Jennifer--Thanks for your previous communications. I went to the website and I believe I submitted the following comments on the EIS. However, I'm not certain they went throught.

Here are the comments I submittted

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

I-300-001

I find it disturbing that there is no map showing the permanent destruction of wetlands around Foster Island. Only a number--7 acres and 1.3 buffer acres--with no baseline numbers.

It wouldn't have been hard to come up with a graphic of the current 520 and the current marsh, in color, that showed exactly how much will be lost permanently when the current project is overlaid upon it. It's no secret that the DoT prefers a big project, and I think the reason this graphic isn't presented is it would create a strong argument for scaling the whole thing back.

These wetlands are Seattle's last and best, and I personally will be saddened that they will be so degenerated for the rest of my lifetime.

I-300-002

The reality that species displaced are "common" is legalistic. It's interesting that many species that were formally named "Common" in the 1800s are now beginning battles with extinction: the Common Nighthawk, Common Tern and the Common Eider among them. Great Blue Herons, which use the Union Bay marsh would have been considered common in Seattle just 6 years ago. Now there is a real question whether they will survive in the city. Similarly, the Pacific Tree Frog is suddenly embattled. Causes of decline are numerous, but the belief by every jurisdiction that the little best marsh they own is not important enough to save could be a factor.

I-300-003

I don't make the argument that because this project will be ugly,--for that reason alone--that we shouldn't do it. But as a professional artist for the last 27 years, who has painted and issued a limited edition print of Union Bay Marsh, I have a strong feeling about aesthetics--I believe that what aesthetics can do is provide a clue. As I see it this project will degenerate perhaps the most beautiful place in Seattle and replace it with the most mind-numbingly ugly substrate in our arsenal --a vast expanse of concrete. And this is the not-so-subtle clue that it's the wrong thing to do.

For me, it would be ashame to go ahead with this project, as it would cost a lot of money and it would make Seattle, in general, a worse place to live.

I-300-004

We should do a reasonably-priced safety retrofit over just the in-danger portion of 520 that crosses the lake, and postpone any big project until the Viaduct situation and the finances are resolved.

Again, I appreciate the chance to comment.

Sincerely,

Ed Newbold Seattle Wildlife Artist since 1983 at the Pike Place Market

Thanks, Best wishes,

Ed Newbold
206 767 7169

--- On **Mon, 4/12/10, SR 520 Bridge SDEIS <*SR520Bridge_SDEIS@WSDOT.WA.GOV*>** wrote:

From: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS <SR520Bridge_SDEIS@WSDOT.WA.GOV>
Subject: RE: SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program Feedback
To: ednewbold1@yahoo.com
Date: Monday, April 12, 2010, 5:14 PM

Dear Ed,

Thank you for submitting your comments on the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS).

Your comments will become part of the official public record and will be published, with responses, in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Please check the SR 520 Program Web page for additional project information and to stay informed about the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Jenifer Young

SDEIS Environmental Manager

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/SDEIS.htm

From: ednewbold1@yahoo.com [mailto:ednewbold1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2010 1:19 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge Replacement & HOV Project
Subject: SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program Feedback

Sent from:	Ed Newbold
Address:	4972 17th Ave. South
City:	Seattle
State:	WA
County:	King County
Zip:	98108
Email:	ednewbold1@yahoo.com
Phone:	206 767 7169

Comments:

I-300-005

I oppose the DoT's plan for 520. It is astonishing to me that with all the various comments about the project, so few people are zeroing in on the fact that there is no plan as to how to pay for it. ANY other project being proposed for the region would need to have a full financing plan in place first. This is entirely irresponsible, but it is in keeping with the tone and tenor of the entire project. The world is finally turning against big 50's-style highway projects for many reasons, yet the DoT has planned the biggest possible highway it could ever imagine stuffing down Seattle's throat, which it seems to be quite successfully doing right now. I'd prefer to see the DoT prioritize security-only by looking for temporary measures that could retrofit the bridge for safety during storms and earthquakes. Thanks for your time, Ed Newbold

I-301
05/26/2011 13:19 PM

TO: Jenifer Young, WSDOT SDEIS Environmental, Mgr. SR 520 Program Office
4/15/10
RE: SR 520 SDEIS Comments and Concerns
From; Virginia Gunby, E-mail –vgunby@aol.com Phone 206-524-2731

I-301-001 On March 30 2010 the Governor signed into law the 2010 state 520 Legislation **ESSB 6293** enabling of $200 million work for the west-side, 3 Workgroup studies on the major issues listed below, and moved the date forward on-Variable Tolling to start to 2011.

1.)**ESSB 6293** is the 2010 state Law help to refine the Preferred west-side SR 520Alternative Design in the SDEIS into the" Preferred Alternative" for the west-side design in the SR520 FEIS. In Section (4)b.i) **it sets HOV performance standards with a minimum of *3-person carpools in HOV lanes*, and an average transit speed of 45 mph 90% of the time.**

Comment: If the operations of the 520 HOV lanes do not meet this standard there needs to be changes in Tolling fees and/or the number of people in HOVs.

I-301-002 2.) Requires "**Mitigation to protect against *adverse impacts on neighborhood environmental quality."*** I

Comment: I assume that this is a directive to WSDOT, but no Workgroup was required for this to assure that the statement is followed.

I-301-003 3.) To accommodate effective connections for Transit, including HCT at the U of W Station a **WSDOT Workgroup** is to recommend "**alternative connections for transit**", including HCT to the U of W LRT Station, and a **report by 7/5/10.**

Comment: The "A :SR 520 design option plan includes bus on and off ramps to and from the east-side on Montlake Blvd. We requested that city of Seattle connecting arterials have new transit preferential lanes, and transit control of keeping the traffic light green at the Montlake Blvd.NE/NE Pacific St. Intersection. These actions improve transit service movement between SR 520 and the Triangle Bus transfer-point/LRT station.

I-301-004 4.) Provides **$200 million in excess bond proceeds, beyond the funds** needed for the bridge segment, to fund SR 520 from I-5 to Medina, and

Comment: Is this real money for the west-side project?

I-301-005 5.) Creates a **WSDOT Workgroup** to recommend options **for financing HCT.** - Report on **520 is due 1/1/11,**

Comment: 1.) **State gas tax and vehicle license fees are dedicated for highway use, and cannot expend funding for providing capital programs for LRT**
2. Local and Regional Transit agencies are dependent on the sales tax for revenue, are Projecting deficits, as their rider-ship rises. METRO is filling in temporarily with Capital funds,
And Sound Transit is projecting about a $3 billion loss in projected funds to pay for their ST-2 Long Range Plan voters approved in 2008. The state makes little contribution to the support of any local or regional transit service.

I-301-005 **A supporters know that we need improved transit service for the new SR 520 HOV lanes, to reduce SOV trips. As this group seeks options for financing HCT, they should explore support a new source of funds for increased transit operations from SR 520 Tolls.**
(May also need to make a change in our existing state laws.)

I-301-006 6) **WSDOT** is required" to develop a project mitigation plan **to address mitigation for the Washington Park Arboretum",** including enhancing wetland mitigation, and reduce impacts and to be consistent with federal and state laws. Submit a Mitigation plan by **12/31/10** to the state for the FEIS. Includes City Council , Mayor, U of W, consult with Arboretum Board Rep. **Must include on-site mitigation of the Wetlands.**

Comment: A supporters urge that this Workgroup meetings be open to the Public. No amount of mitigation payments can compensate for keeping the Arboretum Ramps to be used for access to a state highway road, given the projected increase in the use of the ramps ,if they are replaced

.

I-301-007 7.)A **WSDOT Workgroup,** including the Mayor and Council, SDOT and others are to study and **recommend design refinements** on the **520 Preferred Alternative selected by WSDOT** in the SDEIS process, for 'timely progression' of the SR 520 bridge replacement, consistent with the SDEIS, and *submit the recommendations to the Governor and Legislature by.* ***7/15/10***

Comment:
This new 2010 legislation plus reading the City Council and Mayor' Draft 520 Reports on SR 520 was a "game changer" and changed my approach for to commenting on the 14,000 page SR 520 west-side SDEIS . It is a new ball game, particularly since the proposed K and L designs are not viable SR 520 proposals anymore. The **three Workgroups** listed above will focus and report on three of the west-side's most controversial and perplexing 520 issues, including ***west-side 520 design refinements* to *promote timely progress and budget actions for the 520 replacement*, consistent with the SDEIS**, ***Transit connections between SR 520 and Sound Transit's LRT station* at the U of W stadium area**, and to address ***mitigation for the Arboretum***, with up to a**$200 million fund** added to pay for their west-side **Workgroup recommendations**.
All of their meeting should have a Public Notice prior to Meetings, that are open to the Public.

I-301-008 II. **IsThere Support for a SR 520 West-Side LRT Design Now?**- *A supporters* are for a policy that retains the SR 520 as a six lane corridor permanently, due to the sensitive environment on the west-side. **Environmental agencies like NOAA were very concerned about the construction required for the 520 rebuild impacts, and do not want the area to be impacted ever again because of the cumulative impacts**! So what should be done now to prepare for the future possibility of adding LRT to SR 520?
The *policy of precluding the future SR 520 LRT should also be studied in order to know the long term effects on our regional and local transit systems. Are revisions to SR 520's design needed now to make it easier and less expensive to retrofit for LRT in the future. What are the benefits and the costs?*

Because my long term history and knowledge of the **cross-lake issues** (I-90 too) has focused on with land-use issues, I don't find that the present eastside development patterns, adjacent to SR 520 could support and use a cost-effective public LRT system. It would be In addition to the planned for and funded I-90 East Link, and the Sound Transit's SR 520 BRT

I-301-008

services. Too much and to early LRT capacity would be costly to build operate and would have negative land-use impacts on our adopted King County Urban Growth Boundary. It would encourage sprawl and encourage the developers to build further out, toward the Cascades, into another regional drainage Basin, and place pressure on moving the agreed upon current King County adopted Urban Growth Boundary further east, creating rural sprawl

1. There is no existing LRT system plan for where another SR 520 LRT route to the U of W would go in Seattle? How would it complement and not duplicate the planned Sound Transit's LRT system, without expensive tunneling under or through Seattle many hills?

