widening the feeder routes (I-95N, _95S, I-66, and I-270) into the D.C. Beltway (I-495), I can say that wider roads did little to decrease commute time, decreased safety, and increased dissatsfaction of the public the road served, all at an enormous cost. Wider roads just do not solve the problems we face!

tht said, if we are going to icrease the flow capacity of 520, even without changing the capaity of the terminal points, then the Pacific Interchange just make far, far more sense from both a neighborhood perspective and a traffic solution perspective.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Online Comment by User: bill

Submitted on: 8/29/2006 7:01:00 PM
Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-11, Page-1
Address: , , 98102
Comment:

I-0056-001 There is a viable alternative to which I do not believe WSDOT has given fair, objective, unbiased consideration: this alternative is known as the Pacific Interchange. This alternative absolutely must be considered and investigated. Yes, a relationship from and support of the UW will be necessary but this support can be forthcoming if only WSDOT staff and management will exhibit leadership.

Please do not keep your blinders on to building only more traffic lanes. To do so will only be a disservice to the citizens of our state.

Online Comment by User: bkrieger

Submitted on: 10/2/2006 8:53:00 AM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98102
Comment:

I-0057-001

from Barbara Krieger, resident Portage Bay/Fuhrman Ave:
Please don't make the mistake of ignoring transit and bicycles - they should be the very top priorities if we want to get ourselves out of this congestion.

The 4 lane alternative with lids and HOV lanes is preferred by my household and neighbors. The quiet, natural resource of Montlake Park+its wetlands, and the arboretum (Foster Island and associated wetlands) should be protected and the silt/runnoff from the current viaducts should be stopped! These resources are what makes the neighborhood livable. If perserving them requires a submerged tunnel option, it should be top priority, along with transit.

Sincerely,

Barbara Krieger and Bill Butler, 2906 Fuhrman Ave E.

Online Comment by User: bmckib1

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:03:00 PM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1
Address: , , 98195
Comment:

I-0058-001

The Pacific Interchange is an absolutely awful idea. It will destroy the daily operations of the Southeast part of the UW campus. And, it will damage the arboretum. There is no solid proposed mitigation of a variety of impacts on the UW campus. What about loss of hospital and sports attendance? Can this part of campus really handle light rail construction and this? Why must UW bear the burden of all this construction, and not be paid a dime?

This is a classic case of the Montlake community having TOO MUCH SAY in State policy. They are only ONE neighborhood.

Comment Category: Comments on Construction Effects
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-2
Comment:

The parking lost at the UW, as well as disruption to the UW Medical Center is totally unacceptable. We must do something to make sure the campus is not totally gridlocked in construction traffic.

Online Comment by User: bmcmullen

Submitted on: 9/16/2006 8:10:00 AM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-9
Address: , , 98105
Comment:

I-0059-001 Comment on the Pacific Street Interchange-

I oppose the Pacific Street Interchange and believe it has fatal flaws that will worsen traffic on Surface streets and make bus trips longer.

1. We are reducing the through put to get cars onto the 520 bridge for those People who head Eastbound: Currently, going East bound we have 1 General Purpose lane entering 520 at the arboretum and 1 GP + 1 HOV lane at Montlake that merges together into 1 lane prior to entering 520.

In the Pacific Interchange at the top where the 4 lane stop is, we have 1 HOV lane and will be jamming the 2 GP lanes into 1 lane on the on-ramp to east bound greatly restricting the throughput via the one GP onramp.

This would be essentially as if you took the current Montlake GP lane and could magically attach it over at the Arboretum stop sign where all the traffic comes together so they would merge together and then get onto the bridge using the one lane. This is more of a bottle neck then the current situation and therefore will backup traffic onto surface streets.

Montlake would be a dedicated HOV lane but all the GP traffic coming into one place in the arboretum illustrates the reduced capacity to get cars onto the bridge. This seems like we are making it worse for eastbound traffic then what we have today. The result would be larger backups onto the surface streets then we have now. How does reducing the amount of onramp capacity allow more cars to get through? This doesn't make sense.

A simple model might illustrate this…. If you assume that each GP lane provides 100 riders per hour and then you assume the current volume of HOV traffic carries 300 riders per hour then the current throughput would look alike…

= 1gpx100 riders for the arboretum + ((.75gpx100) +(300 for HOV)) for Montlake assuming that you only get 3/4 use of the GP in Montlake due to some HOV traffic also using that space this = 475 throughput for the current scenario……

Alternatively with the Pacific Interchange using the same analysis

.5x100 + .5x100 for the GP Lanes that come together + 300 for the HOV lane = 400

I-0059-001

2. Two left hand turns do not seem to make traffic better. The Pacific Interchange Main intersection will allow only two lanes to turn left that will need to support both eastbound and westbound traffic and HOV traffic.

An additional left hand turn at the top of the interchange prior to getting onto the bridge will only add to the problems. If most of the traffic is coming from the north then why would you want to make them make two left hand turns to get onto 520?. This will however greatly improve the travel for the people from the north who before had less volume but did have to make the left hand turn which caused some backup.

3. Will we create a longer bus ride for those wishing to get off at the UW during Rush Hour: We will have backups on the Pacific Interchange arms between the 4-way lights and the main intersection going both inbound and outbound. Because of that, buses will be stuck in that traffic between the 4 lane lights at the top of the interchange and the Main intersection adding 10 to 15 minutes as they try to navigate from the offramp to the bus stop and then back out whereas today they easily exit and enter the freeway at the Montlake / 520 bus stops.

4. Do the analytical models reflect reality: I suggest you drive the Montlake blvd north to south several times on one day between 7am and 8am. You will see how the initial backup on Montlake starts when 520 volumes rise and backups start out on 520 at the "S" curve of the high rise and then the Arboretum exit and then the backup flows back onto the on ramp and finally back onto Montlake blvd. If 520 is flowing there is never a backup of consequence on Montlake during rush hour.ever.. This may be different in the afternoon but I have not seen any acknowledgement of this nor have I seen any discussion on the actual entry points onto 520 and how they are improved (See point 1.) If the models show that there is some kind of critical backup in Montlake in the morning that is due to a constriction on Montlake then it is not supported by my 7 years of driving that route at various time in various directions. The backup on Montlake 99% of the time starts with the backup on 520 at the Arboretum exit and moves West to the Montlake onramp and onto Montlake. Models can be wrong or blatantly misconstrued to generate the outcome desired..

Online Comment by User: Bobbi Campbell

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:33:00 AM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-12, Page-1
Address: 9644 Evergreen Dr, Bellevue, Wa 98004
Comment:

I-0060-001 Hello, My name is Bobbi Campbell. I have lived in Bellevue all my life. I currently ride the bus - 261 - to Seattle every day to work over the 520 Bridge. I am in favor of the Pacific Interchange. I hope that this choice becomes a reality. I am currently also on the Board of Trustees at Seattle Yacht Club. Our club whole heartedly endorses the Pacific Interchange as well. Regards.

Online Comment by User: bowman07

Submitted on: 10/24/2006 8:28:00 AM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98004

I-0061-001 **Comment:**
I am in favor of this option to the six-lane alternative. So long as WSDOT and its partners make every effort to mitigate the environmental impact on the Arboretum and the lake wildlife, the Pacific Street Interchange offers the best choice in meeting the throughput demands of the corridor, and has the potential for light rail in the future, of which I am strongly in favor. My family lives in Redmond and I work in Bellevue, but my wife works in Seattle and must cross SR 520 every day. Please don't delay.

Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

I-0061-002 **Comment:**
Please DO NOT adopt this 4-lane alternative in any form. This is not a good option for meeting the corridor's demand for throughput because it decreases capacity in the corridor. It also is not forward thinking because it does not provide for future light rail.

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

I-0061-003 **Comment:**
I am strongly in favor of the 6-lane alternative and ask that you adopt it. We need to maintain or increase capacity along this corridor, and having two general purpose lanes and an HOV lane is a good start. Building the structures/pontoons with an eye toward future light rail is also worth every penny. (See my separate comment in favor of the Pacific Street Interchange.)

Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

I-0061-004 **Comment:**
I would like to thank Julie and John for their leadership on this project. During my stint as counsel for the House Transportation Committee in 2006, I had the opportunity to attend numerous open houses and public hearings on the SR 520 project, including taking a boat tour of the SR 520 bridge with the expert review panel, and in my conversations with both John and Julie it became apparent how dedicated and knowledgeable they are. The citizens of the seven affected communities do not realize how lucky they are that this project has these particular individuals at the helm. Keep up the good work!

- David Bowman

Online Comment by User: bowmanm1

Submitted on: 10/25/2006 12:23:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1
Address: , , 98052

I-0062-001 **Comment:**

I strongly support using one of the six-lane alternatives, rather than the four-lane alternative. The Eastside has become a major employment center. For example, substantially more people now work in Redmond than live in Redmond. And obviously we need adequate transportation infrastructure to get people into Seattle. The current four-lane 520 bridge is a choke-point for east-west traffic, and increased capacity should be critical to this project. In terms of the alternatives, I support the Pacific Interchange option. I work at Seattle University, so I would also want to see bus service preserved or enhanced between the Eastside and that area.

Online Comment by User: bradmeacham

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:34:00 AM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 2714 fairview ave e, seattle, wa 98102

I-0063-001 **Comment:**

I support a six-lane replacement with the Pacific interchange. It is most critical that the bridge be transit-friendly and have a wide bike path.

