

**Meeting Summary**  
**Seattle City Council, Committee of the Whole**  
**Tuesday, November 24, 2009**  
**9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.**  
**Council Chambers, City Hall, Seattle, WA**

**Attendees:**

**In attendance:**

- Council President Richard Conlin
- Councilmember Jan Drago
- Councilmember Nick Licata
- Councilmember Richard McIver
- Councilmember Jean Godden
- Councilmember Tom Rasmussen
- Councilmember Sally J. Clark
- Councilmember Bruce Harrell
- Councilmember Jim Burgess
- Councilmember elects Sally Bagshaw
- Councilmember elect Mike O'Brien

**Welcome and Introduction (Council President Richard Conlin)**

Richard Conlin, Seattle City Council president, called the meeting into session. He stated that the purpose of the hearing was to learn about the recent recommendations made by the SR 520 Legislative Workgroup and hear public feedback on those recommendations. Mr. Conlin clarified that it is not in the council's purview to make decisions on the SR 520 program, but to provide feedback as the Seattle City Council to the workgroup on the recommendations. The decision-making authority rests with the governor and state legislature.

**Program Update and Presentation by WSDOT Staff (David Dye and Julie Meredith)**

David Dye, WSDOT Deputy Secretary, and Julie Meredith, SR 520 Program Director, presented the council with an update on the SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program and the I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project. This included an overview of the SR 520 program's history, purpose and need, four projects included in the program, and schedule. Ms. Meredith reviewed the westside design options A, K and L that are currently under analysis in the supplemental draft environmental impact statement.

Mr. Dye stated that in order to remain on schedule to open the floating bridge to drivers in 2014, the program needs to have a preferred alternative identified by the legislature in the Spring of 2010.

**QUESTION:** What is the price tag of the unfunded part on the westside, from I-5 to where the funded portion begins? (Councilmember Clark)

**RESPONSE:** *The price tag for the westside varies from \$2 billion on the low end, up to \$4 billion on the high end. (Julie Meredith)*

**RESPONSE:** *The cost of the Eastside project is roughly \$800 million. (David Dye)*

## **Legislative Workgroup Presentation (Barbara Gilliland)**

Barbara Gilliland, Workgroup Administrator, presented on the draft recommendations made by the SR 520 Legislative Workgroup on November 17, 2009. Ms. Gilliland reviewed the workgroup's objectives as stated in Engrossed Substitute House Bill (ESHB) 2211. The Workgroup had two objectives:

1. To recommend corridor design options within the set \$4.65 billion budget.
2. To recommend a financing strategy to meet that funding target.

She stated that the workgroup heard from a variety of community representatives, jurisdictional representatives, resource, permitting and transit agencies and other stakeholders throughout the process. Ms. Gilliland stated that the community groups also further refined the options analyzed in the SDEIS to develop new options, Option A+ and M. Option A+ combined design elements from Option A and L. Option M builds off of design elements included in Option K. The Workgroup identified Option A+ as their draft recommendation to move forward for public comment. The rationale for choosing Option A+ includes:

- It meets the purpose and need of the project and complies with statutory requirements to implement a six-lane (four general purpose and two HOV lanes) bridge replacement project.
- It meets the transportation needs of the corridor with the least impact to the surrounding environment.
- It can be constructed within the \$4.65 billion financial threshold.
- The impacts are covered within the current Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.
- It meets the needs of transit providers within the SR 520 corridor and on local surface streets.
- It has broad based support from local communities including the University District Community Council, Ravenna Bryant, and Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Park and regional organization including the University of Washington, Seattle chamber, King County Metro, and the Eastside Transportation Partnership.

The Workgroup also recommended a financing strategy that includes the following:

- Use of the base funding previously identified, including early tolling of SR 520.
- The creation of, and early tolling of HOT lanes on I-90 as soon as is practicable.
- The remaining gap to be filled by new FEDERAL or STATE revenue, to be identified in the next year or two.
- IF THAT DOESN'T HAPPEN, THEN general tolling of I-90 to fill the gap no sooner than 2014.
- The group also recommends the pursuit of cost savings by further refinement of cost estimates and design.

