-----Original Message-----
From: larryscheib@yahoo.com [mailto:larryscheib@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, February 20, 2010 3:18 PM
To: WSDOT Web Feedback
Subject: WSDOT Web Site Feedback

The following is the contents of a form submitted on 2/20/2010 3:17:48 PM

======My Contact information======
Name: Larry Scheib
E-mail: larryscheib@yahoo.com
Web site:

===== My Question/Comment/Complaint =====

I-200-001 What a shame that light rail planning is not mentioned in your 520 plan. You realy ought to rethink what your doing. Your public officials and should do what's best for the public.

February 2010

Dear planners and builders

I-201-001 Please don't let more traffic drive by the Tea Garden.

It's beautiful. It should be a quiet place to rest and think.

Adding bridge traffic will be very bad.

Yuka

Washington State Department of Transportation

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Supplemental Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to share your comments on the content provided in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. WSDOT will consider all comments received between Jan. 22 and April 15, 2010 in making its final decision in the environmental review process. Thank you for your comments.

You can provide comments using one of the following methods:

-- Complete this form.
-- Mail your comments to Jenifer Young, SDEIS Environmental Manager, Washington State Department of Transportation, 600 Stewart Street, Suite 520, Seattle, WA 98101.
-- E-mail your comments to SR520Bridge_SDEIS@wsdot.wa.gov.
-- Speak to a court reporter at an environmental hearing scheduled for 5 – 7 p.m., Feb. 23, at Lake Union Park Naval Reserve Building, 860 Terry Ave. N., Seattle.

1. Name	Janis Varo	**CommentDate:**	3/3/2010 9:42
2. E-mail	janis_varo@yahoo.com	**Comment Source:**	Online Comment Form
3. Address:	214B 12th Ave E		
4. City:	Seattle		
5. State:	WA		
*** 6. Zip Code:**	98102		

7. Do you have any comments on the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

I-202-001
I-202-002

I think we should go with the no build option until you can find a better way to pay for it. The state is out of money, and the proposed toll structure is untenable. The tolls as they have been proposed are extravagant and very insulting to visitors to our area and others (like me) who live in Seattle and like to go to Bellevue on occasion to eat or shop. You will charge me more because you can't be bothered with a single toll booth. If you can't afford to build and staff even ONE toll booth for non- M-F commuters, then you cannot afford to build this new bridge.

Plus, what happened to Microsoft helping to pay for the new bridge? This was discussed about 4 years ago and then magically vanished. How did they weasel out of this?

These comments will become part of the public record for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Personal information is voluntary and will become part of the public record if provided. The Washington State Department of Transportation is a public agency and is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Therefore, comments may be made available to anyone requesting them for non-commercial purposes.

From: ellen aagaard [mailto:ellaag@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 11:04 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: No Lake Washington Boulevard ramps as a suboption to A; Yes to A as most cost-effective, least environmental damage

Please include the following comments on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statesment for the 520 Bridge design:

I-203-001 Because it has the least overall environmental footprint of the 3 options, and the least overall projected cost, please choose Option A, but without the suboption of Washington Boulevard on and off ramps. The ramps would inappropriately burden a historic Olmstaead parkway with traffic for a higher capacity cross-lake bridge, and would unnecessarily reroute traffic from multi-lane arterials with shorter and more direct bridge access.

I-203-002 I very much like the Eastbound direct access HOV ramp as a suboption, and hope that in the future the I-5 express lanes might be considered for HOV-only designation. They are easy to monitor, and allowing only HOV in the express lanes would help keep them flowing smoothly, as well as encourage carpooling on I-5, which is already past capacity during peak hours and will see increased congestion as an expanded 520 brings more traffic to the connecting freeways.

Thank you,

Ellen Aagaard
5322 N.E. 67th St.
Seattle, WA 98115

From: Justin Lancaster [mailto:justin@nationalsolarusa.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 20, 2010 11:35 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS; mike.mcginn@seattle.gov
Subject: 520

Dear Washington State Department of Transportation,

I-204-001 I live at 2601 11th Avenue East here in Seattle Washington and have a view of the current 520 bridge from my home as it crosses Portage Bay. You current plans do nothing for noise abatement as far as I have heard or seen. The bridge currently is extremely noisey all hours of the day and night, the pavement used is noisey as well as the expansion joints.

I-204-002 Further, the current design does not move more people across the bridge but simply adds more cars and gridlock. How can you widen a bridge that simply dumps into a backed up interstate; the bridge is not a island of transportation but rather connects to very crowded roadways. The questions, is why is there no design for rapid transit, such as rail across the bridge that would limit the size and impact of your outdated designes of bigger and wider-- I suggest go smarter and start thinking about the future. Scare tactics and spreading fear of sinking bridges may push your current agenda and design through but why not create a legacy of vision and leadership when so much public money is being used.

Just my thoughts on the 520.