I-301-009

(The following are questions for the ESSB 6293 WSDOT established SR 520 Workgroups that need to be answered when studying alternative connections for planning SR 520 Transit and the Financing an additional HCT system route.

2.a.) If LRT is added to a 6-lane highway corridor, can the two center lanes that are initially for HOVs be converted to a two-way LRT system in the future? Would a 6-lane (floating) bridge be structurally able to handle the added LRT weight with or without added pontoons?

b.) Can the 6 lane bridge mainline lanes each-way, be converted for HOV lanes?

c.) Could the remaining outside lanes would be used for two-way SOV traffic?

d.) Are more pontoons needed to support the weight of a LRT 4-car train-set?

e.) Would metering of the cross lake LRT service be necessary and limited only one train "set" on the bridge at a time, if the bridge is less that 6 lanes?

f.) Is the static electricity from the LRT system on a 6-lane bridge with LRT too close to the pontoons, so there is a danger that it would corrode the steel in the pontoons?

g.) With a second LRT line from the north, the transit planners have always projected that the existing Seattle CBD Bus/LRT tunnel would be over its capacity, and another costly downtown tunnel would be required to serve it.

h.) Transit planners have also projected that the North Link line has enough use to balance the LRT service on both the I-90 LRT line east and the South Link service. This means service would be balanced both ways, and no LRT would be "dead-heading" (making a trip with few of or no passengers

i,) The Eastside SR 520 transition span is 75' off the water to allow larger boats to travel to the south side of the Lake. Would the highway grade be compatible with limits for LRT to a 6% grade?

My initial conclusion is the planned expansion of capacity with the I-90 with East Link, will add increased cross-lake people-moving-capacity, especially with the added new I-90 HOV lanes to the east-side and the Sound Transit's new BRT service on SR 520. High speed I-90 LRT has adequate capacity to serve the projected east-side population and economic growth across-Lake Washington Transit service for at least the next 20 years. And it has been strengthened to handle the added LRT weight.

I-301-010

Study and consideration by city of Seattle and the Region needs to be redirected to what is **the Seattle Transit Plan** for future Transit improvements within the city, and relating it to the long range Sound Transit's System Plan**. What is Seattle long range Transit Plan for**

I-301-010 **Connecting to the Regional System, and what is the Timing, the Priorities and the Financing options.**

3. Planning and Building LRT in Seattle to the growing denser urban centers like West Seattle and
Ballard, could be more beneficial and responsive to the city's future economy and its citizens,
than to support LRT to the eastside, which today have few urban centers or dense growth patterns, and are not concentrating their growth enough to support an economical and efficient
LRT service with the SR 520 Commuter-shed.

I-301-011 **III. Features of the A west-side Design That Should be Improved Compared with the current Design in the SDEIS**

1. Option A includes support of a LID at **the I/5/SR 520 Roanoke Interchange**. But there is a existing center landscaped I-5 Median strip with some large trees. This I-5 planted median that in SR 520 plan would be completely Lidded. If it were completely lidded, the existing large, grey, ugly noise walls on both sides of I-5 would make this part of I-5 be like an ugly Tunnel, at this busy interchange. **Recommendation**: When designed leave part of the LID open.

I-301-012 2. The **new reversible I-5 Express lane ramp for SR 520 Transit/HOVs** to travel south AM and north on the I-5 Express lanes in the PM, is a welcome addition to speed Transit/HOV trips to and from the CBD. The express lanes have been underutilized for many years. I support evaluating them for a change in the express lane operations in favor of encouraging more two-way Transit/HOV use on the I-5 express lanes. (New SR 520 Tolls and new HOV lanes should increase Transit/HOV use, and WSDOT should work on changing the I-5 lanes to encourage transit two way/all day by working to change the operation. This future revision should be kept in when the design of the SR 520/I-5 Express Lane Ramp Connection is prepared. (*Rob Fellows, WSDOT, is your expert onI-5 Express lanes*)

I-301-013 3, The **Lids at E. Roanoke St and Delmar Drive, and 10th E**. should be landscaped and have a plan for connecting to City Bike and Pedestrian-Trail Plans, to use as neighborhood connectors, and well as noise dampeners. The grand view from the **little Bagley viewpoint** should not be lost in the rebuild, but incorporated on one of the appropriate adjacent planned Lids.
.While commenting on Lids, I support increasing y Lidded green space in the vicinity of Montlake Blvd.

I-301-014 4. Increasing the width of the landscaping in the center of Montlake Blvd. is needed. There used to be Japan donated flowering Japanese Cherry trees, that were beautiful every spring, but when the road was widened they were moved to the U of W "Quad" for the students to enjoy.

I-301-015 5. The other Lid is the McCurdy Park Lid, omitted in many parts of the SDEIS discussion. A Seattle Park's staff report said that all of McCurdy Park would be taken by the West-side SR 520 project. I urge that the storm-water pond to be located on the McCurdy Park's former land be made to look as natural as possible. The removal of the Arboretum Ramps, which A

I-301-015 supporters are for, would mean that there wont **be a new auto Ramps built over the Lid**. That issue will be settled by the ESSB 6293 directive for WSDOT's to lead an Arboretum Mitigation Workgroup, this Spring and Summer. If the Ramps are not removed, using the Lid at McCurdy Park for a new access Ramp to SR 520, it would be a travesty and expensive mistake, and the Lid should be removed from the Plan.

I-301-016 **The future meetings of the proposed Work-group on Arboretum mitigation should be open to the Public.**

I-301-017 6. The City Council's SR 520 March 2010 Consultant's Report suggests removing the proposed two-way HOV lanes on the new Portage Bay Bridge, to reduce the footprint. This action would not be an aid for Transit and HOV users. It is inconsistent with opening the new I-5 Express lane reversible ramp into the HOV/TRANSIT two-way express lanes. If narrowed to four lanes Transit/HOVs would be in "mixed traffic on the Portage Bay Bridge. In addition the SDEIS states that at peak hours, the I-5/SR 520 intersection to and from the mainline lanes, will have congested delays and "spill-backs," with Single Occupant Vehicles unable to enter I/5 North or South ramps in the AM, and the reverse in the PM. Not having that two-way HOV lanes space for transit could lead to increased transfers at the Sound Transit U of W station. The LR service at this station isn't able to be used more as transfer Station from bus to LRT, because the LRT cars are projected to be crush load full, when they come from the either north or south to the Sound Transit's U of W LRT Station.

I-301-018 Finally A and A+ supporters are for **design competition** on the Portage Bay Bridge, to select the best design possible, at the least cost.

I-301-019 10. There needs to be new, improved changing Message signage to assist in the channelization of Montlake Blvd. to reduce the barging of cars into lanes at the last minute to get to the correct West/East SR 520 ramps, with new entry ramp metering. The city's Consultant also recommended using the shoulder instead of adding an auxiliary lane on the westbound to the I/5 ramp at Montlake Blvd.

WSDOT staff should locate where in the world, urban areas have used an entry lane to a limited access freeway successfully, and the related traffic accident statistics. I tend to support the new auxiliary lane to help safely move the traffic off of Montlake Blvd. to SR 520. But the neighborhood opposes it and I do not want the historic NOAA Science Building, to be replaced for $200 million, that is not in the 520 project budget, for the Montlake Blvd. SR 520 entrance west to I-5 ramp. lane.
Recommendation-WSDOT Staff work is needed to resolve this important question- an auxiliary lane versus a using wider shoulder

I-301-020 11. The A 520 design's Interchange at Montlake Blvd. must be improved compared to the existing and confusing "U" turn pattern for SR 520 users traveling to SR 520 from the south on Montlake Blvd E. to travel east or west. Traffic calming and TDM is need on Montlake Blvd. E to assist transit and local pedestrians/bikers, and even potential transit users.

I-301-021 12. Even though A has two Bus ramps onto Montlake Blvd E. in the design, I think that a change in their location is needed. Could we return to transit using the existing Loop, for transit to use to go East, where there are bus lanes/stops on Pacific St and closer to more users? This would allow passengers to either board at the Triangle transfer area, or at west-side Bus Stops. Having the ramp on the east side of Montlake E requires the buses from the

I-301-021 north LRT station going east to need a traffic light to turn left on the interchange overpass, to move to the bus ramp to SR 520, on a very heavily use street.
I don't support a Bus stop at the East Entry ramp because a bypass would be needed for HOVs to enter while the bus is stopped, would back-up traffic, and would increase the SR 520 footprint significantly.

Now that we will have HOV lanes, WSDOT should investigate a new option that could also be used for **HOV cars to add/ pick-up HOV certified riders** at one of the designated west-side Bus Stops. This program is used successfully on the entries to some San Francisco Bridges

I-301-022 13. Another suggested change the exit for west-bound buses from the east, exiting at Montlake to connect to the U of W or LRT station ,or to travel north. Could if be designed to use the inside of the existing off-ramp the north side of the SR 520. The ramp could move toward the exit starting near to the existing 24thE.overpass, by MOHAI. . Would may take some of the load off of Montlake Blvd., and help to decrease the 520 Interchange's footprint?