The Workgroup will consider public feedback received by Dec. 4, 2009 and submit a final report to the governor and legislature on Jan. 1, 2009.

**QUESTION:** When will the pontoons be ready, in case of need for rapid bridge replacement? Or is the plan to keep the bridge out of service for a long period of time in the case of a catastrophic failure? (Councilmember Rasmussen)

**RESPONSE:** *We are currently in the process of conducting the environmental impact statement (EIS), covering the environmental effects of building a pontoon construction facility, and building the first pontoons to replace the bridge in case of a catastrophic failure. We will start construction on the facility in late 2010. The pontoons should be available to move onto Lake Washington in 2012. The environmental process that allows us to build those pontoons allows us to store them in Grays Harbor until either there is a catastrophic failure and they are needed, or the environmental process is completed and they are used for the I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project. (Julie Meredith)*

**QUESTION:** What are the differences between Option K and Option M? (Councilmember Drago)

**RESPONSE:** *Option M is still under in development. The main differences are the tunnel construction methods across the Montlake Cut. Option M removes the sequential excavation method (SEM) tunnel, and replaces it with an immersed tube tunnel (ITT). The ramp configuration is also different. (Barbara Gilliland)*

**QUESTION:** Is the ITT above water? (Councilmember Drago)

**RESPONSE:** *No, it is actually just below the bottom of the Montlake Cut. But it is raised from where it was located before. (Barbara Gilliland)*

**RESPONSE:** *The regulatory agencies oppose open cutting, trenching, or cofferdams across the Montlake Cut. The Option M proposal goes back to a concept that was discarded when discussed during the mediation process. The goal is to work in good faith with the parties in the workgroup process and, as a result, the ITT came back on the table. It does require extraordinary mitigation costs, and is extremely difficult to permit. (David Dye)*

**QUESTION:** What is the projected traffic count with both Option M and Option A+ across the Montlake Cut and also through the Arboretum? (Councilmember Licata)

**RESPONSE:** *I would like to answer the question about traffic volumes through the Arboretum in Option A+ and Option M. During the evening peak hours today, there are 1,400 vehicles per hour through the Arboretum. This would grow to 1,800 vehicles per hour in 2030. In Option A+, with Lake Washington Boulevard ramps, you would experience 1,800 vehicles per hour, similar to a No Build scenario. In Option K, which we believe is comparable to Option M, you would see 2,100 vehicles per hour. Today over the Montlake Cut, there are 5,100 trips per hour. In a No Build option, there would be 6,200 trips per hour. In Option A+ there would also be 6,200 trips per hour. In Options K and M, there would be 4,000 trips per hour over the existing Montlake Cut and 4,200 trips per hour through the tunnel. (Julie Meredith)*

**QUESTION:** Regarding permitting, on Option A+ in comparison to Option M, please explain the relative hurdles they would face in federal permitting and environmental concerns, and the status of Native American concerns. (Councilmember Licata)

**RESPONSE:** *Related to the permitting, I'll address the differences between Option A+ and Option M. Option A+ is very similar in the crossing of the Montlake Cut to the original concepts in the original draft environmental impact statement. There were some concerns about pier placement in the near shore but have worked with the resource agencies, resulting in piers being brought back out of the water in more of a full span of the Montlake Cut. The additional Montlake Bridge option is much more permissible, which the permitting agencies are on record saying. When we had Option K before Option M, the tunnel was far deeper, and far more expensive. Because it was so much deeper, wetlands to the east were impacted. Working with the Option M proponents, the interchange was raised, and the in-water fill issue was resolved, but a new issue was created. This issue was the impact on the Montlake Cut from dredging. The resource agencies were emphatic that because all fish in Lake Washington go through the Montlake Cut, they were concerned about fish impacts. The agencies are sensitive to tribes and fishing rights. The plan must take into account the tribes' usual and accustomed fishing rights, and to the potential impacts to Foster Island. (David Dye)*