Improvements should be made to the interchange at I-5 to eliminate the weave to Mercer Street. But this needs to be done within the current I-5 footprint.

Lastly the 520 footprint through the Arboretum should be as small as possible. Perhaps the structure could be elevated more or curve to minimize impacts.

Online Comment by User: brebnerjk

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 4:48:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98115
Comment:

I-0064-001 We do not favor expanding the bridge to 6 lanes.

Online Comment by User: brenhi01

Submitted on: 10/26/2006 1:17:00 PM
Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-9
Address: , Seattle, WA 98052
Comment:

I-0065-001 This 4 lane alternative looks like a waste of money to me. All you've done is kept the same amount of lanes we have now, widened two of them and widened the shoulders. And added a bike & pedestrian lane. Is a bike & pedestrian lane really a priority on a major freeway? And don't we already have many places they can walk & ride in our state?

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-9
Comment:

I like this alternative and am sorry the 8 Lane was not feasible. If we're going to spend the money, let's plan ahead and get the most capacity we can on 520. I'd prefer to have 3 open lanes on each side, get rid of the bicycle/pedestrian lane and add it as an extra lane to either side.

Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-3
Comment:

-Go with the 6 lane
-Go with whatever reasonable option those communities nearby that are going to be effected favor the most

Please make 520 first priority over the viaduct and I90. It is the worst for traffic congestion across the water. I commute every day from Seattle to Redmond and the traffic reporters on the news stations might as well just record their broadcasts and play them over and over each day. People says we no longer have a reverse commute; however, from what I see every day, traffic always seems to be worse going to the Eastside in the morning and back to Seattle in the late afternoon. (Sonic games, Mariners games, Seahawks, opera/musical events, etc.) My commute, of course. :)

I-0065-002 -Has anyone thought of a tunnel vs. open lanes? Or too costly? It would reduce the noise even more and eliminate slow-downs when: that water-skier shows up every Winter skiing next to the bridge and people slow down to watch, when people take their foot off the gas while gawking at all of the boats on the water in Summer and when traffic gets congested because of the sun blinding the majority of drivers who forgot to bring their sunglasses with them.

I-0065-003 -And how about stacked lanes? They have them in PA. Eliminate the width of the bridge; just make it taller? Too costly? Ruin too many views?

I-0065-004 And most of all, start electronically tolling the 520 now! I am ready. As long as no one spends the money on something else, you would have a good head start on funds when this project finally gets started and it would eliminate any more delays.

Thanks for giving me the opportunity to comment.

-Brenda

Online Comment by User: Brett Marck

Submitted on: 9/20/2006 11:13:00 AM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-7
Address: , , 98144
Comment:

I-0066-001 No improvements to the SR520 bridge are going to improve traffic flows unless improvements are made to the exits at (1) I-5, (2) Montlake and (3) SR405. A prime example is I-90, I-90 has six lanes and includes carpool options but it still comes to a stand still if traffic is stopped on I-5 or 405. Adding more lanes and building a bigger-wider SR520 will not increase traffic flows during peak hours unless improvements are made to the major entrance / exit points and traffic flows increase on I-5 and SR405. Please do not just build a bigger parking lot.

Online Comment by User: briankr

Submitted on: 10/17/2006 10:56:00 AM
Comment Category: Comments on Construction Effects
Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-14
Address: 1633 Bellevue Ave Apt 512, Seattle, WA 98122

I-0067-001 **Comment:**
Closing the westbound HOV lane as it approaches the bridge is a terrible idea, as it provides a huge disincentive to use transit. Doing this will result in a drastic increase in SOV's on the road, as taking the bus is no longer a reasonable option.

As of now, I take it every day. I estimate that getting to/from the bus stops and waiting for the bus adds 30-40 minutes to my evening commute every day, however this is compensated for by the fact that the bus can use the HOV lane. Without this, I couldn't justify taking the bus, and I'd imagine many people feel the same way. The 545 especially is a commuter route, and the vast majority of people likely own cars.

While the construction will be painful for everyone, it is absolutely backwards to do something like this when it will significantly increase the number of cars on the road. If anything, the HOV lane should stay open with only one SOV lane. This would provide an incentive for people to avoid SOV trips, and additional transit routes could be added to make the bus more convenient for people not currently directly served.

Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-11

I-0067-002 **Comment:**
As a daily commuter from Seattle to the Eastside, the traffic is nearly unbearable. And I take the bus. A 4-lane alternative that does nothing to improve traffic (for both buses and SOV's) is a waste of money.

Online Comment by User: brinker

Submitted on: 9/11/2006 11:28:00 PM
Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98112

I-0068-001 **Comment:**

The Pacific Interchange is the only option that makes sense to me - as a resident of Montlake, someone who used to commute to the eastside every day and also as someone who relied heavily on public transit when I lived in Chicago.

Any other alternative falls short since it will not integrate surface traffice, SR520 traffice and the light rail line. it's clear to me as a Montlake resident that my neighborhood cannot bear the brunt of any traffic increases and the Pacific Interchange address this concern as well.

Online Comment by User: Bruce Balick

Submitted on: 10/23/2006 8:19:00 AM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1
Address: , , 98112

I-0069-001 **Comment:**

Regarding the connectivity of the Sound Transit Metro stop at Husky Stadium and bus services: the design shown in the draft EIS is exceedingly vague, its goals are unclear, and the functionality of the design is dubious. For example, the Montlkae roadway is lowered below grade level to make space for a pedestrian/bike overpass at the intersection of Montlake and Pacific. There is no obvious place on the lower level near the Metro stop for busses to load and unload passwengers. Additionally, the Metro stations are at grade level, not at street level. So, unless I am mistaken, it is physically impossible for local bus passengers to get to the Metro stop in a safe and convenient manner.

Bruce Balick

Online Comment by User: bshecket

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 7:52:00 AM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-14
Address: , , 98112
Comment:

I-0070-001 Chap 1, pg 14:
Cost estimates for the 4-lane versus the two 6 -lane options show the 4-lane significantly less expensive to build (.3 - 1.4 billion dollars less).

Other sections of this document don't convince this reader that the benefits are substantially better with the more expensive 6 lane options!

Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-5
Comment:

I-0070-002 Chapter 4, pg 5 "The Morning Life of a Commuter" in 2026:
Your scenario for the individual "future commuter" at the bottom of this page fails to consider changes in peoples' behavior that will inevitably occur in the upcoming years. The factors used here carry forward patterns from today that are already changing due to social, environmental and political forces!

Online Comment by User: bsherman_01

Submitted on: 9/9/2006 5:11:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-20

Address: , , 98115

Comment:

I-0071-001 After looking very closely at the options and alternatives, I strongly support the Pacific Interchange option for SR 520. Local traffic flow would be greatly improved (in fact, it would again be truly "local" instead of a bottleneck for commuters). It would greatly improve transit efficiancy for many reasons as outlined in the study, and there would be a direct link to light rail at UW. There would also be a continuous new park area with trail systems from Portage Bay to the Arboretum. Spending the money for a 4 lane system seems a waste, and for a 6-lane system that does little or nothing to improve transit and actually makes local congestion worse seems to a bad idea as well. Doing nothing is crazy (it's bad now, and it's going to get worse AND more expensive).

Thank you

Brad Sherman

Online Comment by User: bskelly

Submitted on: 9/10/2006 10:01:00 AM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98112
Comment:

I-0072-001 I would like to register my support of this alternative, as it is the only one that mittigates the traffic problems along montlake blvd, and helps to reduce noise and polition in the montlake area,
This option would allow the montlake area to be reconnected across 520 by a lid and the introduction of more green space.

It also ensures that the homes in montlake are not destroyed, for highways.

Thank you
Bill Skelly

Online Comment by User: Buckem

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 1:39:00 PM
Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 3312 81st Place SE, Mercer Island, Washington 98040

I-0073-001 **Comment:**

The new bridge is planned to last 100 years.It must be designed to accommodate a significant increase in General Purpose traffic - however much is transferred to transit.The bridge must start with at least 6 lanes,with the capability to be expanded to 8.The Pacific Street interchange is necessary to speed access to the bridge for traffic to/from points north of 520 .We cannot afford not to think long term.
Richard Tait

Online Comment by User: cagp

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 7:31:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98115

I-0074-001 **Comment:**

I am writing to oppose the current expansion proposal for SR520. I don't beleive it has given full consideration to the impacts it would impose on the local and greater community, the true long-range benefits to transportation flow, or the irreperable environmental loss from it's intersect with the Washignton Park Arboretum, Union Bay wetlands, and University of Washington campus areas. The environmental impacts to the Arboretum areas have not been fully reviewed and viewed...after the recent master plan efforts for this local resource with international repute, this is a great insult to this local treasure.

While traffic back-ups along the Montlake Cut are notorious and getting thicker, I am not convinced by the expansive 6-lane proposal and Pacific Interchange. The I-90 expansion was to take up much of the flow from SR520. Now here we are again, looking to build another highway of immense scale.

A more full investigation of the values and contributions to the region of the natural resources that would be impaired by this construction is called for. Broader range of options for the functions and capacity of SR520 against other transit options and routes.

As a long-time Seattle resident who travels this area, and has worked at and around the UW, I am not only opposed to what has been presented, but would feel a huge insult to the quality of life I have enjoyed and sought from this area. I do not wish to see more of my beloved City consumed by massive highway expansion.

The current plan is short-sighted, and needs to look more fully at the traffic implications for the broader reaches of the University to Madison to the south.