Since there is so much Transit service on Montlake Blvd., second to the Seattle CBD, WSDOT must work with SDOT and the Transit agencies to improve the SR 520 transit access and exit ramps into and out of the preferential arterial transit lanes, at least at the peaks and give Transit the ability to extend the arterial green lights, particularly at the Montlake Blvd NE/NE Pacific St. Intersection.

I-301-023 14.. SR 520 needs new enhanced planned "**Complete Streets**" improvements for connecting Transit-users, Bicyclists and Pedestrians to the surrounding Trail systems and Bike routes. Adding the Montlake parallel Bascule Bridge provides a new capacity for moving Transit through this busy corridor, but it also provides an opportunity to provide more space for the Pedestrians and Bikers to safely cross the Montlake Cut. The operations on the bridge should be planned to have safe non-auto lanes to reach the SR 520 Regional Bike/Ped Trail to the east side, or to cross the McCurdy Park lid to move to the Arboretum safely, or travel further south to the I-90 corridor bike lane, or on the Lake Washington Blvd and south to waterfront parks.

The area around the Montlake Bridge has heavy pedestrian and bike use and WSDOT needs to do some design work to improve the SR 520 connectivity with new plans and signage that explain the potential of the new connections to and from SR 520 for these users.

I-301-024 15. The removal of the existing SR 520 Freeway Level Flyer Stops is an improvement and narrows the 520 interchange footprint. They are to be replaced with every type of transit service they provided, only better than ever, and it results in an interchange which is narrowed by 60'-70'.

I-301-025 16. I agree with the Consultant's statement is his report to the City Council that the SR 520 West-side "*portion from the High-rise to I-5 is the most difficult and sensitive area and needs to be planned with the best current thinking available now to 'get it right' in terms of the next 100 years*".

16.**Achieving Future Improved Performance and long term Sustainability for SR 520/I-90 Operations and Modal Goals and Objectives- Achieving Positive Planning for Performance**

A new step forward has been taken to enable the actual Monitoring of the overall multi-modal Performance of SR 520/I-90 as one of the major regional corridors, and it's the adjacent arterials. The regional PSRC's new Vision 2040 (land use plan, and the adopted Transportation 2040 Plan have included a **SMART Corridor's Program**. PSRC will start soon to collect data from state, regional and local transportation modes, operating on the two corridors to obtain an overview of the two corridor's Performance. With this information they will be able to make recommended changes
If needed jointly on both SR 520 and I-90, to meet their adopted Corridor Goals, Objectives and adopted policies and cross-lake and Reporting it regularly to the users, and adjacent jurisdictions.

(Note: Background: The PSRC's Corridor Management Program is the new Transportation Demand Management Tool that is the result of the WSDOT "TEEM" Consultant study about 2000-2002 to study the benefits of Managing the Performance of major multi-modal urban Corridors. It was funded with an $850,000 grant from the FHWA. After the study was completed it was passed on the PSRC's Staff to implement, as part of their PSRC Regional Plan update and their Transportation Management Program.
I was involved in the Translake study at the time and suggested WSDOT seek the Grant to improve our knowledge about managing multi-modal Corridors, to help prevent the need for expanding SOV capacity, through alternative modes and transportation management polices. I think of it as being similar to a Transportation Performance Audit, except it continues from year to year will report its findings to the users and the public and recommends adjustments in the various modes to improve the Corridor performance to keep it sustainable over time.

A New GMA Local and County SMART Corridor Monitoring Program Too.
Recently I learned of changes in the new state GMA Administrative Rules 365-196-430, in the **Transportation Element**-Guiding the Implementation of the state's **Growth Management Act** for local cities and counties "transportation element" **which are complementary to the PSRC's new**
Smart Corridor program

It includes a requirement that cities and counties they have transportation and land use elements that contains the "estimated impacts to state owned transportation facilities' and changing results from land use assumptions, to assist in monitoring the performance of state facilities and to plan improvements for the facilities, and to assess the impact of local land use decisions on state owned transportation facilities

It also states the purpose is to reflect the level of service standards for state highways in the local comprehensive plans and to monitor the performance of the system and to evaluate improvement strategies to facilitate improved coordination between local, county and state transportation programs,

Comment: We need to become more aware that we live in transformative, "game-changing times for transportation when we are coping with how to reduce trips with gas-driven vehicles to reduce four state's 50% contribution's GHG emissions and using vehicles that are fueled using scarce and expensive foreign energy, to move around. Right now it is difficult to make predictions about the future direction and use and potential funding to support of our

I-301-026 transportation systems, and how in fact people will adjust to the to any new limits to our movement, or new opportunities for moving around differently. Changes in our transportation mode will change how we live, and these new changes for new regional SMART Corridor like SR520/I-90 with and local transportation and land use planning is a new hopeful direction to reduce our fragmented planning processes.

****

I-301-027 III. **We Reject the Proposed SR 520 SDEIS K, L and M Designs**

1.K-Design Issues-The **K design must be rejected** because it does not meet the SR 520 project purpose and need, does not meet previous and existing state Legislature's existing laws, and has significantly impacts the sensitive, surrounding environment where it was planned to be built, and was estimated to be at least $2.billion over the $4.65 billion total Project Budget Limit, set by the Legislature.

2. **K at Union Bay–The K East Montlake Interchange design has 4 lanes, 2 each way to move through a Tunnel. Because of its location the tunnel would have to be 150' wide, due to a 50' middle support section.** *Transit would be with mixed traffic, not HOV lanes. The under water level Interchange called "the Boat" entrance has no preferential merge lane or ramp for Transit. It would be located within McCurdy Park, and it would also impact East Montlake Park, which would be a major federal "4f" and 6"f'issue, and limit receiving federal grant funding for SR 520.*

The proposed complex K design Interchange is located for the south-east side of the Cut. K is designed with an underwater 'single- point urban interchange' called "the Boat," by Tunnel experts. If built, it would have removed a large grove of Willow trees that buffered adjacent homes from viewing SR 520, or hearing the 520 traffic noises. The entry to K was through the entrance from Washington Park Boulevard by the "Ramps to Nowhere." K impacts the Arboretum area, McCurdy and East Montlake parks, with a planned Tunnel across and under the Montlake Cut. On the north side the Tunneling for K continues under the U of W south Stadium Parking lot.

It was **not to be used as a new north/south crossing for local trips**. But only for entering and leaving SR 520, with ramps to travel east or west. K's north exit and entrance, due to the 8% grade needed to Tunnel under the Cut, and was designed to be 20 feet below the arterial surface street level at the Montlake Blvd.NE /NE Pacific St. intersection. With the exit and entrance 20' below street grade, those using it would take a left, right of straight choice, on a sloped grade to get to the surface street level,.. Over this inter-section K planned a circular Lid/cover, to aid Pedestrians and Bicyclist to find passage over a heavy trafficked area.

3. Locating the interchange in a new East Montlake Location. A Tunnel this size would meter the entering and exiting traffic and its capacity, so it would likely have back-ups for vehicles entering from the SR 520 mainline at peak hours. The construction would be started by freezing the ground under the cut for 5 months, before the Tunnel is hand-mined and then lined. One of the risks is that if the freezing process if not sufficient, it could cause what the expert's call an unplanned "blow-out" that could lengthen the construction time and costs.

4, Another limitation is that the endangered species **salmon run in the Cut** prevents any work in the water or with anchored barges for 5 ½ months of the year. So the construction

I-301-027 time window is longer and much of the Construction soil hauling and, storage of equipment for the project would be on adjacent land, that is existing Park lands. If built, the Tunnel would have an 8% Grade and a sharp curve that would slow Trucks and Bus movement. With limited lane capacity in a 4-lane Tunnel all of the exit and entrances ramps would be congested most of the time.

The 20' below the street level exit and entrance would be located at the busy (LOS F today), Montlake Blvd NE/NE Pacific Place Intersection. Tunnel traffic entering and exiting are predicted to "spill back" into the Tunnel, and onto the 520 mainline lanes at the peak hours. The below the ground entrances and exits at the Intersection would be sloped in order that exiting Tunnel traffic would emerge on a sloped roadway, to the surface street level. In addition, K planned to build a pedestrian Lid over the Intersection. A major Seattle water main helped to discourage this K design. Relocating it would have closed the busy intersection for an estimated 6 months, not counting the tunnel construction contract impacts. Over 57,000 truck loads of tunnel dirt would have to be removed for the K options, which would have had great impacts on the U of W facilities, the neighboring communities and the local arterials.

During K's construction City Parks, Wetlands, and sensitive habitats would have been impacted due to the process for the removal of dirt at the surface to haul it away. The underwater interchange is another reason why the costs for this design ballooned above the budget by $2.Billion. Seattle's Park's Initiative 42 (1996) that limits any change in use of any Seattle park would have also limited the use of city park lands for non-park purposes, for this proposed K design.

K's Foot-print in the SR 520 SDEIS on Page 19 of the Executive Summary, is 250' wide, with the Arboretum ramps located under a Lid at Foster Island, with a large Land bridge to Foster Island. In comparison, the L diagonal bridge design was projected to be 270' over Foster Island.

I-301-028 The **L design** was a large, diagonal Bascule Bridge over the Cut, east of the current interchange in McCurdy and East Montlake Parks, and a large above ground Interchange fir the bridge to cross into the U of W south parking lot. Technically is was larger than any bascule bridge that had ever been built and the Bridge designer experts said that it was not feasible.

I-301-029 **The M "Tube" Tunnel Design, west-side interchange,** which is not in the SDEIS, but was proposed **afte**r the K supporters found that K's design is was too expensive, over the project budget, and would not be approved by the state and federal DEIS reviewers. The proposed M's west-side Route, Interchange and Tunnel are similar to the K options, except the Tunneling sections are **more environmentally damaging**. This is because M needed to excavate in the Cut, **below the 30' navigation level**, in order to install the large highway lane width Tunnel Tubes, that would be constructed off-site. It also required coffer-dams on the sides of the "historic" Cut, for the below the cut tube tunnel installation. The construction window for the M option was limited, due to the need to protect the endangered annual salmon runs in the Ship Channel.