Justin Lancaster

-----Original Message-----
From: Spidermantribal [mailto:spidermantribal@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, March 20, 2010 6:45 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Comment on 520

I-205-001 1. Build a true 6 lane bridge, not an 8 lane. No big shoulders. 6 lanes. 6 lanes. 6 lanes.
I-205-002 2. Keep the profile as low as possible.
I-205-003 3. NO SECOND MONTLAKE BRIDGE. Find a way to fund the Pedersen concept instead.
I-205-004 4. Lid everything. Keep the noise down.
5. Figure out a way to get the noise mitigating roadway pavement right.

Washington State Department of Transportation

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Supplemental Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to share your comments on the content provided in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. WSDOT will consider all comments received between Jan. 22 and April 15, 2010 in making its final decision in the environmental review process. Thank you for your comments.

You can provide comments using one of the following methods:

-- Complete this form.
-- Mail your comments to Jenifer Young, SDEIS Environmental Manager, Washington State Department of Transportation, 600 Stewart Street, Suite 520, Seattle, WA 98101.
-- E-mail your comments to SR520Bridge_SDEIS@wsdot.wa.gov.
-- Speak to a court reporter at an environmental hearing scheduled for 5 – 7 p.m., Feb. 23, at Lake Union Park Naval Reserve Building, 860 Terry Ave. N., Seattle.

1. Name	Beth Bingley	**CommentDate:**	3/20/2010 18:53
2. E-mail	user865741@aol.com	**Comment Source:**	Online Comment Form
3. Address:	7808 89th Pl SE		
4. City:	Mercer Island		
5. State:	wa		
*** 6. Zip Code:**	98040		

7. Do you have any comments on the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

I-206-001

With this economy this is a project that should not be started at this time. It is too expensive.

Thank you.

Beth Bingley

Please do not disclose my information to others.

These comments will become part of the public record for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Personal information is voluntary and will become part of the public record if provided. The Washington State Department of Transportation is a public agency and is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Therefore, comments may be made available to anyone requesting them for non-commercial purposes.

From: Jean Amick [mailto:jeanseattle@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, March 26, 2010 1:37 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Noise and I-5 interchange

Dear WSDOT 520 SDEIS staff:

I-207-001 The traffic noise is magnified across the water/lake. I don't think this has been properly considered in the SDEIS. Presently homes to the north, maybe to the south, get a huge vibration whenever a truck or bus goes over the connection between the floating bridge and the part that opens. General noise can be heard for miles (especially since the pavement around Foster Island is abysmal.)

I-207-002 Also, the HOV connection from 520 to I-5 is not adequate to continually move traffic. In the evening when there are Mariner games, etc, and the eastside traffic is headed south from 520 where is all the HOV traffic going to go??? No point in moving the present Medina eastbound traffic backup over to the Roanoke viaduct...the 520 traffic is 50-50 for employment so why is a reversible lane designed?

I-207-003 The Arboretum will loose lots of property to a larger highway if a new 520 is built. It deserves compensation and mitigation for all the noise and increased traffic through it on Lake Washington Blvd. We do not see how this can be properly done.

Russ & Jean Amick
3008 E Laurelhurst Dr NE
Seattle WA 98105
206-525-7065
jeanseattle@earthlink.net
russ@floytag.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Rich Hass [mailto:richhass@mac.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 28, 2010 2:52 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Comments to SR520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program

I-208-001 As a resident of Medina Circle in Medina, our neighborhood will be directly impacted by the construction and new design of the 520 bridge approach on the Eastside, specifically the new on-ramp design at 84th Ave NE. There are a couple of important factors that I don't believe have been adequately addressed in the new design.

First, 84th Ave NE in Medina is becoming what amounts to a holding pen for Seattle commuters returning from the Bellevue CBD. The new design needs to encourage commuters to use Bellevue Way as the primary access point to SR520 from the Bellevue CBD. Specifically, Bellevue Way flow controls during rush hour should be metered to pass substantially more vehicles than NE 84th. The Bellevue Way on-ramp design need to suggest, 'this is the best way to get to Seattle'. The 84th Ave NE onramp should serve the Medina/Clyde Hill Communities and not be a primary access point for Bellevue CBD traffic.

I-208-002 Second, commuters often exit SR520 and use surface streets to bypass congestion before getting back on SR520 at 84th Ave NE. California has laws making such activity illegal and it is well-enforced. The new SR520 design should anticipate such a law and include monitoring equipment in the new design to enforce such a law when it is passed. Allowing commuters to clog surface streets in order to bypass freeway congestion is bad public policy. The new design needs to take this into account.

Third (and most important to me personally), the traffic stacking plan (what I call the holding pen) NB on 84th Ave NE moves from the right lane to the left lane, with a left turn onto the new NE 84th Ave onramp.
During rush hour, this will make it impossible for Medina Circle residents to access our neighborhood without sitting in the same line of traffic with people commuting from the Bellevue CBD, waiting to get on SR520. Consideration needs to be given to Medina Circle residents who will be blocked out of our own neighborhood. The current design does not adequately address this issue.

Having attended one of the informal presentations and discussed this question with one of the WSDOT representatives, I understand WSDOT doesn't believe there will be a long line of vehicles down 84th Ave NE once the new bridge is constructed. I believe this is wildly optimistic.