Online Comment by User: Caisa

Submitted on: 8/31/2006 8:46:00 AM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98117
Comment:

I-0075-001 I support the Pacific Interchange proposal - it makes sense. There is no use building extra lanes on 520 if we don't have an integrated commuter system. I live in Seattle and work in Redmond, and this plan makes sense.

Online Comment by User: cajseattle

Submitted on: 9/12/2006 7:24:00 AM
Comment Category: Second Montlake Bridge
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1
Address: 2211 E. Calhoun Street, Seattle, WA 98112
Comment:

I-0076-001 I am vehemently opposed to the Base-Six options being put forth by the state. They appear to have been drafted with little to no regard for the residents of Montlake. As a five year resident who commutes across 520 every day I clearly see the need for action. that is why I support the Pacific Internchange Plan. Please give serious consideration to this option.

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1
Comment:

I-0076-002 I completely suppport the Pacific Interchange Plan. Please give it the due diligence and consideration it deserves.

Online Comment by User: Caleb

Submitted on: 10/28/2006 2:55:00 PM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98112
Comment:

I-0077-001 I would like to strongly support the Pacific Interchange Plan for the replacement of SR 520. I also strongly oppose the other alternatives that would not work for transit or reconnect my neighborhood. I am a bike rider and like the direct connection from the Burke Gilman Trail to the east side over that new bridge.

Online Comment by User: Camille

Submitted on: 10/23/2006 1:00:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98117
Comment:

I-0078-001 I think the view across the lake and the environmental impact on Lake Washington are the two most important criteria to consider when deciding how 520 should be expanded. I hope
I-0078-002 a toll can pay for the rebuilding.

Online Comment by User: candace frankinburger

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 7:51:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98112
Comment:

I-0079-001 please don't build a six lane highway. I favor the NO build alternative.
thanks, candace frankinburger

Online Comment by User: carl@demarcken.org

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:44:00 PM
Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 4013 ne 45, seattle, wa 98105
Comment:

I-0080-001 The six-lane alternatives, by making it even easier for large numbers of people to travel in single-occupancy vehicles, will add to the city's traffic problems rather than reducing them. Without strong incentives for the public to use public transportation, and the city to provide practical forms of it, I am opposed to increases in the size of road arteries. It will add to polution and impose further traffic on smaller road systems (the arboretum road, montlake blvd, etc) that are already full.

I prefer the 4-lane alternative paid for with heavy usage taxes (tolls), because I think it is the most responsible in the long run for the city to be trying to reduce road traffic, not increase it.

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Comment:

I-0080-002 It is very difficult to imagine the pacific interchange option, with its intersection above the arboretum islands and increased traffic through the arboretum drive, not significantly harming the arboretum, both ecologically and visually. The mere construction will be extremely destructive.

I am opposed to:

the arboretum off-ramp;
the pacific interchange option intersection over the arboretum islands
the pacific interchange option bridge over the channel

Online Comment by User: carls

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 7:45:00 AM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 4451 91st Ave NE, Bellevue, 98004 98004
Comment:

I-0081-001 Facilitating convenient, flexible transit service should be a top goal of each alternative. We are building a structure with a 50 year lifetime. There is no doubt that whether due to global warming or due to peak oil or demands from India and China, we will have to cut the use of fuel in transportation, and that our future will require higher use of transit. Thus the alternative that is selected must be designed to work well with transit -- both eventual rail transit which should be built on the 520 corridor in the future, and bus transit in the earlier years. Even if the majority of citizens and politicians don't yet understand that reality, we should make it a design priority to give the community the value and flexibility of this massive community investment.

For flexible bus transit, it MUST be a design criterion that a bus route coming from the Eastside be capable of directly service downtown Seattle AND having a transfer stop somewhere in the Montlake vicinity to both serve the Montlake area, and allow transfers towards Capitol Hill and northward toward the University and beyond.

No alternative should be designed so that buses headed to downtown have no ability to serve a stop at Montlake. The ideal location for that stop will be Montlake Blvd/24th Ave where local service intersects.

No alternative should be designed with the concept that passengers headed to downtown must transfer at Pacific Street.

In addition, If some buses do terminate at Pacific Street, there should be a seamless connection to the Link Light Rail which requires crossing no streets.

The Eastside stops at Evergreen Point and at Yarrow Point (92nd Ave) should be maintained so that these areas have some ability to access transit.

If the 520 project goes as far as I-405, there should be a structure built that will allow transfers along Bellevue Way/S. Kirkland P&R for buses that are continuing on 520 or 405.

Online Comment by User: Carol Curtis

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:32:00 AM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98105
Comment:

I-0082-001 After being briefly excited by the 6 lane Pacific Interchange option (anything to help Montlake bridge congestion!) and thinking maybe it would work with expensive noise mitigation and expensive artistic bridge design, I have decided that the 4 lane replacement option should be chosen because the most important consideration on the design of the bridge should be to protect the open space and endangered urban wildlife of the present Arboretum. In one hundred years, other and better transportation options than the car will have presented themselves but it will be too late to replace the valuable Arboretum. It seems to me that much of the Montlake congestion could be solved by simply eliminating the access to 520E (while maintaining the exits and access to 520W) at that location, a much less expensive option than the $450+ million Pacific Interchange option.

To facilitate traffic and encourage ride sharing, I would make l lane each way, during peak hours, dedicated to car pools, mass transit and those willing to pay a premium (2x or 3x the toll). Carol Curtis

Online Comment by User: carol wales

Submitted on: 9/16/2006 10:17:00 AM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-12, Page-14
Address: 3820 NE89th St, Seattle, WA 98115
Comment:

I-0083-001 I support the Pacific Interchange Plan for SR520. It is the only plan that will eliminate the bottleneck on the Montlake Blvd and provide better bus serevice to my neighbor.hood

Online Comment by User: Carol Watts

Submitted on: 10/23/2006 1:01:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 6247 26th Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98115
Comment:

I-0084-001 I am very concerned about plans to charge a toll of $3.50 per trip--$7 per day for those of us who must commute to work daily. That's $35 a week, and more than $150 a month. Who can afford that? Only the very rich. So the effect of such a toll will be to divert traffic to the only other cross-lake option--down I-5, across I-90, and up I-405--creating horrible gridlock and causing everyone to use tons more gas. That is no solution.

And don't think that the huge toll will motivate people to take the bus. Given the huge traffic jams on 520 today, anyone who *can* take the bus *is* taking the bus already.

When the 520 bridge first opened up, there was a toll of around 25 cents per trip. That is affordable. But even accounting for increases in wages and cost of living over the years, there's no way that 25 cents then equals $3.50 now. That's an increase of 1400 percent.

I think whatever design option you choose must be something that can be built affordably, with affordable tolls--not more than $.50 per trip, or $1 a day round trip. Yes, it's fair to have those who use the bridge pay for some of the work. But not at a rate that makes it impossible for any but the rich to use the bridge.

Online Comment by User: caroleecolter

Submitted on: 10/29/2006 6:08:00 PM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98118
Comment:

I-0085-001 I am opposed to the six-lane alternative, and would prefer any four-lane altnerative Here is why:

* Global warming: The six-lane alternatives worsen global warming in a way that the four-lane alternative does not. The City Council draft resolution, and WSDOT's EIS both fail to consider global warming, and thus miss this advantage of the four-lane alternative. The City of Seattle's recent "green ribbon" commission report warns that increased driving is our region's largest single contribution to global warming. Keeping SR520 at four lanes is the most important single step that our region can take to reduce its future impact on global warming.

* Greater adverse construction impacts: SR520 construction will cause huge impacts from truck noise, vibration, dust and pollution, and traffic safety and tie-ups--and building the six-lane alternatives will cause a year more of these impacts than the four-lane alternative, plus tens of thousands of additional trips by dump trucks.

* Six-lane alternative encourages car driving: Because of wider lanes and shoulders, and improved connecting ramps, a four-lane SR520 would accommodate somewhat more traffic than the current bridge, but not be as wide or destructive as the six lane proposals. Transit can work well on a four-lane alternative through a combination of congestion pricing and preferential access, including conversion of lanes to HOV-only at rush hours. By building new HOV lanes, the six-lane alternatives would move car-pools and buses off of the other lanes, creating more incentive to drive. We do not help transit by making it easier to drive alone.

* Benefits for four and six lanes are equal, while adverse impacts are worse for six lanes: All the features now being promoted as benefits of the six lane option would also be true of the four lane option--reducing noise by building lids and sound walls, improving water quality by diverting runoff from the bridge to water treatment facilities, easing congestion on the Montlake Bridge, and adding shoulders for emergency vehicles and breakdowns.

* Community opposition: UW, Arboretum Foundation, and most neighborhoods oppose the Pacific Street Interchange. Descriptions of the Pacific Street Interchange as being community-generated are inaccurate. On August 11, 2006, eight stakeholders provided to the City the following statement:

"The organizations that we represent are opposed to the so-called Pacific Street Interchange proposal because it is overly large and expensive, and has unacceptable impacts on the Arboretum and its wetlands, Union Bay, the University of Washington, and the surrounding neighborhoods. Please include this statement in the body of the SR520 Seattle Advisory Committee report."