I-301-030 Fortunately, our state SEPA and federal NEPA environmental reviews saved all of us and the adjacent sensitive environment; endangered species, wetlands, parks and open spaces from further consideration of the K, L, and proposed M SR 520 west-side design options.

I-301-030

About the same time the **A and L supporters** held a meeting together and decided to join together in support of the **A** design**. L** Proponents agreed with all parts of the A design, ***except the removal of the Arboretum Ramps***. **To differentiate between the two the L supporters decided to call their option A+**

One of the major objectives of the A SR 520 design supporters is to improve local and BRT cross-lake Transit services on SR 520, and on the adjacent arterials. To be competitive with using the private car, transit must be efficient in the new HOV lanes. Paying a Toll for SOV vehicles to use the existing SR 520 lanes in 2011, and more when it is completed will be compared to the costs and speed of transit service to the same location.
I look forward to continuing to be an involved citizen as WSDOT's SR 520 Workgroups established in the 2010 ESSB 6293 520 legislation as they deal with--the issue of Transit connectivity, -Mitigation of SR 520's impacts of the Arboretum*, hopefully by removing the Arboretum Ramps*
Permanently and the Study of the need to develop LRT on the SR 520 Corridor in the future.
****
****

I. MY Background History and Involvement with SR 520: My support for the west-side SR 520 A design without the Arboretum Ramps was founded after 13 years of my involvement in working with others for the best design package for solving how to rebuild SR 520. I was a member of the 1997/200 Trans-lake Study group that reviewed alternative designs for Transit and Highway options, and information on the environmental impacts. This study was the "Big View" look at the SR 520/I-90 corridors jointly and we were immersed with the cross-lake, long-term view for transportation modal options. From its information, decisions were made as to the recommended number of lanes, and which corridor would be the best, most cost effective and efficient for an LRT crossing of Lake Washington.
After a 520 project budget reduction and delays, the SR 520 Executive Committee comprised of local elected officials and chaired by a former WSDOT Commissioner, submitted a 2006 SR 520 Pacific Interchange design and the DEIS was available for Public Comment on the 4, 6 and 8 lane 520 designs. The Pacific Interchange was opposed by many and failed to meet the "purpose and need" for the project. It was decided to try again for a rebuild design option, with another Public Process through a Mediator.

I-301-031

Two Year West-side Mediation Process- After the 2006 DEIS process the Governor declared that the SR 520 would to be 6 lanes, eliminating the 8 and 4 lane options. Two of the lanes would be two-way center HOV lanes. New legislation required a two-year SR 520 Mediation process. I was asked to represent the Ravenna/Bryant Community Association. The Legislation also required that two studies: a **2008 Health Impact Plan** and a 2008 **High Capacity Study**, which are barely mentioned in the 2010 SDEIS Documents.

I-301-032

The Mediation process focused the group on developing a range of SR 520 west-side designs. A list of designs from **A to L** were developed and reviewed, for their "feasibility and reasonableness," with many participating community representatives and other relevant stakeholders represented. We were asked to decide on three west-side 520 designs to be reviewed for the forthcoming 520 SDEIS. Finding that there was **no agreement** on one **Preferred Design**, the three final 520 designs were presented in a **Project Impact Plan** that was completed and sent to the Governor and the Legislature at the end of 2008.

I-301-032

2009 Adoption of ESHB 2211, May 2009-This state legislation authorized pre-construction Tolling on 520 to begin in 2010. It set a limit on the total cost the SR 520 project Budget at $4.65 Billion, which became our A design supporters' maximum cost target. It also set up a **2009 SR 520 Legislative Workgroup** to study the west-side and recommend a preferred Design, which after 5 months of study was A+, along with 520 Funding and Tolling Strategies.

They consulted with the affected state and federal agencies, relevant interest groups and neighborhoods and communities. During the Workgroup meetings, DEIS reviewers from the state and federal agencies testified to the Workgroup on the feasibility of the three designated 520 designs to be reviewed in the SDEIS process. Only the A options did not have the major environmental problems found in the K and L designs. On November 17, 2009, the 520 Legislative Workgroup voted to support the A+ 520 Design to the Legislature and the Governor,
And their work is now history.

File: SR 520 SDEIS Gunby Comments 41510.doc

I-302-001

-----Original Message-----
From: Stuk, Christopher J [mailto:christopher.j.stuk@boeing.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 3:27 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Comment on SDEIS, April 15, 2010

////// I also submitted the following on the WSDOT website, but I wasn't sure it transmitted properly. //////

The SDEIS presentation of Option A with Lake WA Blvd Ramps (i.e., the A+ Option) doesn't capture the full impact of removing the existing ramps and relocating them to the west. The relocation of that traffic onto the local Montlake streets will have a devastating impact on the neighborhood. Noise, pollution, and traffic congestion will increase while safety, quality of life, and property values will decrease dramatically. The Arboretum Foundation's desire to reduce traffic through the Arboretum and the neighborhood's desire to keep extra traffic off its streets seem to be at odds on this issue, but I believe there is an alternate approach would benefit both groups. Since federal law requires studying all reasonable options when historic districts are being impacted by highway projects, please add the analysis of the following proposal to the final EIS. It is likely that very little new work would be required.

The new off and on ramps can be located in the WSDOT right-of-way area that is east of the cottonwood trees lining Lake WA Blvd E, north of the Arboretum entrance, and slightly west of the existing ramps. The ramps would join Lake WA Blvd at the same place they do today. This configuration would still create a minor noise issue and an unsightly view for a few of the neighbors on Lake WA Blvd, but at least it would keep the extra traffic off the neighborhood streets. After all, this traffic runs between neighborhoods south of Montlake and the Eastside.It has no need to use Montlake's quiet, residential streets. This proposal would completely remove the existing ramps from the Arboretum as required by the project.

Taken on its own, this design would not decrease traffic through the Arboretum but two things could be done to improve conditions in the Arboretum. First, the Arboretum could be closed to all non-emergency through traffic on weekends. Traffic would have to use 23rd/24th Ave instead. Second, a turn restriction at the east end of Boyer Ave E could be put in place to prevent left-hand turns onto northbound Lake WA Blvd. This would discourage cut-through traffic on Boyer (which it desperately needs, anyway) and eliminate some of the daily commuter trips through the Arboretum. Compare to today's traffic situation in the Arboretum, this would be a marked improvement.

I-302-001

Please consider this and any other options related to the removal and relocation of the existing Lake WA Blvd ramps that would mitigate the project's impact on Montlake's neighborhood streets. There's another option that involves a new loop ramp near the Fisheries building that also deserves a look. I don't know the details, but I understand it will be presented to WSDOT shortly.

Thank you,
Chris Stuk
2506 E McGraw St
Seattle, WA 98112

-----Original Message-----
From: Warren Yee [mailto:wyeridesrailtransit@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 12:57 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: SR-520 SEIS comments

Comments on the SEIS for the SR-520 Bridge

I-303-001 (1) Does the proposed I-5 lid near Roanoke St preclude any future move for moving the westbound SR-520 to southbound I-5 mainline ramp from the left to the right to fix current problems with drivers coming off WB SR-520, and switching lanes quickly to exit off Mercer St.

I-303-002 (2) Though the Montlake freeway transit station is scheduled to be removed in all alternatives in the present location, has there been any thoughts of maybe reinstating the station not at the current location, but west of Montlake Blvd instead? Your diagrams seem to indicate there may be space to place a transit station WEST of Montlake Blvd. It should be noted that moving the transfer operations as proposed to north of the Montlake Cut by the light rail station will probably cause ridership to fall, due to extra time to transfer and the possibility of the Montlake Bridge going up (and the lack of HOV lanes on Montlake Blvd, see 3 below), thus increasing travel time even more for transit riders (even twice, if coming from the south).

I-303-003 (3) Lack of HOV lanes on Montlake Blvd between SR-520 and NE Pacific St/Pl north of the bridge will insure that transit will get stuck in the 3 general purpose lanes. One lane in each direction needs to be designated HOV.

I-303-004 (4) Though your SEIS process for the SR-520 east of the bridge is done and complete, there might be an idea to maintain the connection between Route 271 and other Eastside routes east of the bridge. Current designs do not allow Rt 271 to stop at the new Evergreen Point Freeway Transit Station, which will be in the middle of the freeway and the 271 must exit off at 84th Ave NE to head to Bellevue.

Here is a possible idea:

(a) Eliminate both Evergreen Point (76th Ave NE) and Yarrow Point (92nd Ave NE) Freeway Transit Stations, and consolidate into one station at Hunts Point (84th Ave NE).

(b) The Hunts Point Station will be similar to the 142nd Ave NE HOV off and on ramps on I-90, and would provide HOV/Transit direct access to/from SR-520 at 84th Ave NE. Since Hunts Point station is on the ramp itself and not at freeway grade level, no elevators/ramps or stairs would be needed, unlike Evergreen Point and Yarrow Point Stations, which would be located at freeway grade level.

I-303-004

(c) Bus stops would be on the ramps, west of 84th Ave NE so Rt. 271 can use this stop, in addition to all other transit routes serving SR-520, and maintain that connection between U. Dist and Eastside routes that exist today at Evergreen Point Station

(d) Though transit buses would have to exit the freeway to access the Hunts Point Station/Stop, there should be no time difference, since Evergreen Point and Yarrow Point Stations are to be eliminated.

(e) There is a very small parking lot for Evergreen Point, and none at Yarrow Point. These freeway stations are predominantly neighborhood stops, and some of these riders could be reaccommodated at Hunts Point station instead.