I-208-003 Please consider alternatives for 84th Ave NE to prevent it from becoming the primary gateway to SR520 from the Bellevue CBD. And lastly, please consider ways to keep Medina Circle accessible during rush hour.

Thanks,

Richard Hass
2525 Medina Circle
Medina, WA 98039

--From: Sean Riley [mailto:seanr@microsoft.com]
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 2:05 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: SR 520 SDEIS Feedback

Submitting this via email. Also sent in feedback via the online tool, however, I experienced some technical difficulties with the website and want to make sure our feedback is heard.

Please confirm that this feedback has been collected.

Hello,

I-209-001 As residents of Montlake, specifically East Lake Washington Boulevard in the Arboretum, my wife (Morgan Riley) and I (Sean Riley) would like to submit our feedback on the proposed SR 520 Bridge solution. The feedback is broken down into several catagories below: Noise After construction, Noise During Construction, Visual Effects, Traffic Flow and Misc.

Our ask is that you answer our questions/concerns and work with affected neighborhoods to construct a solution that is a benefit to our beautiful, historic (Montlake Historical District, house number 188) community.

Thank you for your time,

Sean and Morgan Riley

2465 E. Lake Washington Boulevard

Seattle, WA 98112

I-209-002 **NOISE AFTER CONSTRUCTION:**

Noise levels for several homes on LWB, LWBE, and ELWB are significantly above FHWA's criteria of 67dB. For LWB residents, how do you plan to mitigate noise levels above FWHA regulations in addition to noise reducing pavement and sound walls? When will you start working with LWB residents? How will you identify which LWB residents to work with? What is the process for identifying additional mitigation measures?

Section 1-25 states option A is defined as including noise walls and/or quieter, rubberized asphalt pavement. Does the mediation group recommend noise walls and/or quieter, rubberized asphalt pavement for option A+ even though section 1-26 states that quieter pavement has not been demonstrated to meet FHWA and WSDOT requirements and cannot be considered as noise mitigation? What is the process for deciding which areas will get noise walls and/or quieter pavement? What are additional mitigation measure that will be considered?

I-209-003 What is he mitigation process and what are the mitigation measures being considered for eligible, contributing Montlake Historic District homes on LWB, LWBE and ELWB?Where will sound walls be located along the LWB corridors? How will you work with LWB residents when determining placement of sound walls adjacent to and near LWB? Please describe your outreach and design plans in detail.

I-209-004 How will you work with LWB residents when determining placement/design/landscaping phases of lid placement adjacent to LWB? Please describe your outreach plans in detail.

I-209-005 What are the projected noise levels after for plan A+ for all homes on LWB before and after sound walls and noise reducing pavement? If this study hasn't been done, when will it be done?

I-209-006 **NOISE DURING CONSTRUCTION:**

What noise reduction measures will be taken during construction for LWB residents? What are expected noise levels during construction? If you haven't done a study, when will it be published?

Section 3-13. When trucks pass in front of our house on LWB (property # 188), our windows rattle. Table 3-7 in section 3-31 shows that daily truck trips on LWB will increase from 16 to 100-175 during construction of plan A+. In addition, 3-35 states there will be additional clearing, grading and paving activities on LWB during construction of the LWB ramps. What is the construction period for the ramps? For homes with serious adverse effects during and after construction, will you work with home owners to supplement the cost of replacing single pane windows with multi-paned windows with sound control? How will qualifying homes be identified?

I-209-007 What are the traffic levels on LWB for before and after plan A+ for peak and non-peak hours?

I-209-008 **VISUAL EFFECTS:**

When will we see visualization mock ups for effected properties on LWB and ELWB for plan A+? Can anyone request visualization mock ups from the vantage point of their property?

I-209-009 **TRAFFIC FLOW:**

LWB and ELWB residents experience severe traffic back ups on LWB and EWLB during weekends, peak traffic hours, when the Montlake bridge goes up and during frequent sporting events held at the UW. The backups often prevent residents along LWB and ELWB from safely using their driveways to access their homes. How does plan A+ reduce traffic jams after adding three additional ramps to LWB? How will traffic flow on LWB and EWLB differ with plan A+ versus today?

MISC:

I-209-010 How are you evaluating and compensating for environmental affects/quality of life during and after construction (traffic, air quality, visual impact, property devaluation)?

I-209-011 An email string we had going with Daniel Babuca, Jim Salter, Amanda Phily and Marsha Tolon regarding home value still needs to be addressed. Specifically, how with WSDOT compensate homeowners in affected neighborhoods for the devaluation of their home? If a home on ELWB is worth $1M today, but post construction is worth $600K due to changes from WSDOt, specifically, how do you plan on compensating these homeowners through mitigation?

Washington State Department of Transportation

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Supplemental Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to share your comments on the content provided in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. WSDOT will consider all comments received between Jan. 22 and April 15, 2010 in making its final decision in the environmental review process. Thank you for your comments.