I-0085-001

Jean Amick, Laurelhurst Community Council
Lisa Anderson, Madison Park Community Council
Matt Fox, University District Community Council President
Louis Hoffer, Broadmoor Homeowners' Association
Larry Sinnott, Ravenna-Bryant Community Association
Carsten Stinn, Eastlake Community Council President
Theresa Doherty, University of Washington Assistant Vice President
Fred Hoyt, University of Washington Botanical Gardens
Angela Belbeck, Seattle Board of Park Commissioners

Unaffordable: The 520 upgrade is going to be expensive but the six lane option is going to be even more expensive than four lanes. The Expert Review Panel finds the most likely cost of the Pacific Street Interchange six-lane alternative to be $4.38 billion--$1.59 billion more than the four-lane cost of $2.79 billion.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Online Comment by User: Carolt

Submitted on: 9/10/2006 8:32:00 PM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98112
Comment:
Hello,

My family strongly supports the Pacific Interchange option for the 520 bridge. We believe that it will benefit the Montlake neighborhood, 520 commuters, and the University of Washington. By directly routing northbound traffic to the University of Washington, this will alleviate the nonstop congestion on the Montlake Bridge and the surrounding environment.

Regards,
Carol Troup and Peter Johnson

Online Comment by User: Carolyn Janko Gardner

Submitted on: 10/4/2006 3:11:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 2029 E Howe St, Seattle, WA 98112
Comment:

I-0087-001 I vote to support the Pacific Interchange Plan!

As a Montlake resident for many years, I have experienced the frustrations that many others have - the awful traffic congestion that exists in our neighborhood due to the current location and configuration of the Montlake On- and Off- ramp traffic.

Harking back to the debates (that droned on and on) about the I-90 rebuild, it is a wonder that the I-90 bridge project became a reality. Now that I-90 is a reality versus a debate, we should applaud the foresight of those who were so dedicated to improve the traffic, while - at the same time- improving the visual environment and respecting the residents in that area I pray that we residents of the Montlake neighborhood will receive similar respect.

Please give Montlake the renewal of our environmental area - how lovely that will be!

Carolyn Janko Gardner
2029 E Howe Street
Montlake Neighborhood
Seattle, WA
carolyn.janko@gmail.com

Online Comment by User: Carolyn White

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 9:11:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98109

I-0088-001 **Comment:**

Thank you for opportunity to express preference on this critical expansion of 520. I definitely prefer the Pacific Street option because it best supports the public's ability to use rapid transit in an efficient manner. With out energy concerns, rapid transit will be used much more extensively--especially if we have created almost-seamless connections.

Online Comment by User: carrie

Submitted on: 9/29/2006 6:39:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98110
Comment:

I-0089-001 In general, I don't support rebuilding the 520 bridge because of the negative impacts to the neighboring communities and the Arboretum. If you rebuild it to a larger structure, it will only fill up to capacity again. This issue forces us to work on alternatives like light rail. Let's spend more on that than more roads for cars to use, making it harder to use a car. Let's encourage people to use public transportation instead.

We need to protect our wildlife habitat, the little that is left in Seattle proper. Save the Arboretum, please! And the Foster Island area.

Thank you,
Carrie
Bainbridge Island

Online Comment by User: Cascadia

Submitted on: 9/25/2006 2:20:00 PM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , Seattle, WA 98103

I-0090-001 **Comment:**
I can't fathom why a four land replace bridge is even on the table. The state's inability to improve traffic flow across the lake has a direct impact on the affordability of housing in our region. Your failure to increase capacity has resulted in such unbearable commutes that people are unable to afford to live in neighborhoods where you can raise children.

Please don't let the weathly few dictate what tens of thousands of people who use the bridge every day clearly need. This is a no brainer. Build six lanes and build it as fast as possible.. Do you have any idea how stressful it is to sit in traffic night after night trying to get home to our families? There is no advantage in trying to take the bus since there aren't any bus lanes on the routes going from Seattle to Bellevue in the morning.

The bike lanes will only benefit a tiny tiny tiny percentage of people and they don't make sense to include. Why not build a mini rail that would let people drive tiny electric cars (the size of say a mini cooper) instead? Come on you have spent millions on this and the best you can come up with is a 4 or 6 lane bridge? I am as liberal as they come but these type of process oriented projects make the government look silly and waste our time and money. Build it and build it NOW.

Comment Category: Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-1

I-0090-002 **Comment:**
Although the online version of the EIS is impressive what a huge waste of money and time. As far as I can tell not one person has made a single comment this way? No one who is working and driving across the bridge has the time to read this document nor does it give the information we want.

Even though I have a background in construction engineering we really don't need to explain the various types of footings or retaining walls do we? Break this project down into pieces with short little bullets of information. Why can't you build it in less than five years? Do you honestly think we want to commute on a constrction project for seven years?

I-0090-003 Do you honestly think people think it is a good use of taxpayer money to hold public meetings on what texture to use on the walls? This is a urgent and very necessary project but your attempt to build community suport is over the top. Use every means necessary and build it as fast as you can. Leave the art for later.

Online Comment by User: cate4appeals

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:02:00 AM
Comment Category: Ecosystems
Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-5
Address: 652 32nd Avenue E, Seattle, Washington 98112

I-0091-001 **Comment:**

Please consider the No Build alternative more seriously. Increasing traffic in this corridor will encourage more commuting between Seattle and Microsoft by a class of people who seem incapable of recognizing the environmental consequences of their actions. And placing a structure at the height of a 10-story building (the "Pacific" alternative) based on the height of two boats that travel in this area is a true outrage!
catherine smith
(I WALK to work; and have made employment and residence choices based on the ability to do so. Everyone should be encouraged to do the same.)

Online Comment by User: Catherine Allchin

Submitted on: 10/29/2006 7:20:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98105
Comment:

I-0092-001

This letter is to voice our strong opposition to the preferred alternative (Pacific Interchange) to replace SR520 as outlined in WSDOT's recent Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

We represent some Microsoft families who live in the Laurelhurst neighborhood. On weekdays, it takes at least a full hour to get to or from the Microsoft campus (only a 12-mile trip). We do believe that traffic on 520 and Montlake Blvd. is a real problem for the city and the state. However, we think the Pacific Interchange and 6-lane replacement bridge would be a huge setback for our region. The negative impacts on affected neighborhoods and natural areas are far too extreme. During the years of construction, we would essentially be trapped in Laurelhurst. Afterward, we'd be left with more traffic, more noise, and more pavement. (Even today, the noise from 520 off the lake is a real concern.) Despite our personal desire for a better commute, we strongly urge you to vote against this alternative. It is overkill.

The cost is far too high—both financially and in terms of our precious quality of life. With our children, we enjoy hiking, walking, kayaking and boating in the wetland areas. Every time we go there, we feel lucky to live in a major U.S. city that values its natural areas, where it's possible to see blue herons, turtles, and eagles inside the city limits. Seattle is undeniably a livable city—still. Let's keep it that way for our children's children.

We urge you to pursue a less invasive approach (like floating in replacement spans, doing necessary retrofitting, and prioritizing mass transit).

Catherine & Jim Allchin
3038 E Laurelhurst Dr NE
Seattle, WA 98105

Karmann & Rich Kaplan
3373 E Laurelhurst Dr NE
Seattle, WA 98105

Online Comment by User: cathyl

Submitted on: 9/10/2006 6:40:00 PM
Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98112
Comment:

I-0093-001

REASONS I FAVOR THE PACIFIC INTERCHANGE CHOICE FOR REDESIGNING HIGHWAY 520:

It makes no sense to me to funnel an increased number of cars and people from 520 north across the Montlake Bridge! Or even more troublesome, to not provide a better way for all the cars north of canal to get onto 520 (yes, lots of these people are UW-related). Let's help those cars and people move smoothly through to where they want to go, and let lanes on Montlake Bridge do what they do so beautifully: provide gorgeous city street driving from one neighborhood to the neighborood next to it (IE a person who works at Children's Hospital and lives on Capitol Hill could drive or ride bus without traffic backups smoothly southward to get home from work.)

So many people want to get off of 520 to the north side of the Montlake Canal, whether they are connected to the UW or headed to other points north. Say they want to shop at University Village, or they live or work in neighborhoods that are north of canal and don't want to use I5 North. It makes sense to choose a well-thought out design that gets these cars where they want to go without continuing to force them all to sit backed up at the Montlake bridge bottleneck.

ALSO, mass transit is our region's only hope for the future. Mass transit needs to be viewed from an overall viewpoint, meaning one form of mass transit should connect to another--buses bringing riders off of 520's wonderful new HOV lanes should bring those riders to the light rail station that will be built at Husky stadium--not drop them off down on the 520 freeway from where they would have to walk north across the Montlake Bridge to get to the light rail station.

Thank you for listening--please choose the Pacific Interchange Option!
Cathy Loeffler

Online Comment by User: cburtner

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:57:00 AM
Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-1
Address: , , 98117

I-0094-001 **Comment:**

This alternative (6-lane, no options) seems the most beneficial to ease traffic congestion without scarring the natural landscape that we absolutely need to preserve and protect around the UW arboretum. The Pacific Street interchange looks like it would cause too much interference with the existing natural environment that has to struggle enough as it is in the area that has been overly developed around the Lake Washington shore. The HOV carpool lane, and bicycle path give good alternatives to commuters who might otherwise be single car users. This wider road may also be easier in the future to add light rail to? We need to get people out of their cars!!! Let's not to inflict irreversible harm to the future of our wetlands and beauty of our natual landscape, because we make it too easy for single occupancy drivers to keep up their bad habits. The wider you make the road, the more cars will clog them up. We can't just keep making roads wider. This is extremely short-term thinking. We need mass transit. I can only hope that light rail is destined to be incorporated in this design soon.