(f) This proposal would not require a special (new) bus route to continue to provide direct Eastside-U.Dist service, since it would allow Rt 271 to continue this function, as it does today.

Sincerely

Warren Yee
5912 23rd Avenue South
Seattle, WA 98108-2944
email: wyeridesrailtransit@earthlink.net
Phone: (206) 898-9260
King County: 8th District
State: 11th District
Federal: 7th District

From: J Thompson [mailto:jthomp527@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 5:47 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: SR 520 SDEIS - Comments

To: Washington Department of Transportation

Subject: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS

I-304-001 I have been opposed to further degradation of the Lake Washington associated wetlands surrounding the 520 Bridge and any lane expansion. My opposition remains. I would like

I-304-002 to have the Light rail option given a much more through review than it has received to date.

I-304-003 My experience with the traffic and continuous highway construction is mixed. I believe the goals for highway improvements are to at least maintain traffic flow and reduce stop and go traffic on the freeways. It is my opinion that the money spent to date has been wasted. Here are two examples: first my experience with both the Tacoma corridor between SR 512 and Fife is the continued problems of snarled traffic despite the traffic improvements done to that corridor; second, the recent highway construction in Everett from approximately the Everett Mall exit to the Pacific Ave Exit remains just as slow as it was before the construction was begun. It has become my belief that we asre through money, which we have little, down a rat hole. Expanding 520 to carry more cars and buses is a failed plan.

I-304-004 I support the Mayor of Seattle's request to use this opportunity to put Light rail on the 520 bridge to increase transportation options. The delay is not significant when compared to the impacts of not using this opportunity to expand the light rail options in the Puget Sound Region. We need to strategically look forward to the future and continually expanding the road system is no longer the answer if it ever was the answer.

Best Regards

Janet Thompson

Janet Thompson, MPA
JTL & Associates
Seattle, WA.
206-365-0057

From: Greg Walton [mailto:gbwalton@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 5:01 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Cc: 'Jenn dela Cruz'
Subject: SR 520 Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement comments

To WSDOT,

My name is Greg Walton, I am writing on behalf of my wife, Jennifer dela Cruz and myself. We live at 2810 Montlake Blvd E in Seattle WA, 98112

Following are my comments related to the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement

I-305-001

Montlake Bridge
The current A+ design is flawed in that it amplifies a major existing problem. During boating season highway 520 currently backs up in both directions as the Montlake bridge raises and lowers. I have often seen the eastbound traffic back up onto Interstate 5. WSDOT projections show traffic increasing markedly over the next decades. Traffic volume will increase but the duration and frequency of bridge opening remain constant. Adding a second bridge does little to increase throughput; the traffic backups during boating season will be egregious. A tunnel under the cut, while more expensive, is the long term solution because it removes this bottle neck.

I-305-002

Truck Haul Routes
Current WSDOT plans show the spoils/excavation from the McCurdy Park area being trucked up and down Shelby and Hamlin streets. These are narrow streets in a small residential neighborhood full of children. Our 2 year old attends daycare in the neighborhood and we cannot accept the safety issues generated by large trucks rumbling through down our streets. Moreover, the neighborhood is landlocked between the Montlake Cut and Highway 520 and parking is an issue. Any parking restrictions (which, given the width of the street would have to be enacted to accommodate the width of haul trucks) would place a severe burden on the residents, as most of the garages in the neighborhood are one car and street parking is used extensively. The better solution is to barge the excavations/spoils. Given the physical proximity to the water, barging is an obvious answer that does not place the burden of hauling on any of the local neighborhoods. Work should begin immediately on lining up the proper permits and permissions for barging these materials.

I-305-003

520/Montlake Blvd Interchange
One of the great wrongs introduced with the original 520 design was placing a freeway interchange in the midst of an urban neighborhood. Besides the visual

I-305-003

and sensory blight, the area is a treacherous field for pedestrians and bikers. We now have the opportunity to right that wrong, but none of the current plans do that, instead they propose a similar freeway interchange. The design should be modified to make this an urban intersection by tightening up the footprint so that it has a more human scale, including eliminating the large slip lane ramps. The target should be an urban scale intersection friendly to pedestrians and bikers.

I-305-004

Light Rail Capable
Two things are not going to change in the future; first - neighborhood resistance to widening the bridge footprint and second – continually increasing concerns and restrictions on work in environmentally critical areas. With those two givens in mind, it is highly unlikely that the bridge and Westside approach will ever feasibly be allowed to widen. Consequently, the current design needs to have the flexibility to allow for rail transit to be added within the original footprint at some point in the future.

Thank you for your consideration,

Greg Walton and Jennifer dela Cruz
:

I-306-001

SR520 PLAN A+ - COMMENTS - April 15, 2010:

At the time I moved to Seattle in 1978, Washington residents called out "don't Californicate Washington" when they noticed my California auto license plates. So, perhaps my moving here from southern California is partially to blame for this unacceptable bridge proposal. I compare this auto-centric bridge option to what California did in the 1950's and 60's, laying down miles of twisted concrete with complicated interchanges which attempted to move cars from one end of the city to the other and succeeded only in creating end to end back ups at most times of the night and day. However, in the past few years, LA has managed to get new MetroLink rail lines which move people like the trolleys they had in the 40's. They see rider-ship on mass transit increase every year. And, they also have a master plan to rid the LA riverbeds of concrete in an attempt to return them to a more natural state, while we persist in adding more concrete to Lake Washington. The LA Riverbeds project is an *example of undoing mistakes from previous poor planning at a huge expense to the taxpayers*.

So now in 2010 WSDOT is Californicating Washington with the old 1950's *highway building mentality*. By building another highway across lake Washington and the wetlands, twice as big as the current one, *calling it 6 lanes, when it is really eight lanes in size* is not progressive 21st century design. There is no accommodation for future light rail as was implied by WSDOT. Future light rail will require additional bridge and corridor widening as well as pontoon augmentation to accommodate the light rail so necessary to real transportation. The costs will, no doubt, make adding light rail prohibitive in the future and leave open the possibility of re-striping the corridor to 8 lanes of cars which is totally unacceptable.

I-306-002

The bridge – according to my understanding of the Nelson and Nygaard report commissioned by the City of Seattle is:

- now 60' wide
- current plan without light rail is 115' wide
- Designed for light rail now it would be approx.125' wide,
- With light rail later it will possibly be 150'

It has been noted that I-90 in preparation for light rail will have much narrower shoulders, HOV and bicycle lanes than the current PLAN A+ proposal. So, it is questionable as to whether today's planning for light rail would require the full 125' It also calls into question the necessity of additional width in HOV lanes, bicycle lanes and shoulders indicated in the Plan A+. There is more width than necessary in the Plan A+, particularly if Light Rail will not be accommodated in the future without an additional widening of the structure as Nelson and Nygaard report suggests.

If light rail is delayed until some time in the future this bridge could be 2.5 times the width of the current configuration! This is not progressive transportation planning, it's the transition to urban blight. We now have a substandard design with the current SR520 bridge, today's solution should be better, perhaps more expensive, but a much more successful option than PlanA+.

I-306-003 If the budget constraints are one of the major considerations for the current pressure to build now, then we should be studying an enhanced 4 lane option which would be less expensive, and would keep the footprint smaller, particularly if light rail is to be added at a future date. Alternatives to PLAN A+ require more study to eliminate the taking of park lands, excessive noise in residential and recreational areas, visual and physical blight from unnecessarily high and wide bridge design. The options offered by WSDOT did not reflect the real possibilities. WSDOT offered a scaled down 4 lane option to use it as a *straw man* in the choices, forcing the 6 (really 8 lane alternative) to the default position. The SDEIS is incomplete/flawed because it failed to identify all Federal Section 4f properties and evaluate alternatives to avoid damage to the quality of life for residents, to wildlife habitat, existing park lands and recreational uses.

I-306-004 PLAN A+ PROBLEMS

The "State preferred" Plan A+ bridge replacement :

- Will create **two new merge problems for transit** both eastbound in the AM and westbound in the afternoon forcing transit to cross general purpose lanes to merge to I-5 or merge with Montlake onramp traffic. (According to WSDOT studies, the congestion at I-5 cannot be alleviated – cost prohibitive.) A traffic flow analysis is required to determine if the Portage Bay Bridge could be reduced to 4 lanes. The additional lanes in PLAN A+ may not be cost effective or prove to be of any advantage.