**QUESTION:** Regarding emergency preparedness, the pontoons will first be available in 2012. What happens if the bridge fails before then? (Councilmember Burgess)

**RESPONSE:** *If there is a catastrophic failure of the bridge prior to 2012, we enter into emergency mode. We waive normal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) processes to address the emergency as best we can, and go faster. How much faster remains to be seen, depending on the emergency. There is potentially a year of environmental and permitting processes to skip. Some time would still be needed, so probably 2011 would be the fastest time possible to replace the floating bridge. (David Dye)*

**QUESTION:** In recommended Option A+, how many, if any, private homes need to be condemned in that scenario? (Councilmember Burgess)

**RESPONSE:** *There is a home on Portage Bay that needs to be acquired under all options. In order to build a parallel bascule bridge across the Montlake Cut in Option A+, two more homes would need to be acquired. (Julie Meredith)*

**QUESTION:** On slide 22 of the presentation, it states that we will hope for additional federal or state funding in the next year or two. If this does not appear, tolling on I-90 will start. Was there consideration of beginning tolls on both corridors now? And what is the estimation on getting such state or federal funding? (Councilmember Burgess)

**RESPONSE:** *The Workgroup did consider tolling on both corridors. They will be looking at early tolling on SR 520 as was authorized under ESHB 2211. They are recommending moving forward with HOT lane tolling on I-90 as part of that early tolling. As far as federal or state funding materializing, your estimation is likely as good as their estimation. They would like to exhaust all options in that arena, prior to tolling I-90 in full. (Barbara Gilliland)*

**QUESTION:** Wouldn't general tolling, started sooner, lessen the potential negative impact if we find out in the next year or two that there is no federal or state funding?  
(Councilmember Burgess)

**RESPONSE:** *That piece was part of their conversation, and they decided not to pursue that at this point. (Barbara Gilliland)*

**QUESTION:** Under both Option A+ and Option M, you propose four general-purpose lanes, and two special lanes. Are those special lanes available for future rapid rail or light rail? Are the pontoons being built to handle that? (Councilmember Godden)

**RESPONSE:** *The pontoons are being constructed in a manner to be expanded. We are building a six-lane roadway now that handles the four general purpose lanes and two HOV lanes, one in each direction. Then, in the future, if the decision is made to add high capacity transit to that facility, additional flanking pontoons could be brought in and attached to the bridge. You could then have a six-lane facility with additional light rail from Sound Transit in the future. (David Dye)*

**RESPONSE:** *So this could work for both options A+ and M? (Councilmember Godden)*

**RESPONSE:** *Yes. The floating bridge is the same across the both options. The bridge is not the challenging part, it is more about where it goes afterwards on the east and west ends. (David Dye)*

**QUESTION:** You mentioned three homes potentially being taken. What about other properties or public land such as the Arboretum, recreational facilities, golf course, the yacht club, etc.? Would there be permanent taking of those facilities? Temporary? How do they compare? (Councilmember Rasmussen)

**RESPONSE:** *In our supplemental draft EIS, we analyze options A and A+, K, and L. Option M is not yet fully analyzed. All options look at taking the private home at Portage Bay. Option A+, with the parallel bascule bridge, requires taking the two private properties in the Montlake area. Option A+ also affects the science structures [NOAA Science Center Facility] just north the SR 520 Portage Bay Bridge. All options require the acquisition of the Museum of History and Industry (MOHAI). Option A+ would require the acquisition of the gas station by the Montlake interchange. Each option has various park effects. McCurdy Park and Arboretum Park are affected. (Julie Meredith)*