You can provide comments using one of the following methods:

-- Complete this form.
-- Mail your comments to Jenifer Young, SDEIS Environmental Manager, Washington State Department of Transportation, 600 Stewart Street, Suite 520, Seattle, WA 98101.
-- E-mail your comments to SR520Bridge_SDEIS@wsdot.wa.gov.
-- Speak to a court reporter at an environmental hearing scheduled for 5 – 7 p.m., Feb. 23, at Lake Union Park Naval Reserve Building, 860 Terry Ave. N., Seattle.

1. Name	Thomas Payne, MD	**CommentDate:**	3/24/2010 2:50
2. E-mail	thpayne@comcast.net	**Comment Source:**	Online Comment Form
3. Address:	2070 23rd Avenue E		
4. City:	Seattle		
5. State:	Wash		
*** 6. Zip Code:**	98112		

7. Do you have any comments on the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

I-210-001 1. The EIS does not adequately address congestion faced by car and bus traffic leaving the bridge in Seattle. The Montlake Boulevard, Lake Washington Boulevard, Roanoke and Interstate 5 exits from 520 are all currently frequently congested.

I-210-002 2. There is inadequate analysis of an option to add light rail to the replacement of SR 520.

I-210-003 I approve of the bypass of the Montlake Bridge by constructing a tunnel under Union Bay to Husky Stadium.

I-210-004 I support addition of bicycle lanes.

I oppose constructing a replacement for 520 without light rail from the first day of operation.

These comments will become part of the public record for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Personal information is voluntary and will become part of the public record if provided. The Washington State Department of Transportation is a public agency and is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Therefore, comments may be made available to anyone requesting them for non-commercial purposes.

From: M Smith [mailto:jema8675@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 30, 2010 11:04 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: bridge comment - train

I-211-001 Hello. My question is, if we are going to build a new 520 bridge, then why don't we plan for it to accomodate rail? To me, it doesn't make sense to steal away traffic lanes on I-90 while we could put them on 520. Thank you, M. Smith

-----Original Message-----
From: wy7z@comcast.net [mailto:wy7z@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 8:56 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Sculpture by Max Gurvich

I-212-001

Recently I learned that the two multicolored metal devises at the west end of the SR520 bridge are sculptures by Max Gurvich. As I frequently drove by them I assumed they provided some mechanical function and never would have guessed that the devices were artwork. I hope that tax money wasn't spent to buy them and that no tax money will be spent on them in the future. I strongly recommend they be given back to Mr. Gurvich or otherwise disposed of when they are removed during the coming bridge construction.

H.W. Petersen
5214 120th Ave. SE
Bellevue, WA 98006 USA

From: Kelly Charlton [mailto:kellycharlton@msn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 3:25 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Comments on 520

Dear Sirs,

I-213-001 I would like to suggest that the design of the SR520 look forward to the transportation needs of the region over the next 50 to 100 years.

While it is certainly not easy to predict the future, I believe it is safe to say that simply building a replacement for today's traffic demands would create a situation where the replacement would likely be inadequate after 10 or 20 years.

Since the population density will likely increase over time, and modes of transportation will change, we should be short sighted about the design or the cost.

I also believe that the cost of wasted fuel and wasted productivity would easily pay for a larger replacement than has been discussed up to this point in time.

Please design the SR520 replacement to last 100 years.

Kelly Charlton
206.920.6764
kellycharlton@msn.com

From: Eric Feigl, M.D. [mailto:efeigl@u.washington.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 3:36 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject:

Hi

I-214-001 - Please get modern and build the Mountlake station and bridge end so that it will accommodate future light rail on the new 520 bridge.

Eric Feigl MD
Physiology Dept 357290
G. 424 Health Science Building
University of Washington
Seattle WA 98195 - 7290
U.S.A.

Tel: 206/ 543 - 1496
FAX 206/ 685 - 0619
email: efeigl@u.washington.edu

From: Hilton, James M. (Perkins Coie) [mailto:JHilton@PerkinsCoie.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 3:04 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Comments on the EIS For Replacement SR 520 Bridge

Dear Environmental Manager:

I-215-001 It is evident that both options A and L will constitute substantial derogation to the environment in the Montlake vicinity. In fact Option K will also constitute a substantial, but less pervasive, derogation.

There are two critical affects that must be addressed more thoroughly: Noise and appearance.

I-215-002 Noise: Option L with the route to the north being above the 520 road bed will generate great and unacceptable noise in very large areas of residences, parks and public areas. It would be totally unacceptable and would constitute a constructive taking of private property.. Option K, by placing the tunnel to the north under 520 is the only acceptable way to mediate this critical concern. Further, the lids proposed for Option K must be completely covered from the east end of the Montlake area to at least beyond the present bridge over to the MOIAH. Finally, it is critical that road beds in this entire area (both 520 and adjacent streets and ramps) be surfaced with the noise reducing surfacing material like that which was tested recently on the east end of the bridge - or some material that is at least as effective in reducing noise.