I-306-005
- Creates **unnecessary noise and pollution at Portage Bay viaduct** and other areas along the corridor with the increased footprint and traffic. This will result in reducing quality of life for nearby residents. It's unlikely, according to recent Nelson/Nygaard consultant reports, for noise problems to be solved by sound walls alone, SDEIS does not adequately address the sound issue and more studies need to be done. As we have heard from the consultants, parallel noise walls on 520 may make sound worse and they increase the height of the structure; thereby adding to the visual blight. Creative methods such as roadway coatings, sound insulating materials on the underside of the bridge and traffic speed management must be implemented and maintained over time to reduce noise in this corridor. It is understood that current approved methods include only sound walls. This issue must be studied further. Excessive noise during construction to nearby residents need to be addressed and mitigation has not been discussed in the SDEIS

I-306-006
- Will cause **visual and noise blight to the parks, wildlife and urban wetlands particularly around Portage Bay and the arboretum**. It fails to address Seattle's very own plans for the Bands of Green (and previous Olmstead "string of pearls") a continuous greenbelt or pathway connecting to a recently restored natural area with viewpoints overlooking Portage Bay, adjacent to Montlake playfield called South Portage Bay Reclamation. This natural area has a series of trails intended to connect to the Arboretum. The pathways at South Portage Bay connect to the Bill Dawson Trail, (future plan) to continue along the shoreline in front of NOAA to West Montlake Park, further to the Ship Canal Trail leading into the Arboretum Waterfront Trail.
  Ramps cut right through the greenbelts of PLAN A+ and the loop ramp has not been removed from the plan! In addition, it appears that wetlands adjacent and contiguous with this trail will be taken, reduced or disturbed by PLAN A+. There is

I-306-006 an opportunity now to make these connections part of the plan, because they may never happen in mitigation due to budget constraints. The City of Seattle Parks Department has a South Portage Bay Master Plan for a portion of the area, and the other portion is within the Bands of Green Plan. Recognition of the health benefits of exercise, the aging of the population and public health concerns about the importance of exercise, have expanded public interest in walking, jogging, cycling, kayaking and other forms of exercise. All of these factors place greater stress on our City's parks and trails. It is apparent that they are more heavily used today than ever before, and that our park system must continue to grow, and not be lost in order to keep pace with these changes. **Codify and guarantee that any disturbance of park lands, wildlife, and recreation areas identified as 4f must be mitigated and all the lids on SR520 be built as part of the plan and include park connections. It is not OK to give these items a low priority and drop them later due to the insufficient funding of the project.** WSDOT's OWN OBSERVATION -"Mitigation and enhancements in the affected communities would be critical to gaining support from local communities."
(Note: Excerpt on final page, - From Bands Of Green 2007 - Seattle Parks Foundation)
Make accommodations in the SR520 plan to protect and augment urban walking, boating and biking trail connections and protect parks especially along shorelines and open spaces, including the Arboretum. All of these lands must be properly identified in the SDEIS and efforts made to minimize or mitigate harm.

- I-306-007 Requires a **better design for light rail on the corridor so it can be easily added without any unnecessary widening of the footprint**. There are indications that enough residents on both sides of Lake Washington, including employees of Microsoft, who would benefit by the addition of light rail for the region. We need better transit and rail connections to the UW station in all cases. WSDOT has not been transparent about the ability of the PLAN A+ to accommodate light rail now or in the future.
- I-306-008 Will cause more traffic congestion, I-5 has NOT gotten any wider lately and it will NOT accept this increased traffic flow without causing considerable backups. The result will create more cut through traffic problems in the neighborhoods which are already pressured by traffic at the critical times of the commute. These problems should be addressed in the design solution and needs further study.
- I-306-009 Has an **unacceptable off ramp** at Lake Washington Blvd, pointing at a residential neighborhood which needs to be redesigned
- I-306-010 Adds a **second bascule bridge which obscures an historic feature of the neighborhood**, requires demolition of two historic homes and will create more problems requiring dual bridge openings. It was rejected in the 50's and is still an unacceptable option.
- I-306-011 Has not addressed the Montlake Triangle **pedestrian safety issues**. No grade level crosswalks or signals should be added to an already busy arterial. Solutions should be overhead as in the Sound Transit sky bridge concept or a pedestrian tunnel for safe passage between the UW, UW Hospital and Sound Transit Station. This should be included in the final SR520 plan and coordinated with UW and Sound Transit. From the outset of this project WSDOT and Sound Transit's project co-ordination was questionable and still seems lacking.

I-306-012

- **Does not have adequate funding** which will lead to inappropriate design changes during the course of the project. This project should not begin until all the funds to complete it are clearly available, including tolling options which may be subject to Federal scrutiny. The full cost of mitigation including all lids, landscaping, recreational structures, and pathways should be included in this funding.

I-306-013

Yes, the design of the SR520 is a time consuming process which some people have been working toward for the past 12+ years .... Plenty of people who live in the effected neighborhoods have worked with WSDOT and in a Mediation Group without compensation, for the good of their community, but Governor Gregoire and WSDOT persist in pushing their original plan and worse. The majority of the those neighborhoods feel like the State of Washington is looking only at arbitrary project completion deadlines, is not looking at current and future mass transportation solutions, and is not heeding results of the Mediation Group. The focus appears to be moving cars, not people, at any cost to Seattle's residents, landscape, wildlife and natural beauty.

Please take steps to allow additional design time to get it closer to being the best possible choice. Otherwise, the inevitable neighborhood lawsuits will start dragging the process through the courts adding time and expense to the project.

Be willing to increase the time of the project to get a better result for Seattle and work outside of the current SDEIS. Don't reduce the study of alternatives to alleviate changes to the SDEIS. Environmental Impact Statements are intended to aid the decision making process – bypassing the process is not consistent with legislation.

RCW 43.21C.020
Legislative recognitions — Declaration — Responsibility.

(1) The legislature, recognizing that a human being depends on biological and physical surroundings for food, shelter, and other needs, and for cultural enrichment as well; and recognizing further the profound impact of a human being's activity on the interrelations of all components of the natural environment, particularly the profound influences of population growth, high-density urbanization, industrial expansion, resource utilization and exploitation, and new and expanding technological advances and recognizing further the critical importance of restoring and maintaining environmental quality to the overall welfare and development of human beings, declares that it is the continuing policy of the state of Washington, in cooperation with federal and local governments, and other concerned public and private organizations, to use all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to: **(a) Foster and promote the general welfare; (b) create and maintain conditions under which human beings and nature can exist in productive harmony; and (c) fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Washington citizens.**

Thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns and I hope you will consider your actions as a future investment in Seattle and the region. My wish is that we will ultimately be proud to have weathered the storm in the planning process to steer this project to a **successful** conclusion.

I-306-013

Sincerely,

Karen Wood
1611 E. Lynn Street
Seattle, WA 98112

I-306-014

AREAS FOR MITIGATION

New Boat Launch

Wetland habitat to enhance and protect

Below is excepted from Seattle Parks Foundation – Bands of Green

"On the south shore, a network of walking trails extends from the Arboretum across Foster and Marsh Islands, along the Montlake Cut, under the University Bridge and through West Shelby-Hamlin Park, under Highway 520 and along the Bill Dawson Trail to the Montlake playfield."(and now include SOUTH PORTAGE BAY RECLAMATION and boat launch)
"The University of Washington is working to create a similar trail on the north shore beginning on Boat Street and following Columbia Road to connect with a gravel path that leads along the Montlake Cut to Union Bay, where the route continues through the University's sports fields via Walla Walla, Canal and Clark Roads, connecting to Mary Gates Boulevard at the Center for Urban Horticulture.
Eagle's nest on Foster Island Bridge from the Arboretum Foster Island wetlands
The upcoming 520 Bridge project will have a significant impact on this loop. All alternatives include new trail connections to Montlake and some include a new trail up to 10th Ave. E. and Roanoke. We suggest the City make every effort to assure that the 520 Bridge project is designed to enhance – rather than damage - this portion of the open space network."

NOTE: This potential connection from South Portage Bay Wetland Reclamation to the end of the Arboretum is a 5 mile urban trail which **requires a greenbelt connection along the shore from the Bill Dawson Trail at the Montlake Playfield to West Montlake Park.** From West Montlake Park a trail exists along the Montlake cut which connects to the Arboretum Waterfront Trail leading directly into the Arboretum. **Current lid configurations and ramps do not enhance these possible trail connections**

From: David Baker [mailto:dabaker@u.washington.edu]
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 9:40 PM
To: Dennis Shaw
Cc: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS; Hannele Ruohola-Baker
Subject: Re: SR520

I-307-001 I would like to completely support and extend these comments. I think option A would be an unmitigated disaster in every way: more cars coming into an already congested area would be horrible, and widening Montlake Blvd. would destroy
I-307-002 the neighborhood. Greater incentives need to be given to cut down on the number of single occupancy vehicles clogging up the bridge and surface roads.
I-307-003 Finally, as the mayor has pointed out, going ahead with a plan without light rail, which will be key in a future where gasoline becomes increasingly scarce, is extremely short sighted.

On Apr 15, 2010, at 8:16 PM, Dennis Shaw wrote:

Comments on the SR 520 replacement.

Regarding the proposed SR 520 replacement, serious consideration needs to be given to incorporation of rail transit, and less surface area for traffic. Limitations of the I-5 corridor traffic capacity and undesirability of additional single occupancy vehicles as well as the desire and ultimate need to decrease the carbon footprint all support expansion of rail.
Replacement of SR 520 needs to be with anticipation of the next 100 years in mobility, and sustainability, integrating with the technology of the future. Work on what would be the intersecting north-south rail line has already begun.

Furthermore the impact of greater traffic onto a widen Montlake Blvd [option A] will have a significant negative impact on the adjacent neighborhood. The current 4 lanes of traffic already impacts the walkablility and biking experience but is within a width and is with mature trees that keep it livable. Additional lanes and roadway width would turn Montlake Blvd into an 'Aurora Ave' experience; a huge noisy scar. Any additional northwardly directed traffic should be tunneled.

Regards,

Dennis Shaw & Julie Howe

2023 E Louisa St
Seattle, WA
2023 E Louisa St
Seattle, WA

From: Zoe and Greg [mailto:zoegreg@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 8:42 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Comments on SR 520 SDEIS

From: Zoe Barsness, 2045 E Newton St, Seattle, WA 98112. These comments were also submitted using the online form, but I wanted to be sure they were received.

I-308-001 Hello. My husband, children, and I are residents of the Montlake neighborhood. We travel Montlake Boulevard and 520 almost every day, and play in the adjoining parks and Arboretum often. We live here, and so we take this project very seriously, as it has a significant impact on our quality of life. We have reviewed the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) and have concerns both about the final design and the process of construction.