As for the tolls, I hope that this makes people think about carpooling, and to shop and work closer to their homes.

Online Comment by User: cedholm

Submitted on: 10/29/2006 7:34:00 PM
Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98058
Comment:

I-0095-001 Reconsider the 4 lane or hybrid option on the 520 project. This would have less impact on the University of Washington, Seattle neighborhoods and the Arboretum. Six lanes are not consistent with Seattle's enviornmental concerns. This is the most expensive option with the greatest negative impact on the city, the wetalands and stadium events.

Online Comment by User: Celia Kennedy

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 9:42:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 6055-52nd Ave. NE, Seattle, WA 98115

I-0096-001 **Comment:**

While we need to improve the transportation in and around the greater Seattle area, we need to do it in a manner that does not degrade one of the most precious natural areas that is housed in the city. This precious natural area is the Washington Park Arboretum. It is loved and appreciated for its amazing plant diversity, the variety of birds that call it home and the peace and quiet that so many visitors can find there. In these days that we spend millions and millions of dollars on repairing habitat that has been degraded, we need to make certain we are being good stewards of the natural areas we have now that are still in good condition and still are peaceful, quiet places for generations to come to visit and enjoy. I am not necessarily opposed to the 6-lane option (with HOV lanes as 2 of those) if mitigations can and are put in place to limit the sound impacts to the northern part of the arboretum. The current plans appear insufficient in that regard. I am strongly opposed to any option, current or future, that would add any increase in traffic through the road that currently runs north to south through the body of the arboretum. Any increase in traffic in that road, or any road into the body of the arboretum, beyond the bridge replacement itself, will substantially degrade the experience of the arboretum because of the increase in noise levels. Let's identify a bridge replacement project that allows us to protect the amazing natural resource that so many enjoy and cherish. I think more analysis is needed on what the negative impacts (especially increased noise levels) will actually be on those visiting the arboretum given the possible options and have more public discussions on whether these impacts are acceptable to the public. Thank you.

Online Comment by User: cgchu

Submitted on: 9/12/2006 11:04:00 PM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-12
Address: , , 98112

I-0097-001 **Comment:**
I think that the best option for the region would be implementing the Pacific Interchange option.

Online Comment by User: chole1

Submitted on: 9/18/2006 5:49:00 PM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 2727 Belvidere Ave SW, Seattle, WA 98126

I-0098-001 **Comment:**

I would like to show my support for the Pacific Interchange option for SR 520. We should concentrate our efforts to connect our transportation projects including light rail with our existing bus service. Additionally we should be proactive in our vision of creating more public activity options and should support the creation of a continuous new park and trail system from Portage Bay to the Arboretum including a bicycle trail link from the proposed 520 bicycle trail to Madison Park.

Let's support a solution that relieves the major choke point of the Montlake Bridge and the backups it creates!

Online Comment by User: cholloway

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 9:31:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98144

I-0099-001 **Comment:**

I am a citizen of Seattle; my grandmother lived in Madison Park and fought diligently to keep 520 from running through the Arboretum. Even now when I walk by the terminated off-ramps, I am amazed that we came so close to losing such a precious resouce. I bless my grandmother every time I see those off ramps and am so grateful that we have this treasure with us.

I use the Arboretum extensively, for walking my dog and observing the seasons. I am an architect, and am well versed in urban planning, with an intense appreciation for both the environment and the Olmsted Legacy.

It has been documented that building more roads does not decrease traffic problems, but rather increases them. If driving is made convenient, people will drive; drivers will fill the roads until it becomes crowded enough to become inconvenient again. Then we will be left with the same problem, only on a larger scale. This is no legacy to leave our children.

If we as a City and as a State are interested in controlling air pollution, noise, global warming and transportation issues, we will continue to seek alternatives to transportation by means other than automobiles (most of these single occupant vehicles during the work week). Widening 520 is a solution that destroys an inner city resource, while INCREASING our transportation problems by adding to the number of vehicles on the roads.

In addition to the Arboretum, 520 is adjacent to an historic landmark: the Montlake Bridge and Montlake Cut. It is hard to imagine Opening Day, and the UW shell races being held adjacent to a 6 lane freeway. The noise and pollution created by this proposal would be another serious impact to a Seattle citizen's enjoyment of an historic Seattle landmark.

I also question the funding of a project which is relying on a tax transportation package that has not yet been approved by voters. This is spending money the State does not have. There has been no adequate addressing of how this project is to be paid for. Hopes and wishes do not constitute a responsible financial plan. I am reminded of the Monorail fiasco.

I strongly urge WSDOT to reconsider widening 520. It will seriously impact a fragile ecosystem, mar the enjoyment of two significant historic legacies, will not solve our transportation problems but serve to worsen them, and will throw us further into debt.

Constance Holloway, AIA, Seattle Chapter

Online Comment by User: Chris Pike

Submitted on: 9/21/2006 12:01:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-5
Address: , , 98112
Comment:

I-0100-001 I would like to stress the importance of adding a bike lane to the proposed 520 bridge re-build project. Currently there are no options for bicycles wishing to cross the 520 bridge except for the bus system. Many cyclists find waiting for the bus inconvenient as buses are infrequent at times and would prefer not to pay $4.00 ($5.00 for Sound Transit) a day to get a ride across the bridge. (works out to $80.00 or $100 a month for the working commuter) Alternatives to commuting by car should be encouraged, as commuters who use these alternatives shoulder greater inconvenience and difficulty on a daily basis in an effort to alleviate our traffic congestion problems. Thank you.

Online Comment by User: Chris Warner

Submitted on: 9/26/2006 3:01:00 PM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 3514 NW 67th St., Seattle, WA 98117

I-0101-001 **Comment:**
I favor the Pacific Interchange alternative as the least disruptive high capacity solution.

Online Comment by User: christina566

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 1:13:00 PM
Comment Category: Parks and Recreation
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98133

I-0102-001 **Comment:**

I urge you to select an alternative that does not impact the Arboretum in any way. The solution should not be visible from any part of the Arboretum and should not intrude on the Arboretum space. In addition, unnatural shade, pollution, and noise must be avoided.

Online Comment by User: christiney

Submitted on: 10/27/2006 5:35:00 PM
Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98102
Comment:

Mr. Paul Krueger,
WSDOT
414 Olive Way, Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98101

Dear Mr. Krueger:

I-0103-001 I am writing to urge you to oppose the proposed six lane expansion of the 520 bridge and Pacific Bridge interchange and to urge you to support the four lane alternative with tolling. The current WSDOT EIS fails to properly evaluate the more affordable four lane alternative and is a biased and factually incorrect document that promotes an unaffordable and unnecessary six lane expansion.

I recognize that a bridge replacement is necessary, however the only reasonable option for replacement of the bridge should be a four lane alternative with emergency pull-outs. A six lane proposal is fiscally reckless and would have devastating environmental impacts on the surrounding Seattle neighborhoods and the Arboretum. The current six lane Pacific Interchange proposed by the draft City Council Resolution is unacceptable and is opposed by nearly all the surrounding neighborhoods.

The EIS study that was done on the six lane alternative is seriously deficienct, and both the Council resolution and the EIS fail to acknowledge that the six lane alternative has hazardous noise levels that cannot be mitigated. The higher noise from the six-lane alternative will affect all neighborhoods that now experience noise from SR520, including Montlake, Portage Bay/Roanoke Park, Capitol Hill, and Eastlake, as well as Madison Park, Laurelhurst, and the Eastside neighborhoods. There is no more certain way to degrade quality of life and home values in this broad area than to install a six lane bridge.

I-0103-002 The City Council draft resolution and WSDOT's EIS are seriously flawed in failing to propose a tolling level that would reduce traffic flow at rush hour for the four-lane alternative to make it viable.

As a daily 520 transit rider, I can tell you that the limited schedules, inconvenient departure points, and lack of park and ride facilities make it a challenge for even a motivated person to use transit in this corridor. It should be no surprise that transit is underutilized and that the bridge is overloaded with single occupancy vehicles. Except at rush hours, the 520 has more than sufficient capacity. It is irresponsible for our government leaders not to determine the impact of tolling and transit improvement prior to making a decision to spend billions on additional capacity.

I-0103-002

Finally, as a property owner and tax payer, I strongly object to a bridge expansion that is unaffordable and unnecessary. The City and region have many critical needs, and a six lane 520 expansion is not one of them. I am a voter and I will work against any transporation proposal that allocates tax dollars to an unnecessary, ill-considered concrete monstrosity that would severely damage my own and surrounding neighborhoods and the Arboretum.

I urge WSDOT to revise the EIS to properly evaluate the four lane alternative, as it is a more responsible to the taxpayers and to future generations. Thank you for taking the time to consider my comment.

Sincerely,

Christine Yokan

1016 E. Shelby St.

Seattle, WA 98102

206-323-9155

Online Comment by User: chuchito

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 5:18:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98145
Comment:

Sirs and madames of WSDOT,

I-0104-001

Please, please, please please please! Do NOT expand Hwy. 520 over Marsh Island and Foster Island! Is nothing sacred? Do you know how many people of all ages use and revel in this area?

Don't you see? One expansion begets another expansion. And another, and another, and another. Highway 520 itself -- and the destruction of the lowlands east of Lake Washington -- was bad enough.