I-215-003 Appearance: 520 as it was originally constructed was an insult to the community and to the beauty of the Pacific Northwest. This is finally a chance to improve that environmental disaster. First, the area from the present access to the Montlake bridge and east to East Montlake Park should be completely covered with a landscaped lid, with access for pedestrian and bikes (like I-90 on Mercer Island). Second, all walls that are to be installed should be minimized and benched and stepped, and artfully decorated - and with vegetation covering to the extent possible. The EIS is deficient in lacking details for such construction.

I-215-004 There is only one option that even begins to meet the needs of our community - Option K. And it needs substantial additional refinement to constitute anything less than and outright constructive taking of the Montlake community and the residential properties in the area.

Sincerely,
Jim Hilton {2425 East Lake Washington Blvd.]

IRS CIRCULAR 230 DISCLOSURE: To ensure compliance with Treasury Department and IRS regulations, we inform you that, unless expressly indicated otherwise, any federal tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written by Perkins Coie LLP to be used, and cannot be used by the taxpayer, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties that may be imposed on the taxpayer under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein (or any attachments).

* * * * * * * * * *

NOTICE: This communication may contain privileged or other confidential information. If you have received it in error, please advise the sender by reply email and immediately delete the message and any attachments without copying or disclosing the contents. Thank you.

-----Original Message-----
From: Liam M Stacey [mailto:liams@u.washington.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 12:48 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: wave attenuation on bridge

Attn: engineers,

I-216-001 Wave attenuation structures could be a simpler and cheaper alternative to bridge height. Many wave attenuation configurations exist. Most are variations of concrete stars or finger-jetties. A simulated sloping beach of concrete is more expensive, but could be more aesthetically pleasing. All of these options permit the bike trail to be placed on the south side of the bridge -- so that cyclists don't have to live in the cloud of mist that wafts northward for much of our rainy season. (Try riding your bike accross I-90 for a month and you will see how tiresome it gets)

Waves could also be harnessed to generate power: a wall of many textured boards each hinged with electromagnetic resistance. The rectified current would just be dumped into the electric transit system. University engineers could host a design competition. I know, it makes too much sense.

Please consider my wave attenuation proposal as an alternative to a "height and might" method of resisting wave power.

Liam Stacey

College of Forest Resources
Doctoral Candidate
University of Washington

Winkenwerder Research Labs 106b
liams@u.washington.edu
206-543-5767

From: Bill [mailto:f4pilot@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 5:28 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Tolls on SR520 Bridge

I-217-001 What is the policy on tolls on the SR 520 bridge? Specifically,

1. Will car pools be exempt from paying tolls?
To toll car pools runs directly contrary to the State's stated goals of reducing single occupancy vehicles and reduce congestion. In support of the State's goals, car pools should be exempt from paying tolls.

2. Will government vehicles have to pay tolls? If not, why not? Are government vehicles also using these assets, just as every citizen? What is the controlling legal authority, if one exists, for exempting government vehicles from paying tolls.

Bill Kyle
Seattle

From: Brian & Carol Murphy [mailto:brcaer-f3@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 5:35 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: "Impacts" Typo on 520 memo

To whom it may concern,

I-218-001 The email you sent out says "….address SR 520 impacts to the Arboretum….". The word " impacts" as a noun does not exist in the dictionary. I think the word intended here was "effects".

Regards,
Brian

From: Linda & Doug Elsner [mailto:elsner43@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 8:41 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: I-5 to Medina Replacement

I-219-001 My choice overall is Plan L. More lanes are crucial; preserving the arboretum as much as possible is crucial; until everyone has been impacted by the glut of traffic on 520 (that means more than 1 or 2 times), people who commute daily need to have the easiest and most direct routes available including bicyclists and pedestrians. I think it might be underestimated what a bicycle route would do to help eliminate a few vehicles headed to the UW. Thank you.

Washington State Department of Transportation

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Supplemental Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to share your comments on the content provided in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. WSDOT will consider all comments received between Jan. 22 and April 15, 2010 in making its final decision in the environmental review process. Thank you for your comments.

You can provide comments using one of the following methods:

-- Complete this form.
-- Mail your comments to Jenifer Young, SDEIS Environmental Manager, Washington State Department of Transportation, 600 Stewart Street, Suite 520, Seattle, WA 98101.
-- E-mail your comments to SR520Bridge_SDEIS@wsdot.wa.gov.
-- Speak to a court reporter at an environmental hearing scheduled for 5 – 7 p.m., Feb. 23, at Lake Union Park Naval Reserve Building, 860 Terry Ave. N., Seattle.

1. Name Alex Broner

CommentDate: 3/31/2010 18:57

2. E-mail

Comment Source: Online Comment

3. Address: 424 19th ave e

4. City: seattle

5. State: wa

*** 6. Zip Code:** 98112

7. Do you have any comments on the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

I-220-001

The current bridge design maintains existing capabilities for Single Occupancy Vehicles yet it degrades transit service to the University of Washington and Montlake by removing the flyer stop at Montlake. This is moving in the wrong direction. We should be working on building a better stop serving UW and montlake with better walking and bicycle connectivity to these places and to transfer stops on Montake blvd.

These comments will become part of the public record for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Personal information is voluntary and will become part of the public record if provided. The Washington State Department of Transportation is a public agency and is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Therefore, comments may be made available to anyone requesting them for non-commercial purposes.