In general, we find that Option A/A+ is inadequate at moving people efficiently, reliably, and predictably east-west across Lake Washington and north-south through the Montlake Boulevard corridor. This option creates a bottleneck on Montlake Boulevard, where single occupancy vehicles, high occupancy vehicles, busses, pedestrians, bicyclists, and Montlake residents all converge in a very small corridor. It makes no sense to have the transit hub at Pacific be separated by drawbridges to the highway. Options K and L, despite their problems, separated some of these uses, resulting in better efficiency for both east-west and north-south travel, and a higher quality of life for those outside of cars (transit commuters, pedestrians, cyclists, home owners, and businesses).

As has been pointed out by many, these designs favor more highways and more cars over more space efficient alternatives, such as mass transit. The simple fact is that Seattle's streets cannot absorb the additional cars that these plans would place on them, and the result is a reduced quality of life for neighborhood residents and

I-308-002 businesses. The Arboretum ramps are a perfect example of this - we all know it is wrong to run an arterial through a major park, but that is the only choice we are left with given the volume of cars 520 will bring.

I-308-003 Instead, we favor the designs proposed by Mayor McGinn. From its opening, the new 520 should include light rail: 4 general purpose car lanes + 2 light rail lanes across Lake Washington, and then only 4 general purpose car lanes across Portage Bay. We should divert the light rail lanes to the U-Link station before reaching Montlake, in the area of Foster Island (similar to Option K and L, but not all traffic, just light rail). Finally,

I-308-004 we should remove the HOV/Transit on and off ramps from the Montlake Interchange, significantly shrinking the footprint of this interchange. The advantages to this plan are numerous, which include all the benefits of a smaller footprint plus less cars on Seattle streets and less clogging at I-5.

Here are more detailed comments:

I-308-004 1. We are very concerned about the width of the corridor through our neighborhood and across Portage Bay. The on and off ramps for both general traffic and HOV/transit, with their approaches, makes the highway significantly wider than it is today. This has a number of negative impacts. This design facilitates more capacity for cars on 520, which will result in more air and noise pollution in our neighborhood. With Option A/A+, it will be much more difficult and dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross from south of 520 to north of 520 at the Montlake Interchange. Views of Portage Bay will be obscured by more concrete, making 520 more of an eye sore than it is today.

2. The Montlake Interchange is a very complex system, connecting a freeway, transit, pedestrians, bicycle paths, and at the same time trying to reconnect the two parts of the Montlake neighborhood. Details matter. Important details of the design are missing from the SDEIS, making it difficult to fully evaluate the proposal, especially for pedestrians where safety is the primary concern. The current interchange design, with its long and numerous entry and exit ramps to 520, appears to favor freeway access over pedestrian, bicycle, and transit use at the very heart of the Montlake neighborhood.

I-308-005 3. The Montlake Lid proposed with Option A falls well short of the goals of creating a usable green space, connecting parks from the Arboretum to the Montlake Playfields, and reconnecting the Montlake neighborhood. It is difficult to call it a lid because of all the roads and ramps that cross it. The HOV/transit ramps coming on/off 520 to Montlake Boulevard forces the "hole" in the lid between Montlake Boulevard and 24th Ave. Instead, we should have the HOV/transit lanes come on/off 520 east of 24th Ave, roughly where MOHAI is now, and travel north of 520 to reach Montlake Boulevard.

I-308-006 4. As a cyclist who often uses Montlake Boulevard to access the Burke-Gillman Trail, and who is looking forward to the new bike path on 520, I am concerned with how the bike lanes interconnect with the highway. Sharp corners and switchbacks are hard for cyclists to negotiate and become a safety concern. More detail on how bike connections are made is needed in the SDEIS. We need a clear, safe, easily navigable path from the south side of 520 on Montlake Boulevard, all the way up to the Burke-Gillman and back again, with the ability to get on and off the new 520 bike path.

I-308-007 5. There are conflicting statements in the SDEIS concerning the ability for Eastbound commuters to board busses at the bus stop near the onramp for East 520. Page 5-22 states "Access to SR 520 bus service in the Montlake interchange area would be reduced, and transit riders that currently use the Montlake Freeway Transit Station would be required to use bus service that operates directly between the Eastside and the University District and light rail between downtown Seattle and the Montlake Triangle." Page 5-23 states "With Option A, riders could board an eastbound bus at the traffic island located at the entrance to the eastbound SR 520 on-ramp or at the Montlake Triangle, and, if required, transfer at Evergreen Point Freeway Transit Station." Please clarify the plans. If direct access to SR 520 buses at the on ramp is not allowed, this poses a problem for the many Eastbound commuters who live south of 520. One of the main concerns for commuters is predictability - if they leave their home

I-308-007 at a certain time, they can expect to be at their office at a certain time. By forcing these commuters to travel up to Pacific to catch the bus to cross the lake, they not only need to cross one drawbridge while walking/cycling Northbound, but they then to cross another drawbridge while traveling on the bus Southbound to get on 520. Drawbridges go up and down and stop pedestrian and vehicle traffic, sometimes at unpredictable times. Not only have we added 10 minutes more walking and 5 minutes more bus riding time to their commute, commuters are now susceptible to two unpredictable draw bridge openings. Instead of forcing Montlake, Madison Park, Madrona, Central District, and North Capitol Hill commuters to travel to Pacific, allow boarding of some set of 520 Eastbound buses at the top of the East 520 on ramp.

I-308-008 6. It is important the pedestrians and cyclists are able to safely cross 520 during the entire construction period. A statement to this effect is in the SDEIS, on page 6-12, and it is very much appreciated. For their health, it is critical that air quality be maintained at acceptable levels throughout the entire construction period. As people will be coming into close proximity with construction activities at choke points such as the 520 crossing, monitoring and reporting of air quality should be a part of the construction plan. Monitoring and reporting should be provided by an independent party, not under contract by the general contractors.

I-308-009 7. Lids should be considered an integral part of the redesign of the Montlake and other interchanges. Under the phased implementation plan, the lids should not be deferred if the roadways in proximity to the lids are being rebuilt. In the case of the Montlake interchange, the lid is designed to help mitigate the extra traffic flowing in/out and under this interchange, and it is unacceptable to rebuild the interchange without the associated lid.

I-308-010 8. The bike lane is a welcome addition to the 520 bridge, and can help relieve traffic congestion. If a phased implementation is used we should create the bike lane across the lake and connect the bike lane on both ends of the bridge with paved ramps that connect to existing streets or bike trails. On the Westside, cyclists are already very familiar with the area around MOHAI, as this is part of the Lake Washington Loop bike route, or the bike lane could be reached from Marsh or Foster Islands, until the rebuild of the Montlake interchange and lid is complete.

I-308-011 9. Why was the air quality at the intersection of Montlake Boulevard and Lake Washington Boulevard not modeled? There are homes and businesses close to this intersection, commuters who will use the bus stops on either side of Montlake Boulevard on the lid, as well as pedestrians and cyclists traveling north and south across 520. With the many lanes of traffic roaring nearby, we should model the air quality at this intersection.

I-308-012 10. Having to make a choice between two bad options, we favor the addition of Arboreteum on and off ramps. Ideally, as many will argue, we would not have traffic flowing through the Arboreteum as it disrupts this beautiful park and makes for a less enjoyable and safe experience, not to mention doing harm to the environment.

I-308-012 However, if we remove the ramps entirely, that traffic will be forced on to Montlake Boulevard, impinging further on the considerable surface traffic that relies on this corridor to travel north-south in the city, or worse traffic will start to use side streets.

I-308-013 The ramps proposed with Option A+, that bisect the Montlake Lid and deposit cars on to Lake Washington Boulevard directly in front of Montlake homes, do harm to the neighborhood and miss an opportunity to create a larger green space for the lid. Better design alternatives must be explored. Whatever the final design is, it must adhere to the "do no harm" principle, both for the neighborhood and the Arboretum. It must not appreciably increase traffic volumes or congestion on existing neighborhood streets, and it must discourage cut-through traffic.

I-308-014 11. The proposed construction, with a duration of up to 78 months and an average of 13 to 50 truckloads per day and a peak of 120 to 300 truckloads per day on East Shelby, East Hamlin Streets and Montlake Boulevard, will severely and negatively impact the neighborhood's access to their own homes. For the Portage Bay Bridge construction, with a duration of 72 months, an average of 11 to 12 truckloads per day and a peak of 50 truckloads per day traveling through the community business district on 24TH Ave and turning on Boyer past the Children's Medical Center and the St Demetrious church, the impact could cause the businesses to fail financially, access to the medical center to be conflicted, and the religious activities at the church that is listed as eligible for national historic registration to be severely impacted. Also, 70-foot truck/trailer assemblies will not be able to turn onto Boyer Avenue from 24TH Avenue. A basic recommendation to mitigate the above impacts is to pursue the use of barges on conveyor systems on Lake Washington and Portage Bay to transport supplies, equipment and debris instead of using trucks.

I-308-015 12. We strongly oppose the construction of a second bascule bridge over the ship canal parallel to the historic Montlake Bridge. This will have a devastating impact on the Historic Montlake District through the taking of historic homes, and the degradation of the area around the remaining homes.

I-308-016 13. Please clarify the need for a road across 520 at 24th Ave E. Obviously MOHAI uses this road today, as do many cyclists. But with MOHAI leaving, is there a need for vehicular travel across the lid here? I believe a pedestrian/cyclist trail would suffice, leading to greater safety on the lid. Service vehicles could still reach the water treatment facilities from Hamlin and Shelby streets.

From: Greg Lindhorst [mailto:gregli@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 8:40 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Comments on 520 SDEIS

I-309-001

From: Greg Lindhorst, 2045 E Newton St, Seattle, WA 98112. These comments were also submitted through the online comment survey, but I wanted to be sure they were received.