Your budgets and jobs necessitate doing something, but we don't want it! Leave things alone! When will humans stop killing everything with our concrete and cars! Highway expansionists and suburban sprawlers are agents of death! Find something else to do with your lives. Imagine something better. NO BUILD.

Very upset, but also thanking you for your time.

Cameron Chapman
Seattle, Washington

Online Comment by User: ciaokk

Submitted on: 9/9/2006 7:55:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 1200 NE 88th St, Seattle, WA 98115
Comment:

To whom it may concern:

I-0105-001

I am in support of the Pacific Interchange for the solution to the Montlake/520 mess that is currently present. This option will allow traffic to flow across the Montlake Bridge all of the time, not just in the dead of night; allow commuters access to a bus/rail hub, add trees (didn't the Mayor just say he wanted to add trees to Seattle??) and a new park that would connect Portage Bay to the Arboretum....how can anyone say no to this proposal?

I work at Children's Hospital and will go around the lake during high traffic times as I don't want to deal with the mess by the UW going over Montlake. I find it amazing that I can sit in that traffic mess for sometimes up to 30-45"! How in the world can it take me over an hour to get from Children's over to my parents home in the Crossroads area of Bellevue is beyond me and highly irritating.

The Pacific Interchange is creative, has minimal impact to the UW in a negative fashion, creates a new commuter hub (highly needed in this area), and has a very positive impact to the Montlake Neighborhood. It seems to be the answer to many problems.....so make this creation the solution.

Karen Kilian

Online Comment by User: clairhec

Submitted on: 9/14/2006 11:36:00 PM
Comment Category: Noise
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-13
Address: , Seattle, WA 98105
Comment:

I-0106-001 Thank you so much for your hard work to improve the 520.

We are opposed to the Pacific Interchange as we believe it would add considerable noise which would impact the wildlife of tranquil Union Bay and also the residents in Laurelhurst facing towards Union Bay. Waterskiing is banned in Union Bay; Opening Day Fireworks displays get cancelled in Union Bay... but it is OK to build a bridge across Union Bay?!

We are thrilled about the proposed sound walls along both sides of the 520 itself.

Online Comment by User: clauderaby

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 9:08:00 PM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98053
Comment:

I-0107-001 We prefer the 6 lane Pacific St option. Thank you

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Comment:
We prefer the 6 lane Pacific St option. Thank you

Online Comment by User: claudia deibert

Submitted on: 9/9/2006 4:09:00 PM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98112
Comment:

I-0108-001 I strongly support the Pacific Interchange option.
to best use resources, it is essential that the transfer between Metro buses on SR 520 and Sound Transit be within a SHORT walk in a out-of-the-weather environment which only the Pacific Interchange enables.
The UW is a 65,000 community which should have access to both transportation systems.

Online Comment by User: Clint

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 4:41:00 PM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-1
Address: 1636 77th ave ne, medina, wa 98039

I-0109-001 **Comment:**
I think that any alternative that bisects through the parking lots that serve husky stadium is burdan upon the University and its athletic department that is so large it is unjust and flat out not right.

I appose this alternative.

Comment Category: Noise
Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-2

I-0109-002 **Comment:**
I am in favor of the maximum amount of lids in both medina and montlake

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-8

I-0109-003 **Comment:**
I think deleating the 8 lane alternative is a mistake. I support the 8 lane alternative and the 6 lane alternative at a minumum. We need to think towards the future. When they built 520 the first ime they never thought we could use a reversible lane. They never thought we could ever have that much traffic on the bridge. They were wrong then and you are wrong now.

I think building 8 lanes even if it means we don't use one lane right now is planning for the future generations instead of making them redo our mistakes all over again.

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-9
Comment:
I think deleating the 8 lane alternative is a mistake. I support the 8 lane alternative and the 6 lane alternative at a minumum. We need to think towards the future. When they built 520 the first ime they never thought we could use a reversible lane. They never thought we could ever have that much traffic on the bridge. They were wrong then and you are wrong now.

I think building 8 lanes even if it means we don't use one lane right now is planning for the future generations instead of making them redo our mistakes all over again.

Online Comment by User: conjcm

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:27:00 AM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 1800 Eastlke Ave E #309, Seattle, WA 98102

I-0110-001 **Comment:**

I believe it would be a grave mistake to widen the 520 bridge, specifically through the Arboretum. Encouraging more driving via wider roads is a mistake. The mistake would be compounded by infringing on a public nature area. Seattle is a major city and nature areas areas should be safe guarded in such a large metropolis.

Online Comment by User: cooperk

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:06:00 AM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-6
Address: , , 98125

I-0111-001 **Comment:**

The 520 bridge should stay a 4-lane highway. It is important not to ruin any more of the Arboretum than absolutely necessary....preserving the Arboretum greenspace is much more important than accommodating more cars. Over the next 10-30 years gas will become so expensive that fewer - not more - people will be driving single occupancy vehicles, and driving shorter distances. Making more lanes will only encourage more people to drive, and they will be just as clogged up as the 4-lane option.

Online Comment by User: Corinne Fligner

Submitted on: 10/28/2006 10:34:00 AM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , Seattle, WA 98112
Comment:
To: SR 520 Project Office

I-0112-001

I am writing to urge selection of the Pacific Street Interchange alternative for SR 520.

As a long time Seattle citizen, I recognize the difficulties in optimizing transportation for the greater Seattle and King County areas. I have closely followed the development of plans for the replacement of the SR 520 bridge across Lake Washington.

The Pacific Street Interchange alternative is the only option for replacement of the 520 bridge which reliably links buses and light rail at UW, improves local transit in the Seattle area, and fixes the Montlake bottleneck. Selection of this alternative will provide the opportunity to reliably improve mobility in our area, and to truly make a difference to Seattle and Eastside drivers and mass transit commuters. It is the optimal alternative for the UW and the University of Washington Medical Center, and will serve the University of Washington well into the 21st century.

Of all the alternatives for SR520, the Pacific Street Interchange is the best. I strongly support the Pacific Street Interchange for SR 520, and oppose strongly all other DEIS alternatives.

Thank you for your hard work and thoughtful consideration of the issues involved in the SR520 project. Selection of the Pacific Street Interchange would be a visionary step towards improving mobility and livability in the greater Seattle area.

Sincerely,
Corinne Fligner
Seattle resident and University of Washington Faculty member

Online Comment by User: cp

Submitted on: 9/17/2006 8:06:00 PM
Comment Category: Neighborhood Effects
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-11
Address: , , 98112
Comment:

I-0113-001 As a resident of Montlake, I support the Pacific Interchange option. We moved to Montlake with our young son to be walking distance from parks and because we loved the neighborhood community feel so close to downtown. We fear than any other option besides the Pacific Interchange option will negatively effect these wonderful aspects of our Montlake neighborhood and also create bigger traffic and environmental concerns. Please listen to those of use who are invested in raising our families in Seattle and building strong communities. Thank you.

Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-11
Comment:

As a resident of Montlake, I support the Pacific Interchange option. We moved to Montlake with our young son to be walking distance from parks and because we loved the neighborhood community feel so close to downtown. We fear than any other option besides the Pacific Interchange option will negatively effect these wonderful aspects of our Montlake neighborhood and also create bigger traffic and environmental concerns. Please listen to those of us who are invested in raising our families in Seattle and building strong communities. Thank you.

Online Comment by User: Craig Thompson

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:37:00 AM
Comment Category: Comments on Construction Effects
Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-1
Address: 1311 13th Ave. S, Seattle, WA 98144

I-0114-001 **Comment:**
Construction will disrupt wildlife habitat along Marsh Island and nearby Foster Island, plus have negative impacts to pedestrian and bicycle usage through the Arboretum. Instead of opening the Arboretum up for more development, it should be restricted.

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-1

I-0114-002 **Comment:**
Expanding 520 to six lanes will only mean more traffic and less emphasis on public transportation: it would encourage only more single-occupancy vehicles at a cost not only to the immediate environment, but also further contribute to global warming at a time when it needs to be addressed by government agencies. Expanding 520 to six lanes reflects the thinking of the 1950s, when more lanes were built, with the assumption that cars would be the solution to public mobility forever, and the impact of highway expansion was ignored for a perceived continual benefit that has proven elusive. Instead of creating more opportunity to use vehicles, we should be trying to decrease the use of vehicles, through tax incentives for businesses to encourage telecommuting and to hire locally instead of demanding commuting at all.

Comment Category: Ecosystems
Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-1

I-0114-003 **Comment:**
Expanding the 520 highway through the Arboretum to six lanes should not be considered, because of the environmental impact to Marsh Island to the north and the Arboretum itself to the south. The environmental cost to disrupting the wetlands along Marsh Island would include loss of habitat for water fowl, small mammals, reptiles, and other species that have become increasingly rare in Lake Washington due to the level of development along its shores. This is one of the last spots that allows these species a chance at survival in our heaviliy urbanized setting, and one of the few spots that allows the public peace of mind in our city: it's just not worth the trade.

Online Comment by User: Cristal Weber

Submitted on: 9/21/2006 2:05:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98117
Comment:

I-0115-001 Please include bike lanes!

Online Comment by User: csoper

Submitted on: 9/28/2006 10:39:00 AM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-1
Address: , , 98112

I-0116-001 **Comment:**

After reading all of the alternatives, the Pacific Interchange option stands out as the best option being considered. It has several advantages, including:

- The best connection to regional transit at the Sound Transit station.
- The least impact to the affected neighborhoods with the lidding of Montlake Blvd. and 10th Ave East.
- Among the best option to keep traffic moving the fastest, especially with removing the Montlake bottleneck and allowing for dedicated transit lanes.