Washington State Department of Transportation

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Supplemental Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to share your comments on the content provided in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. WSDOT will consider all comments received between Jan. 22 and April 15, 2010 in making its final decision in the environmental review process. Thank you for your comments.

You can provide comments using one of the following methods:

-- Complete this form.
-- Mail your comments to Jenifer Young, SDEIS Environmental Manager, Washington State Department of Transportation, 600 Stewart Street, Suite 520, Seattle, WA 98101.
-- E-mail your comments to SR520Bridge_SDEIS@wsdot.wa.gov.
-- Speak to a court reporter at an environmental hearing scheduled for 5 – 7 p.m., Feb. 23, at Lake Union Park Naval Reserve Building, 860 Terry Ave. N., Seattle.

1. Name Steven J Cramer

CommentDate: 3/31/2010 19:20

2. E-mail

Comment Source: Online Comment

3. Address: 1228 20th East

4. City: Seattle

5. State: WA

*** 6. Zip Code:** 98112

7. Do you have any comments on the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

I-221-001

Mandatory structural engineering be required and built to accommodate light rail service on the new 520 bridge. This is a chance of a lifetime now. If light rail is not constructed now, at the minimum, the bridge should be built to structurally support light rail for the future use.

These comments will become part of the public record for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Personal information is voluntary and will become part of the public record if provided. The Washington State Department of Transportation is a public agency and is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Therefore, comments may be made available to anyone requesting them for non-commercial purposes.

Washington State Department of Transportation

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Supplemental Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to share your comments on the content provided in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. WSDOT will consider all comments received between Jan. 22 and April 15, 2010 in making its final decision in the environmental review process. Thank you for your comments.

You can provide comments using one of the following methods:

-- Complete this form.
-- Mail your comments to Jenifer Young, SDEIS Environmental Manager, Washington State Department of Transportation, 600 Stewart Street, Suite 520, Seattle, WA 98101.
-- E-mail your comments to SR520Bridge_SDEIS@wsdot.wa.gov.
-- Speak to a court reporter at an environmental hearing scheduled for 5 – 7 p.m., Feb. 23, at Lake Union Park Naval Reserve Building, 860 Terry Ave. N., Seattle.

1. Name Steve Krauss

CommentDate: 4/1/2010 13:13

2. E-mail

Comment Source: Online Comment

3. Address: 16204 Main St

4. City: Bellevue

5. State: WA

*** 6. Zip Code:** 98008

7. Do you have any comments on the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

I-222-001 1. Build the 6-lane option.
I-222-002 2. Build the Pacific Interchange design for the Montlake/Pacific St interchange.
I-222-003 3. NO TUNNELS.
I-222-004 4. Transit service MUST be improved along the corridor as soon as tolling begins - there MUST be bus service for those who cannot afford the tolls to drive across the bridge to work everyday. I work at the UW Medical Center, I must be at work at 0700 every Saturday and Sunday morning, and there is NO bus service that can get me to work on time from the eastside!! This is unacceptable.
I-222-005 5. Bike/Pedestrian access across the bridge.

These comments will become part of the public record for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Personal information is voluntary and will become part of the public record if provided. The Washington State Department of Transportation is a public agency and is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Therefore, comments may be made available to anyone requesting them for non-commercial purposes.

Washington State Department of Transportation

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Supplemental Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to share your comments on the content provided in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. WSDOT will consider all comments received between Jan. 22 and April 15, 2010 in making its final decision in the environmental review process. Thank you for your comments.

You can provide comments using one of the following methods:

-- Complete this form.
-- Mail your comments to Jenifer Young, SDEIS Environmental Manager, Washington State Department of Transportation, 600 Stewart Street, Suite 520, Seattle, WA 98101.
-- E-mail your comments to SR520Bridge_SDEIS@wsdot.wa.gov.
-- Speak to a court reporter at an environmental hearing scheduled for 5 – 7 p.m., Feb. 23, at Lake Union Park Naval Reserve Building, 860 Terry Ave. N., Seattle.

1. Name Andrew Pittaway

CommentDate: 4/1/2010 15:37

2. E-mail

Comment Source: Online Comment

3. Address: 2512 E Roanoke St

4. City: Seattle

5. State: WA

*** 6. Zip Code:** 98112

7. Do you have any comments on the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

I-223-001 Could you expand on how the proposed East Lake Washington Blvd westbound off-ramp & eastbound on-ramp will impact traffic both along east Lake Washington Blvd around the Montlake interchange & through the Arboretum? Also, how much will the existing East Lake Washington Blvd need to be enlarged in order to cope with increased traffic brought by these ramps?

I-223-002 What are the traffic, environmental & noise implications of these changes to local residents? I can find no mention of these extremely important details anywhere in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

These comments will become part of the public record for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Personal information is voluntary and will become part of the public record if provided. The Washington State Department of Transportation is a public agency and is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Therefore, comments may be made available to anyone requesting them for non-commercial purposes.