Hello. My wife, children, and I are residents of the Montlake neighborhood. We travel Montlake Boulevard and 520 almost every day, and play in the adjoining parks and Arboretum often. We live here, and so we take this project very seriously, as it has a significant impact on our quality of life. We have reviewed the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) and have concerns both about the final design and the process of construction.

In general, we find that Option A/A+ is inadequate at moving people efficiently, reliably, and predictably east-west across Lake Washington and north-south through the Montlake Boulevard corridor. This option creates a bottleneck on Montlake Boulevard, where single occupancy vehicles, high occupancy vehicles, busses, pedestrians, bicyclists, and Montlake residents all converge in a very small corridor. It makes no sense to have the transit hub at Pacific be separated by drawbridges to the highway. Options K and L, despite their problems, separated some of these uses, resulting in better efficiency for both east-west and north-south travel, and a higher quality of life for those outside of cars (transit commuters, pedestrians, cyclists, home owners, and businesses).

As has been pointed out by many, these designs favor more highways and more cars over more space efficient alternatives, such as mass transit. The simple fact is that Seattle's streets cannot absorb the additional cars that these plans would place on them, and the result is a reduced quality of life for neighborhood residents and businesses. The Arboretum ramps are a perfect example of this - we all know it is wrong to run an arterial through a major park, but that is the only choice we are left with given the volume of cars 520 will bring.

I-309-002

Instead, we favor the designs proposed by Mayor McGinn. From its opening, the new 520 should include light rail: 4 general purpose car lanes + 2 light rail lanes across Lake Washington, and then only 4 general purpose car lanes across Portage Bay. We should divert the light rail lanes to the U-Link station before reaching Montlake, in the area of Foster Island (similar to Option K and L, but not all traffic, just light rail).

I-309-003

Finally, we should remove the HOV/Transit on and off ramps from the Montlake Interchange, significantly shrinking the footprint of this interchange. The advantages to this plan are numerous, which include all the benefits of a smaller footprint plus less cars on Seattle streets and less clogging at I-5.

I-309-004 Here are more detailed comments:

1. We are very concerned about the width of the corridor through our neighborhood and across Portage Bay. The on and off ramps for both general traffic and HOV/transit, with their approaches, makes the highway significantly wider than it is today. This has a number of negative impacts. This design facilitates more capacity for cars on 520, which will result in more air and noise pollution in our neighborhood. With Option A/A+, it will be much more difficult and dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross from south of 520 to north of 520 at the Montlake Interchange. Views of Portage Bay will be obscured by more concrete, making 520 more of an eye sore than it is today.

I-309-005 2. The Montlake Interchange is a very complex system, connecting a freeway, transit, pedestrians, bicycle paths, and at the same time trying to reconnect the two parts of the Montlake neighborhood. Details matter. Important details of the design are missing from the SDEIS, making it difficult to fully evaluate the proposal, especially for pedestrians where safety is the primary concern. The current interchange design, with its long and numerous entry and exit ramps to 520, appears to favor freeway access over pedestrian, bicycle, and transit use at the very heart of the Montlake neighborhood.

I-309-006 3. The Montlake Lid proposed with Option A falls well short of the goals of creating a usable green space, connecting parks from the Arboretum to the Montlake Playfields, and reconnecting the Montlake neighborhood. It is difficult to call it a lid because of all the roads and ramps that cross it. The HOV/transit ramps coming on/off 520 to Montlake Boulevard forces the "hole" in the lid between Montlake Boulevard and 24th Ave. Instead, we should have the HOV/transit lanes come on/off 520 east of 24th Ave, roughly where MOHAI is now, and travel north of 520 to reach Montlake Boulevard.

I-309-007 4. As a cyclist who often uses Montlake Boulevard to access the Burke-Gillman Trail, and who is looking forward to the new bike path on 520, I am concerned with how the bike lanes interconnect with the highway. Sharp corners and switchbacks are hard for cyclists to negotiate and become a safety concern. More detail on how bike connections are made is needed in the SDEIS. We need a clear, safe, easily navigable path from the south side of 520 on Montlake Boulevard, all the way up to the Burke-Gillman and back again, with the ability to get on and off the new 520 bike path.

I-309-008 5. There are conflicting statements in the SDEIS concerning the ability for Eastbound commuters to board busses at the bus stop near the onramp for East 520. Page 5-22 states "Access to SR 520 bus service in the Montlake interchange area would be reduced, and transit riders that currently use the Montlake Freeway Transit Station would be required to use bus service that operates directly between the Eastside and the University District and light rail between downtown Seattle and the Montlake Triangle." Page 5-23 states "With

I-309-008

Option A, riders could board an eastbound bus at the traffic island located at the entrance to the eastbound SR 520 on-ramp or at the Montlake Triangle, and, if required, transfer at Evergreen Point Freeway Transit Station." Please clarify the plans. If direct access to SR 520 buses at the on ramp is not allowed, this poses a problem for the many Eastbound commuters who live south of 520. One of the main concerns for commuters is predictability - if they leave their home at a certain time, they can expect to be at their office at a certain time. By forcing these commuters to travel up to Pacific to catch the bus to cross the lake, they not only need to cross one drawbridge while walking/cycling Northbound, but they then to cross another drawbridge while traveling on the bus Southbound to get on 520. Drawbridges go up and down and stop pedestrian and vehicle traffic, sometimes at unpredictable times. Not only have we added 10 minutes more walking and 5 minutes more bus riding time to their commute, commuters are now susceptible to two unpredictable draw bridge openings. Instead of forcing Montlake, Madison Park, Madrona, Central District, and North Capitol Hill commuters to travel to Pacific, allow boarding of some set of 520 Eastbound buses at the top of the East 520 on ramp.

I-309-009

6. It is important the pedestrians and cyclists are able to safely cross 520 during the entire construction period. A statement to this effect is in the SDEIS, on page 6-12, and it is very much appreciated. For their health, it is critical that air quality be maintained at acceptable levels throughout the entire construction period. As people will be coming into close proximity with construction activities at choke points such as the 520 crossing, monitoring and reporting of air quality should be a part of the construction plan. Monitoring and reporting should be provided by an independent party, not under contract by the general contractors.

I-309-010

7. Lids should be considered an integral part of the redesign of the Montlake and other interchanges. Under the phased implementation plan, the lids should not be deferred if the roadways in proximity to the lids are being rebuilt. In the case of the Montlake interchange, the lid is designed to help mitigate the extra traffic flowing in/out and under this interchange, and it is unacceptable to rebuild the interchange without the associated lid.

I-309-011

8. The bike lane is a welcome addition to the 520 bridge, and can help relieve traffic congestion. If a phased implementation is used we should create the bike lane across the lake and connect the bike lane on both ends of the bridge with paved ramps that connect to existing streets or bike trails. On the Westside, cyclists are already very familiar with the area around MOHAI, as this is part of the Lake Washington Loop bike route, or the bike lane could be reached from Marsh or Foster Islands, until the rebuild of the Montlake interchange and lid is complete.

I-309-012

9. Why was the air quality at the intersection of Montlake Boulevard and Lake Washington Boulevard not modeled? There are homes and businesses close to this intersection, commuters who will use the bus stops on either side of

I-309-012 Montlake Boulevard on the lid, as well as pedestrians and cyclists traveling north and south across 520. With the many lanes of traffic roaring nearby, we should model the air quality at this intersection.

I-309-013 10. Having to make a choice between two bad options, we favor the addition of Arborteum on and off ramps. Ideally, as many will argue, we would not have traffic flowing through the Arborteum as it disrupts this beautiful park and makes for a less enjoyable and safe experience, not to mention doing harm to the environment. However, if we remove the ramps entirely, that traffic will be forced on to Montlake Boulevard, impinging further on the considerable surface traffic that relies on this corridor to travel north-south in the city, or worse traffic will start to use side streets. The ramps proposed with Option A+, that bisect the Montlake Lid and deposit cars on to Lake Washington Boulevard directly in front of Montlake homes, do harm to the neighborhood and miss an opportunity to create a larger green space for the lid. Better design alternatives must be explored. Whatever the final design is, it must adhere to the “do no harm” principle, both for the neighborhood and the Arboretum. It must not appreciably increase traffic volumes or congestion on existing neighborhood streets, and it must discourage cut-through traffic.

I-309-014 11. The proposed construction, with a duration of up to 78 months and an average of 13 to 50 truckloads per day and a peak of 120 to 300 truckloads per day on East Shelby, East Hamlin Streets and Montlake Boulevard, will severely and negatively impact the neighborhood’s access to their own homes. For the Portage Bay Bridge construction, with a duration of 72 months, an average of 11 to 12 truckloads per day and a peak of 50 truckloads per day traveling through the community business district on 24TH Ave and turning on Boyer past the Children’s Medical Center and the St Demetrious church, the impact could cause the businesses to fail financially, access to the medical center to be conflicted, and the religious activities at the church that is listed as eligible for national historic registration to be severely impacted. Also, 70-foot truck/trailer assemblies will not be able to turn onto Boyer Avenue from 24TH Avenue. A basic recommendation to mitigate the above impacts is to pursue the use of barges on conveyor systems on Lake Washington and Portage Bay to transport supplies, equipment and debris instead of using trucks.

I-309-015 12. We strongly oppose the construction of a second bascule bridge over the ship canal parallel to the historic Montlake Bridge. This will have a devastating impact on the Historic Montlake District through the taking of historic homes, and the degradation of the area around the remaining homes.

I-309-016 13. Please clarify the need for a road across 520 at 24th Ave E. Obviously MOHAI uses this road today, as do many cyclists. But with MOHAI leaving, is there a need for vehicular travel across the lid here? I believe a pedestrian/cyclist trail would suffice, leading to greater safety on the lid. Service

I-309-016

vehicles could still reach the water treatment facilities from Hamlin and Shelby streets.