This is a rare opportunity to select a forward thinking option instead of just more of the same. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Craig Soper

Online Comment by User: ctschaefer

Submitted on: 10/27/2006 2:02:00 PM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 4725 15th Ave NE #11, Seattle, WA 98105
Comment:

I-0117-001 ISSUES REGARDLESS OF ALTERNATIVE CHOSEN: The new bridge must incorporate all of the following features. (1) Bridge design and operation must encourage more efficient transportation options over single-occupant motor vehicles. Buses must be able to cross the bridge more quickly than private vehicles, and with a minimum of interference by private vehicles. Incentives to reward carpooling and/or traveling during non-peak times are also needed. (2) The bridge must be designed and engineered to accommodate a future light-rail line. (3) The bridge must include safe and convenient facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians.

I-0117-002 SUPPORT FOUR-LANE ALTERNATIVE: I strongly favor the four-lane alternative over the six-lane alternative. First, a six-lane bridge would be significantly more costly, a difference that is especially important in light of the concurrent need to replace the Alaskan Way viaduct. Secondly, a six-lane bridge would encourage highway users to continue to use inefficient means of travel such as single-occupant motor vehicles. Furthermore, I object to the apparent bias toward the six-lane alternative in the analyses conducted to date. For example, one analysis compares projected noise levels from an open four-lane roadway to those from a "lidded" six-lane roadway. This is an absurd comparison that should never have been made. A lid could be part of the design of either a four-lane road or a six-lane road, a fact that any fair comparison would take into account.

I-0117-003 OPPOSE PACIFIC INTERCHANGE/UNION BAY BRIDGE: If the six-lane alternative is chosen, I strongly oppose the Pacific Interchange/Union Bay Bridge option. I agree with the official position expressed by the University of Washington about the negative impacts of this option on the UW campus, the Washington Park Arboretum, and the surrounding communities. In addition, I am concerned about the issue of clearance under the Union Bay Bridge. Even if it is built with the original proposed clearance of 110 feet, it will exclude the passage of some sailing vessels that have previously had access to Lake Washington, especially two of Washington's most historic ships: the schooners Adventuress (1913) and Zodiac (1924). If the request to lower the clearance to 70 feet is granted, the bridge will exclude many other vessels including the schooner Red Jacket and the Canadian Naval ship HMCS Oriole, both of which have participated in Opening Day festivities in recent years.

Online Comment by User: Curt Nelson

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 1:26:00 PM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 16250 NE 80th St, Redmond, WA 98052
Comment:

I-0118-001 I am in favor of the largest expansion of 520 possible. The road has been completely inadequate for decades! When we moved here 19 years ago it was far too congested. So, I support the most road we can get. If that is 8 lanes, that would be the best. If only 6 are considered or possible then that would certainly be better than what's there in this critical transportation link for the entire region.
This link is so critical that all other considerations, including environmental impact and noise should be very secondary to the extremely important need for the maximum capacity on 520.

Online Comment by User: CurtBrunk@lakesamm.org

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:14:00 AM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: 17211 NE 42nd St, Redmond, WA 98052
Comment:

I-0119-001 The more lanes the better. 520 is vital to continued responsible growth.

Online Comment by User: Dan Johnson

Submitted on: 9/19/2006 12:23:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98112
Comment:

I-0120-001 I am strongly in favor of the Pacific Interchange Option. It will lead to more parks in Montlake, better bus service, no back up on Montlake Blvd. and of course much less noise all around. Thank you!

Online Comment by User: Dan McGrady

Submitted on: 10/2/2006 4:02:00 PM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98107
Comment:

I-0121-001 I support the Pacific Interchange Alternative because it best meets the needs of the community and region.

Online Comment by User: DanCory

Submitted on: 9/25/2006 3:16:00 PM
Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-41
Address: , , 98103
Comment:

I-0122-001 I'd only choose this alternative if it meant replacing the pair of SOV lanes with one SOV & HOV lane. And that is infeasible.

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-41
Comment:

I-0122-002 After reading up on this option, I am reluctantly in favor of it. Although the damage to the arboreteum is terrible, the total amount of pilings in the water is probably not much worse - it adds more on the Union Bay side but fewer on the Portage Bay side.

The current Foster Island / Marsh Island parts of the arboreteum are already ruined by the existing bridge, and I don't think it will get substantially worse.

Comment Category: Other 6-Lane Options
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-41
Comment:

I-0122-003 Removal of the Montlake freeway stop is a big loss to Capitol Hill -> Eastside (Microsoft) commuters, of whom there are many. However, there have long been proposals to route buses over Capitol Hill instead, and one of those would have to be activated.

The other primary usage of the flyer stop is to get bikes across the bridge. Now they could just be ridden, so hopefully that would not be an issue.

There's also some amount of U District -> Eastside commuters

Removal of the flyer stops on the Eastside is probably a good thing - these never seem to get much use and slow the buses down substantially.

Online Comment by User: Daniel Krashin

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 2:02:00 PM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-1
Address: 3825 42nd Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98105
Comment:

I-0123-001 I'm a stakeholder in this issue, since I live in the Laurelhurst area with a magnificent view of Union Bay (and 520) from my balcony (if I lean a little) and I use the waterfront areas, parks, and arboretum quite a bit.

I'm very concerned about several issues:
1) Both the construction and the final six-lane bridge will put severe stress on a fragile ecosystem that is already frayed and challenged by pollution, climate change, recreational activity, etc. Seattle has a unique position as an urban landscape that is coexistant with living bodies of water on every side, and we have a special responsibility to take care of that.

2) Specific areas near the 520 bridge are absolutely unique -- the UBNA wetlands are a (restored) piece of lakeside ecology and a spectacular spot for birds in particular. The close proximity of UBNA and other parklands on both sides of Union Bay make this area much more important, diverse, and viable as an ecological preserve than a few scattered bits of open water would be.

In addition, the Washington Arboretum is a city treasure as well as a scientific institution. Any impact to it should be considered an impact on Seattle as a whole, particularly because trees can be very sensitive to traffic impact.

I-0123-002 3) The report does not, and probably cannot, address long-term affects on traffic flow because there are so many unanswered questions about things like the future of mass transit in the area. However, it seems very likely to me that an expanded 520 will simply have a "vacuum effect" on traffic between Eastside and Seattle, which will after a brief transition lead to the same congestion in SIX lanes as we now have in four, and a commensurate increase in pollution and congestion at both ends of the bridge, particularly a horrible mess on I-5 as three lanes' worth of rush hour traffic enters and leaves the highway. We do know that people are going to keep moving to this area, so aren't we just planting up a crop of trouble for the next generation of traffic planners with this plan?

Online Comment by User: Darwin Roberts

Submitted on: 9/23/2006 1:22:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-17
Address: 4331 Latona Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98105
Comment:

I-0124-001 I believe it is very important for the future economic vitality of our region to move forward on this project. We should try to get it done well before there is a chance for a catastrophic failure of the existing bridge.

I-0124-002 I would support using a toll to help fund its construction.

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-17
Comment:

I-0124-003 As a nearby resident (Wallingford) who travels through the project area frequently, I support the Pacific Interchange option because of the congestion relief and transit connectivity that it would provide. It is very significant to me that no other option makes nearly the same difference in transit times across the Montlake Cut.

Seattle should also consider the value of having a third non-drawbridge connection across the Ship Canal besides the Aurora and Ship Canal bridges, that would also be built to current seismic standards.

While the Pacific Interchange option has some greater effects on the Arboretum area, the freeway is going through the Arboretum no matter what else happens.

Online Comment by User: Dave & Ann Wahl

Submitted on: 10/1/2006 8:56:00 AM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-19
Address: 2237 246th place NE, Redmond, WA 98074
Comment:
Hello,

I-0125-001 My name is Ann Wahl. I was born in Bellevue and have lived 40 of my 45 years in East King County. My husband and I and 3 children live in Redmond and my husband and I work in Kirkland.

As someone who has used the "floating bridge" for many, many years, I stongly support a 6 lane bridge w/commuter and bike lanes. I am also in favor of concrete walls and lids to contain noise and have less of an effect on the residents of this area. We know that the financial costs are high for this type of bridge but as a taxpayers we believe this type of bridge is needed for this area. The cost may be high now but they keep growing year by year. This project has been "overstudied" and delayed time and time again. The costs keep growing year by year. We believe the government needs to take a stand and build the bridge now for safety and traffic reasons and need not let special interest groups keep delaying the project as it becomes more and more expensive each year!

From a safety standpoint I have personally driven the bridge on windy days and have felt the waving and shaking on the elevated portion of the bridge going Eastbound. I have also been going 50 mile an hour and had waves of water from high winds hit my windshield. These are both safety hazards. If this bridge is not rebuilt I do believe that serious damage could be sustained and it could result in a major shut down of the bridge and dramatically effect the people and businesses of this area. Having felt the wind I also worry that the bridge could acutally "break in parts" as commuters are traveling across in those high winds.

Traffic wise, congestion keeps getting worse and worse. When there is an accident of the bridge there are maor shutdowns that sometimes take hours to clear up. This situation will only get worse and worse as the population of our area increases.