Washington State Department of Transportation

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Supplemental Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to share your comments on the content provided in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. WSDOT will consider all comments received between Jan. 22 and April 15, 2010 in making its final decision in the environmental review process. Thank you for your comments.

You can provide comments using one of the following methods:

-- Complete this form.
-- Mail your comments to Jenifer Young, SDEIS Environmental Manager, Washington State Department of Transportation, 600 Stewart Street, Suite 520, Seattle, WA 98101.
-- E-mail your comments to SR520Bridge_SDEIS@wsdot.wa.gov.
-- Speak to a court reporter at an environmental hearing scheduled for 5 – 7 p.m., Feb. 23, at Lake Union Park Naval Reserve Building, 860 Terry Ave. N., Seattle.

1. Name MARTHA TOFFERI

CommentDate: 3/31/2010 21:22

2. E-mail

Comment Source: Online Comment

3. Address: 2620 31st Ave W

4. City: Seattle

5. State: WA

*** 6. Zip Code:** 98199

7. Do you have any comments on the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

I-224-001

I am an occasional user of the bridge and do not live in any affected neighborhood. But of course, I do have an opinion. Please continue to march to replace the bridge. If we were to go back almost to the beginning to fulfill the needs of especially those who would have us rely on streetcars is folly. Let's get to the next phase and build it sooner rather than later.

These comments will become part of the public record for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Personal information is voluntary and will become part of the public record if provided. The Washington State Department of Transportation is a public agency and is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Therefore, comments may be made available to anyone requesting them for non-commercial purposes.

Washington State Department of Transportation

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Supplemental Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to share your comments on the content provided in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. WSDOT will consider all comments received between Jan. 22 and April 15, 2010 in making its final decision in the environmental review process. Thank you for your comments.

You can provide comments using one of the following methods:

-- Complete this form.
-- Mail your comments to Jenifer Young, SDEIS Environmental Manager, Washington State Department of Transportation, 600 Stewart Street, Suite 520, Seattle, WA 98101.
-- E-mail your comments to SR520Bridge_SDEIS@wsdot.wa.gov.
-- Speak to a court reporter at an environmental hearing scheduled for 5 – 7 p.m., Feb. 23, at Lake Union Park Naval Reserve Building, 860 Terry Ave. N., Seattle.

1. Name Trevor Vernon

CommentDate: 4/2/2010 17:56

2. E-mail

Comment Source: Online Comment

3. Address: 1245 22nd Ave. E.

4. City: Seattle

5. State: WA

*** 6. Zip Code:** 98112

7. Do you have any comments on the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

I-225-001 I hope the replacement chosen includes a lid for the Montlake area. This may not be the best metric due to the significant cost overruns but having spent a fair amount of time in Boston pre and post big dig, what that has done for the quality of that city is immeasurable. The bridge

I-225-002 should also include rail lines, much easier to do now than retrofit later which I believe is inevitable. Lastly, toll away on that thing. As someone who commutes to the eastside every day

I-225-003 from Seattle, I use and should pay my fare share for the bridge replacement. Thanks for your consideration.

Best,
Trevor Vernon

These comments will become part of the public record for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Personal information is voluntary and will become part of the public record if provided. The Washington State Department of Transportation is a public agency and is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Therefore, comments may be made available to anyone requesting them for non-commercial purposes.

-----Original Message-----
From: HQ Customer Service
Sent: Monday, April 05, 2010 12:59 PM
To: 'phries@gmail.com'
Cc: SR 520 Bridge Replacement & HOV Project
Subject: RE: WSDOT Feedback form

Mr. Ries:
Thank you for your e-mail to the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) with comments about the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV project SDEIS. We appreciate all the feedback we receive and it is especially gratifying to receive positive comments about the work we're doing.
By copy of this e-mail, I am forwarding your comments directly to the project staff.
Again, thank you for taking the time to write to us.

Kimberly Colburn
Customer Service
WSDOT
hqcustomerservice@wsdot.wa.gov
News - http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/news/
Twitter - http://twitter.com/wsdot
Flickr - http://www.flickr.com/photos/wsdot/

-----Original Message-----
From: phries@gmail.com [mailto:phries@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 04, 2010 1:13 PM
To: HQ Customer Service
Subject: WSDOT Feedback form

The following is the contents of a form submitted on 4/4/2010 1:13:24 PM
======My Contact information======
Name: Philip Ries
E-mail: phries@gmail.com
Phone:
Street Address:
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98122
===== My Question/Comment/Complaint =====

Just an informal comment on the 520 SDEIS.