**QUESTION:** Do you have a chart that compares or outlines these impacts?  
(Councilmember Rasmussen)

**RESPONSE:** *Yes. There are three pages of this regarding the different impacts in your packets. It is the same information presented to the Workgroup, which we have synthesized to three pages. (Barbara Gilliland)*

**QUESTION:** Are all of our current questions included in the data sheets?  
(Councilmember Rasmussen)

**RESPONSE:** *Most of them. You have asked about the bridge's ability to accommodate high-capacity transit, and the bridge's layout. Those are covered. (Barbara Gilliland)*

**QUESTION:** I recall that the Metro bus tunnel was built to accommodate light rail, to save money. The rail technology dimensions then did not meet current needs. How can we avoid this with the pontoons that are designed to accommodate high capacity transit,

so that 20 years from now, if the technology or needs have changed, we won't need to waste more money? (Councilmember Rasmussen)

**RESPONSE:** *Previously there was no regional light rail system. Assumptions were not correct, and there was a different technology selected. Given what we know, we can use the design standards from Sound Transit for the current generation of light rail. It is an issue of weight design for the pontoons. As long as this weight stays generally within the limitations, we should be fine. We are in better position now than in the past. (David Dye)*

**QUESTION:** You mentioned that the traffic count above the Montlake Cut would be 4,000 vehicles, and the count in the tunnel was 4,200? (Councilmember Licata)

**RESPONSE:** *There were two numbers given. One was the number crossing on the existing Montlake Cut bascule bridge. That volume is 4,000 in peak hours. In the tunnel crossing the cut, you would have another 4,200 vehicles crossing. (Julie Meredith)*

**QUESTION:** Does your model assume the same amount of north-south traffic in the different configurations? You are making the assumption that there will be a 30 percent increase in traffic going north-south. Options K and M increase overall traffic passing through the Montlake Cut, correct? (Councilmember Licata)

**RESPONSE:** *It redistributes trips that were using other routes such as 45th Street and 65th Street to the new tunnel and existing bascule bridge. (Julie Meredith)*

**RESPONSE:** *So it takes traffic off of I-5? (Councilmember Licata)*

**RESPONSE:** *Trips get redistributed, taking advantage of the new capacity. (Julie Meredith)*

**RESPONSE:** *The total number of trips is the same, but how they are distributed across the network changes by option. (David Dye)*

**QUESTION:** So with Options K or M, they must cross the water somewhere, you are taking some of the traffic off of I-5, correct? (Councilmember Licata)

**RESPONSE:** *There are 200,000 trips or more on I-5. This is really a small change in the I-5 traffic. To go back, and look at the Pacific Interchange option, we added capacity from Pacific Street to 45th Street. In this case, by definition, the Option K proponents have not added that capacity, and have constrained the Pacific Interchange, so congestion would be experienced there. (Julie Meredith)*

**QUESTION:** I want to hear about mitigation. McCurdy Park is impacted. Also, the Museum of History and Industry (MOHAI) building will be gone. This is a public facility owned by the city of Seattle. MOHAI uses this as a public facility and museum. What is your thinking about the mitigation of that building? (Councilmember Drago)

**RESPONSE:** *We are in the midst of negotiations. We have sent an offer letter to the property owners and MOHAI. We believe that there are two issues at play. One is the valuation of the building. There is also the valuation of the land. It is subject to 4(f) and 6(f) federal funding regulations. If federal funds are used to purchase park lands, there are very restrictive requirements for continuation of functionality of the park property. Subject to the rest of the environmental process and replacing that functionality, we believe we could come back and offer a fair amount or full amount under these restrictions. We are in that process. There is a tight timeline, and we are sensitive to that. (David Dye)*

**QUESTION:** Thank you to Councilmember Conlin, others, and staff, for working on this for so many years. This is a very difficult project. Decades ago there were fewer impacts. There are trade-offs, with impacts to the natural environment and surrounding communities. In both of these, Option M and Option A+, the Foster Island land bridge has dropped off. Is there a component cost to this structure? (Councilmember Clark)