As I drive across the I-90 bridge, (which I often take to get to and from Seattle though it is usually out of my way because I know that the timing is more "predictable") I notice what a nice, seemingly safe bridge it is. I notice how well the traffice flows and I smile as I see the bike riders and walkers travel their lanes. I really appreciate having that bridge. I am sure that people complained beforehand about the impact and cost before that was built but you do not hear anyone complaining about it now.

Please move forward and building a safe and reliable, new 6 lane 520 bridge w/bike and pedestrian lanes. Please start building now!

Thank you for allowing us to express our thoughts and ideas.

Dave & Ann Wahl
2237 246th Place NE
Redmond, WA 98074

Online Comment by User: davebradlee

Submitted on: 10/2/2006 12:20:00 PM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-28
Address: , , 98105
Comment:

I-0126-001 I strongly prefer the Pacific Street interchange option. This option has key benefits, such as better traffic flow from the North (which is a big bottleneck today) and a better connection between 520 and light rail.

Online Comment by User: DAVEFOO

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:43:00 AM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-2
Address: , , 98052
Comment:

I-0127-001 It is my opinion that unless a 3rd cross-Lake Washington bridge is in the plans then there is no question that replacing the SR-520 bridge with anything less than a 6-lane bridge is foolish. Since we are struggling to pay for the 520 bridge, I doubt a 3rd bridge is feasible and therefore the state should be looking at a 6-lane or greater 520 replacement bridge.

I-0127-002 If the SR-520/I-5 interchange presents a bottleneck that would render a 6-lane bridge useless then that is a separate issue that also needs to be addressed. Build the 6-lane 520 bridge with plans to address I-5/520 in the future. Let's not find ourselves regretting a 4-lane 520 bridge 10 years down the road.

Online Comment by User: david hooper

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 3:55:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98112
Comment:

I-0128-001 I support a No Build Alternative.

Online Comment by User: David K Cooper

Submitted on: 9/11/2006 9:04:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-30
Address: 4236 94th Avenue NE, Yarrow Point, WA 98004

I-0129-001 **Comment:**
Yarrow Point, Page 30, Second Paragraph discusses the residential character as having "large houses on large lots". This is not universally so on Yarrow Point. Unlike its most comparable neighbor, Hunts Point, Yarrow Point as a balanced distribution of large houses on large lots and a nearly equal medium to small homes on modest lots. The large houses on large lots is most prevelant for the waterfront homes only.

Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-30

I-0129-002 **Comment:**
Hunts Point, page 30, second paragraph discusses the town as having 2 parks "Hunts Point Park" and "Wetherill Park, at the south end of Cozy Cove". While Wethrill is in fact on the south end of Cozy Cove the park is primarily within the Town of Yarrow Point. The park lands were donated to the two communities by Yarrow Point residents in 1989 and more than 75% of the park is within the Town limits of Yarrow Point. The park is not accessible from Hunts Point directly but rather the main and only entrance to the park is well within the Town of Yarrow Point. Both communities have representative on the Wethrill Nature Preserve Commission.

Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-31

I-0129-003 **Comment:**
Yarrow Point, second paragraph discusses Wetherill Park as lying "partially within Yarrow Point". Wethrill is in fact mostly a Yarrow Point for two reasons. The park lands were donated to the two communities by Yarrow Point residents in 1989 amd more than 75% of the park is within the Town limits of Yarrow Point. The park is not accessible from Hunts Point directly but rather the main entrance is well within the Town of Yarrow Point.

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-35

I-0129-004 **Comment:**
Yarrow Point Comprehensive Plan: It should be noted that not only does the Yarrow Point comprehensive plan "advocates pedestrian and bicycle travel" but the plan makes specific reference as to where these access points are to be developed. It includes traversing the SR 520 corridor several times (not just once with one lid) in an effort to seek mitgation needed to reconnect the north and south portions of the Town that were separated by the original SR 520 project.

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-49

I-0129-005 **Comment:**
Cozy Cove Basin: It needs to be noted that the original SR 520 dramatically impacts the effectiveness of the basin as a worthy habitat for the aquatic plant and animal life due in large part to the extensive culvert the Cozy Cover Creek must navigate under the SR 520 right of way upstream of the Wetherill Park. Although the culvert provides a challenging obstacle, it has been rumored that salmon and cutthroat trout have been seen in small ponds

I-0129-005 located on the south side of SR 520 within a parcel located just east of 88th Avenue NE between SR 520 and Points Drive.

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-50

I-0129-006 **Comment:**

Yarrow Bay Wetland Basin: I challenge the accuracy of the information on the culvert passing under SR 520 and NE Points Drive. I believe the DIES author of this section is significantly confused and this stream and culvert system actually exists within the Cozy Cove Basin. The ravine that is referenced coming from Clyde Hill is immediately adjacent to the Tully's coffee shop on NE Points Drive and the subject culvert is downstream of that. I would be glad to meet to discuss this with staff so this is clear to all, including myself.

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-50

I-0129-007 **Comment:**

Yarrow Bay Basin: The second paragraph states that "Yarrow Bay wetlands is located in the City of Kirkland". This is a mostly correct statement but a small portion on the west side of the basin is actually located in the Town of Yarrow Point. The Town of Yarrow Point has identified this wetland as a sensitive area within its comprehensive plan.

Online Comment by User: David Rudo

Submitted on: 10/30/2006 2:12:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 981101
Comment:

I-0130-001 If the Evergreen Pt Bridge is replaced, I support replacing it with no more lanes or capacity than the present four lane bridge. This is a state route that empties traffic onto I-5 and the city streets. I-5 is already operating at capacity. The only place that the traffic capacity from the proposed additional two lanes could go is onto the already over-crowded city streets. For that reason, I reject the proposal for a six lane bridge.

David N. Rudo
135 Madrona Pl E
Seattle, WA 98112

Online Comment by User: david

Submitted on: 10/23/2006 8:54:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98102
Comment:

I-0131-001 The price of oil now hovers around $60/barrel, and industry experts agree the supply is likely to peak in 2006 or 2007, and decline every year thereafter. With that in mind, gas will likely be at least $15/gallon by the time any of these options are realized, and what will be the demand at that price? Do we need 6 lanes as people scramble for alternatives, living where they work, using mass transit, and yearning for the transportation system that their WSDOT didn't have the foresight to consider. This is no time to be thinking about spending scarce public resources on outdated and unsustainable modes of transportation. Instead we ought to be building a regional transportation system for the *next* century, sustainable, clean and efficient.

Online Comment by User: davidby

Submitted on: 8/25/2006 11:38:00 AM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98112
Comment:

I-0132-001 I strongly support the Pacific Interchange option.

Online Comment by User: davidrose

Submitted on: 10/1/2006 9:30:00 AM
Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98004
Comment:

I-0133-001 The 6 Lane Alternative Is Clearly The Only Viable Option: We need to move ahead quickly to work through this alternative. Increasing the throughput in this corridor is important for Seattle and the east side. For Seattle because that is a preferred place of residence for many working on the east side. For the east side because we need access to the labor force resident in the Seattle area.

The greater the throughput and capacity over the bridge the greater our ability to accomplish land use and growth management objectives of density.

Online Comment by User: dawnbu

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 3:06:00 PM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98012
Comment:

I-0134-001 I only favor six lanes if it includes 4 general-purpose and 2-HOV lanes. Whichever replacement plan you guys select - MUST include an exit to Montlake. The current bridge is hell on any day - ESPECIALLY so on husky game days, including basketball games. PLEASE help relieve the U District traffic by getting them off the bridge sooner.

I-0134-002 But also - be gentle to the Arboretum. Do not put in high roads or large supports. Keep that area pristine!!

Dawn Busick
Bothell, WA

Online Comment by User: dderyss

Submitted on: 9/18/2006 6:56:00 AM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98117
Comment:

I-0135-001 I support the Pacific Interchange Option as it:

1. Creates connections for bus and Sound Transit riders.
2. Enhances first-responder and ambulance access to Children's Hospital and the UW Medical Center.
3. Creates new park and green spaces, and
4. Enhances bicycle commuting both in Seattle and to the Eastside.

Online Comment by User: debvilhauer

Submitted on: 9/19/2006 8:36:00 AM
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98109
Comment:

I-0136-001 I support the Pacific Interchange Option.

Online Comment by User: deibertd

Submitted on: 9/9/2006 5:13:00 PM
Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange
Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-1
Address: 2025 Boyer Ave E, Seattle, WA 98112
Comment:

I-0137-001 I have followed the development of the 520 replacement project and believe the Pacific Interchange Plan has the best solution.
Sincerely
Don Deibert

Online Comment by User: Dennis Noson

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 4:47:00 PM
Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1
Address: , , 98103
Comment:

I-0138-001 The 6 lane option adopted for the Pacific Interchange to UW ONLY, not the Arboretum will reduce noise & provide improved traffic flow, and make the Arboretum whole again -- in my mind the best approach especially if one lane each way is DEDICATED to bus rapid transit, one bus every 4 minutes!

Comment Category: Noise
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-21
Comment:

The improvement in noise at Foster Island is a bonus primarily from elevating the highway, and may make the value of the noise walls less important to preserve outlook from the roadway at this section of the highway

Comment Category: Aesthetics and Visual Quality
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-8
Comment:

The benefits of the Pacific Interchange would be optimum if the connection to Lake Washington Blvd were omitted & traffic flow handled via the interchange at Montlake Blvd. The high impacts on the Arboretum and Lk Wash Blvd do not justify continuing the interchange in the Arboretum.