I-226-001 You guys are doing a great job. I wanted to know how the build options would affect transit and why the Montlake Freeway Station was going to be removed under all of them. While the executive summary didn't have what I was looking for, Chapter 5 of the document did. It is really well thought through and I no longer (for now at least :) have questions or objections!
==========

=== Browser Type ===Browser: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Windows NT 6.1; en-US) AppleWebKit/532.5 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/4.1.249.1042 Safari/532.5

-----Original Message-----
From: Hans and Patti [mailto:hans-pat@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 06, 2010 9:20 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Cc: Rodney Tom; Ross Hunter; Deb Eddy; hammondp@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: Comment of SR-520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

I-227-001 Over the past couple of years I have attended numerous public meeting and watched the SR520 bridge replacement project - in spite of all the good work done by WSDOT staff - evolve from a future oriented, regional needs based analysis to a retro looking mitigation project with an accidental bridge attached. Due to lack of political will and leadership, adjacent community groups have been permitted to dictate terms and design solutions incompatible with efficient traffic flow. A simple project tolling finance option has been high jacked by interest groups that are more interested in what is technically possible with a large associated overhead for development, maintenance, operation, administration and enforcement - as opposed to operationally simple, financially efficient and implementation of good public policy.

As it now appears, the region will be saddled with a solution that
* Offers minimal improvement of the horrible SR520 - I-5 interchange

* Offers no recognition of HOV traffic flow going both North and South from/to SR520 to/from I-5

* Offers an SR520 corridor capacity already under pressure with proposed design and certainly insufficient for planned decades of future use

I-227-002 * Neglects of incorporate both light rail, HOV lane and general traffic lanes as part of a regional transportation system infrastructure

I-227-003 *Basically locks in for the next century all the current inadequate interchanges [decoupled] designed for an obsolete traffic pattern - possibly with exception of Montlake

I-227-004 * Neglects to protect the Arboretum from excessive traffic volume, which is choking the park

I-227-005 * Designs new HOV lane-only access ramps that reflect an obsolete commuting pattern [South Kirkland Park&Ride direction Seattle only]

I-227-006 * Neglects to draw any significant learning from tolling experience from Tacoma Narrows Bridge and SR167 Hot-Lane tolling experiences

I-227-007 * To mention but a few items - again and again

I-227-007

I find it disappointing - if not surprising - that the public will not only have to live with this failure for years to come, they will likely also have to pay an even greater amount within a decade of the planned new bridge opening to get it right. If we are hard pressed to find adequate funding now, why do we think it will be easier next time?

By then, most elected officials currently in office will likely have moved on. There are leaders and there are followers. It is a problem when followers present themselves as leaders only at election time.

Regards

Hans Gundersen

cc: Gov. Gregoire

From: Francie Williams [mailto:FEvans@nwadmin.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 07, 2010 2:38 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: 520 Bridge Replacement Comment

April 7, 2010

To Whom It May Concern:

I-228-001 This letter is to comment on the proposed placement of the on and off ramps that will be east of the Montlake Interchange and are part of Option A+ for the replacement of the 520 Bridge. The current 520 Bridge ramps feed into Lake Washington Boulevard as it exits the Arboretum. The new plan has them located at the end of Roanoke Street. This is not an improvement, as the vast majority of users are those who go to and come from the South through the Arboretum. The new placement will encourage traffic to divert through the neighborhood to access the new ramps. Not only is this disruptive for the neighborhood, it is not safe as there are many children in the area.

I-228-002 We believe that the best plan for the 520 Bridge Replacement Project is **Option A**. If Plan A+ is adopted we feel the ramps should stay where they are presently located. The
I-228-003 Montlake neighborhood is a vibrant neighborhood and should be considered in the plans to replace the 520 Bridge.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter.

Sincerely,

John and Francie Williams
Montlake Neighbors

< Disclaimer >

Confidentiality Statement-This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. This communication may contain material protected by HIPAA, ERISA, other federal or state law or the attorney-client privilege. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. You are instructed to destroy the message and notify Northwest Administrators by immediate reply that you have received this e-mail and any accompanying files in error. Please bring any questions you may have on this instruction to the attention of Northwest Administrators immediately. Northwest Administrators does not accept responsibility for changes to e-mails that occur after they have been sent.

From: Priscilla Arsove [mailto:parsove@execpc.com]
Sent: Friday, April 09, 2010 8:00 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Comment on SR 530 Bridge Environmental Impact

To the Washington DOT:

I-229-001 I was born and raised in the Montlake neighborhood of Seattle, where I continue to visit frequently. I am appalled that plans for the 520 replacement bridge include so many adverse environmental impacts that would irreversibly damage the Montlake neighborhood and City of Seattle. Specifically:

I-229-002 • You must develop alternatives to a huge interchange in Montlake and a broad swath across Portage Bay. A new bridge structure parallel to the existing bridge is a ridiculous "solution" that completely compromises the existing scenic landscape and historic neighborhood. Massive interchanges are an urban blight. YOU CAN DO BETTER THAN THIS!

I-229-003 • You must find ways to preserve the existing green spaces and bays, which are a vital to the quality of the urban environment for generations to come. Once overrun by hideous ramps and concrete, they are gone forever. Is this truly the legacy our planners want to leave? YOU CAN DO BETTER THAN THIS!

I-229-004 • You need to focus on ways to move more people in public transit, NOT cars. More vehicular congestion in an already congested neighborhood and city is not what is needed. Please, PLAN FOR THE FUTURE – do not replicate the principles and concepts of l950s transportation planning. YOU CAN DO BETTER THAN THIS!

Sincerely,

Priscilla Arsove