**RESPONSE:** *The total cost estimate for the Foster Island land bridge is \$80 million. However, removing it does not save a full \$80 million, because you still need pedestrian access and to make it aesthetically pleasing and usable. (Julie Meredith)*

**QUESTION:** Why do we need the ramp connections to Lake Washington Boulevard? What is the functionality benefit gained by keeping those? (Councilmember Clark)

**RESPONSE:** *The Lake Washington Boulevard ramps help relieve some of the congestion on Montlake Boulevard. What the transit agencies were stating is that those ramps help with their local transit trips because there is less congestion on Montlake Boulevard, and they prefer that they are included. (Julie Meredith)*

**COMMENT:** Regarding tolling, the option to go with HOT lane tolling, rather than full general tolling, seems fundamental to financing. How can we avoid a Transportation Benefit District (TBD) that is laid onto the Seattle taxpayers? This is a difficult conversation with the Viaduct [SR 99 – Alaskan Way Viaduct and Seawall Replacement Project], with citizens picking up the cost. No one enjoys this conversation. Looking at general tolling, and seeing that we will eventually go in that direction, that is something that the city of Seattle must push to get. HOT lanes may not be the answer for this system. We may need to jump in and toll the system, both bridges at a time. (Councilmember Clark)

**RESPONSE:** *On I-90, per the workgroup's recommendation, we would begin with the reversible roadway as soon as is practical. Then it would become a two-lane in each direction express lane tolling (two lanes tolled and two free), followed by lastly full tolling. Many have stated that making up the difference of \$2.65 billion or so is difficult. (David Dye)*

**RESPONSE:** *I would add that in the conversation between legislators, they asked when improvements would actually be available to the public, and matching those improvements to the tolling. (Barbara Gilliland)*

**QUESTION:** Would the pontoons be able to convert from the six-lane bridge to carrying light rail? Or is that different from carrying vehicle traffic capacity? (Councilmember-elect O'Brien)

**RESPONSE:** *We would still have to add some sort of flanking pontoons to deal with the additional weight differential between cars and trains. Rather than thinking of embedding rails in the deck and having the trains take over the existing lane, the clearance space required in each direction is at least 20 feet. So it does not line up quite with the lanes. There are some real advantages in terms of the ability to isolate the stray electric current by elevating the light rail above the roadway deck itself. Without full expansion to the 4+2+light rail, I think the answer is yes. (David Dye)*

**RESPONSE:** *So there is a way to get light rail, along with four lanes of vehicle traffic, but it would require some modifications. (Councilmember-elect O'Brien)*

**RESPONSE:** *That is correct. (David Dye)*

**QUESTION:** Has there been studies on vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and in relation to the state law requiring a reduction in VMT by 18 percent per capita by 2020?

(Councilmember-elect O'Brien)

**RESPONSE:** *We have done analysis on VMT in the SDEIS, but I do not have that data here. I can get it to you. (Julie Meredith)*

**RESPONSE:** *Do you know if VMTs went down or up? (Councilmember-elect O'Brien)*

**RESPONSE:** *With cross-lake travel, with tolling in place, we do not anticipate a lot of growth over the next 20 years. Tolling is not only a good way to fund a project, but to manage congestion as well. (Julie Meredith)*

**RESPONSE:** *And just for clarification, the state law only sets targets for per-capita VMT reduction, but does not require individual projects to do so. That said, we are concerned about greenhouse gas emissions. (David Dye)*

**RESPONSE:** *These concerns were also addressed in the Health Impact Assessment developed by Public Health – Seattle and King County and the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency during mediation. (Julie Meredith)*

**QUESTION:** When we were looking at slide 21 in the presentation, at the bottom, there was a statement that Option A+ has broad community support. Could you please walk through or summarize where the areas of contention are still after 12 years? Where are the areas needing resolution? (Councilmember-elect Bagshaw)

**RESPONSE:** *The area of contention is how the crossing of the Montlake Cut actually occurs, whether it is over a new bascule bridge or underground in a tunnel. (Barbara Gilliland)*

**RESPONSE:** *So it is really just the Montlake Cut that is of concern. (Councilmember-elect Bagshaw)*

**QUESTION:** I'd like to know about the expert review panel that was used to verify the cost estimate. Was that the same group and technique that was used to verify the Alaskan Way Viaduct cost estimates? How did they figure those costs? Did they figure them by the time expected to build them? Or based on current estimates? (Councilmember Godden)

**RESPONSE:** *The expert review panel had some of the same members as those used in 2006 for the Alaskan Way Viaduct and SR 520 estimates. There were new panel members as well. The project engineering has progressed quite a bit since then, so they used quantity-based estimates, using quantity and unit prices. They looked at risk issues and inflation. The costs shown are year-of-expenditure dollars, and include risk. (David Dye)*

**RESPONSE:** *I would like to add to that. The expert review panel was brought in to validate the process used to estimate the costs. Then, we asked them to return and do a preliminary review of the initial cost estimates of options A+ and M, and they found them satisfactory. This was not a full cost estimation validation process (CEVP). (Barbara Gilliland)*

### **Option A+ Proponent Group Presentation (Option A+ Proponents)**

Option A+ proponents presented to the Council.

Key points:

- Improves local transit travel times.
- Fewer impacts to parks and natural resources.
- Less traffic congestion on local streets compared to other options.
- Easier to obtain permits compared to other options.
- Best matches the principles developed through the Health Impact Assessment.
- Fits within the legislative budget of \$4.65 billion.
- Aligns with the goals of the University of Washington, Seattle Chamber of Commerce, King County, and Eastside Mayors.
- Supported by the University District Community Council, Ravenna Bryant, and Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks.
- Many comments acknowledged general support for Option A+ **without** Lake Washington Boulevard ramps.

### **Option M Proponent Group Presentation (Option M Proponents)**

Option M proponents presented to the Council.

Key points:

- The current design of the floating bridge proposes a 30 feet high structure across Lake Washington, substantially affecting the view of the crossing.
- In the end it will be a \$9 billion program that will tax the people well into the future.
- As a result of lack of funding there will be increasing pressure to remove essential project elements specifically requested and agreed to by the neighborhoods and the Washington State Department of Transportation.
- Funding is not available to construct any improvements in the corridor given the economic times. Thus, the state should pursue a retrofit with the existing available funding and allow the community process to continue until adequate funding is identified for a complete corridor solution.

### **Public Comment (Members of the Public)**

**COMMENT [1]:** Thank you for letting me come to speak. I live in the Montlake neighborhood. I dislike Option A+. Montlake represents the heart, and it is clogged. When the bridge opens, it is like a heart attack. The neighborhoods have rallied around Option K and Option M. We need artery bypasses. The Governor did not like the price tag. The price is dictating the solution. Neither addresses the issue. These problems do not go away, and there are lots of problems.

**COMMENT [2]:** Thank you to the council for letting me speak. I have lived on Hamlin Street for 39 years. I love it. However, I have concerns with the tunnel and fish through the Montlake Cut. I was a fish biologist for 29 years, working as a habitat biologist, issuing permits. Anyone who is obstructing or changing state waters must get permits. In-water work needs construction considerations. Tunnel segments are critical elements of the plan. I see no reason not to issue permits to WSDOT. Permits should not be a hindrance.

**COMMENT [3]:** I am a 12 year veteran, and was in the mediation process. There is consensus that no neighborhoods support Option A. This removes the flyer stop. There is a mandate to get to the Sound Transit station. We need speed and reliability. Option A+ solves neither. Adding another bridge takes out homes. It is unsafe, fails, and is the only connection to the Burke-Gilman trail and UW. For bikes and pedestrians, the lid fails. It adds traffic. It is a monster intersection. There is no time in two minutes to say all of the fatal flaws. This plan is F-. We need your help, councilmembers.

**COMMENT [4]:** I am a Montlake neighbor. The coalition is strong. I yield my time to the representative of Laurelhurst.

**COMMENT [5]:** Thank you for hearing us. To Councilmember Conlin, thank you for staying at the table. I represent the Laurelhurst Council. There is growth in Laurelhurst. The University Village is growing. Children's Hospital has applied to expand its campus. These could add 42,000 additional vehicles per day to northeast Seattle. There is also the 45th street Viaduct project closure. Mobility is important. Visual and noise impacts are enormous. These are concerns to the neighborhood.

**COMMENT [6]:** I represent the University District Community Council. The University District is north of the ship canal. 8,200 cars would come into our district. We support Option A+ without the Arboretum ramps. The Legislative Workgroup heard about the retrofit option, and rejected it. Option A+ meets the project criteria. Access is key. Option M and Option K bus stops are exactly the same. With Option M and Option K, bus rapid transit would not stop. We should delete the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps.

**COMMENT [7]:** I am a commodore at the Seattle Yacht Club of 4,500 members. I speak for the boating community and the coalition for a sustainable 520. We support fixing the safety problems with SR 520. We oppose Option A. We support Options K and M. We have actively supported the project, and will continue to do so if it is done right. Options K and M are right. The less disruption for the Montlake section, the better.

**COMMENT [8]:** I am a Lake Washington Boulevard resident, and own a home in Montlake. I have concerns with Option A+, or Option A with suboptions. I have concerns with moving ramps in front of my home, and the devaluation of my home property as a result. This will have a severe impact to historic homes. This represents the view of the Lake Washington Boulevard residents. We ask you to reconsider plan A+. This will help avoid litigation, which we want to avoid.

**COMMENT [9]:** I am a sixth generation lifelong resident. I am moving from Magnolia to Laurelhurst. I am with the Seattle Yacht Club, serving the board and as an active member. Opening Day is an annual event for yachters and boaters. We have enjoyed Opening Day since 1920. We have 150 volunteers. Please have a minimum impact on Opening Day. We support expanding. We ask for the barges and work crews to be gone during Opening Day.

**COMMENT [10]:** I am an Eastlake home owner. I have been a past Yacht Club commodore. Access is very important, and if it is blocked, this poses a problem. The time period is unknown, but an optimistic estimate is five years. We can put up with delay, but

the caterers would not. We are hearing of a heavy construction zone. Option A would cause construction to the north with a new bridge. With Option A, access is difficult. Option M is easier. If we lose access we could lose catering, after which we would lose members. We are threatened. We recommend a safety fix.

**COMMENT [11]:** I am a public health physician and UW professor emeritus. I am a board member and live on Interlaken. I speak for Option A prime. Public health means an environment of health, not just the absence of disease. This means social health, exercise, interactions. Foster Island and Arboretum lids are features. These allow pedestrians to Olmsted parks. This crossing is allowed with Option A. Seattle is dedicated to the Olmsted legacy. Transit in peak times is another advantage. We do not want to destroy the Olmsted legacy. We hope that the council considers this.

**COMMENT [12]:** I am from north Capitol Hill. I am with the coalition for a sustainable 520. I have three comments. First, we must stop Option A, A+, or A prime. Second, we must lower the pontoon bridge. Lastly, we must get real about safety and funding. We support Option M. We are telling the state to stop Option A. This is a three story bridge. It is too high. Lower it. Also, get real about funding and safety. Get a near term safety fix.

**COMMENT [13]:** I am a commodore at the Queen City Yacht Club. We have been around for 95 years, and are part of the Seattle fabric. Any expansion has impacts. Option A+ adds a second drawbridge, adds a seventh lane, fails to preserve waterways, and does not take into account our needs. It improves nothing. It creates noise and problems. We, the coalition, have worked with the city, governor, and legislature. The workgroup ignored the criteria. We look to you, our elected officials, to stop the plan.

**COMMENT [14]:** Good morning. I am with King County Metro. I have a letter from our general manager to the council, and I will read some highlights from it. First of all, all options for this project, I-5 to Medina, will dramatically improve transit travel for 15,000 current users of cross-lake transit travel between Seattle and the Eastside. This is a number we expect to grow dramatically in the coming years. The differences between the options on the westside really emerge when examining the traffic analysis for the local services in Seattle. That analysis shows that cross-lake transit times are about the same in all options. The bus stops at the Link station are the same in all options. However, traffic times on Montlake Boulevard differ among the options. Montlake is one of the most important transit corridors in the city of Seattle. Over 350 daily transit trips and 7,000 daily riders go across the Montlake Cut. As many as 20,000 riders daily use the ramps that are affected by the delays that occur, and minimizing delays at Montlake are important to all of those riders. In Option A+, northbound Montlake traffic times are projected to be reduced by 50 percent or more compared to all other options. This will improve travel times for Metro riders between communities such as Capitol Hill, Wallingford, University District, Central District, and downtown Seattle. Improving those times is crucial for both those local riders as well as those connecting to and from cross-lake SR 520 services. King County supports Option A+, provided that the following components are included:

- That there would be eastbound and westbound HOV direct access ramps to and from Montlake Boulevard and SR 520. These ramps improve transit connections

- to and from the University area, for bus riders on local surfaces, as well as on SR 520.
- Lake Washington Boulevard ramps with westbound off-ramp and eastbound on-ramp, as exists today in the vicinity of the Arboretum. These ramps provide a travel time benefit to several local Metro transit services and riders, by reducing the congestion expected in the Montlake Boulevard area that would result by the elimination of the ramps.
  - That there would be bus staging and parking facilities, passenger and pedestrian facilities, and transit priority in the Montlake Triangle area. This would provide priority and increased comfort for customers.

Finally, all options for 520 replacement include the removal of a key transit component, a facility that exists today. That is true for all options. It is important that we replace the function of the Montlake freeway station, which is removed. With permanent closure of the station, these thousands of daily riders which transfer there are affected. We have agreed with the state that the function of this station can be replaced with an eastside station at Evergreen Point Road designed to accommodate increased transfer activity. The replacement of this function would require the provision of mitigation funding, approximately \$3 to \$5 million annually, to provide more direct service between the Eastside and the University district. This service is needed to replace capacity that currently exists on local streets and local bus routes, for Eastside riders to and from the Eastside, to add that capacity to the University District. We thank you for the opportunity to speak this morning. We look forward to continuing to work with the city, the state, Sound Transit, and the communities, in improving transit service.

**COMMENT [15]:** I live in Montlake at east Lake Washington Boulevard. I am affected by Option A+ and support Option M. The best part is the movement of the freeway on-ramps. This preserves more of the character of the area. We urge the City Council to support Option M.

**COMMENT [16]:** We encourage working with the coalition. There is poor design. Why not hear from firms who have built these in Europe and Asia, where they have been built. WSDOT has not built these. Now there is a risk line item in the cost estimations. We want other engineering companies. It is like a Berlin Wall going across the lake.

**COMMENT [17]:** This process has been going on for 12 years. We are at a sorry state of affairs. There is a lack of facts and data. The Legislative Workgroup has not provided the facts. The expert review panel data, for example: there was \$49 million allotted for the tunnel, and somehow that morphed to \$1.2 billion. At Madison Park, the structure has morphed to be 15 feet higher. 30 feet high for the pontoon bridge is like another Viaduct across Lake Washington. People are not getting the facts. The 2014 deadline has no meaning. It is in our front yard. Support us. We wish to continue working with the government.

**COMMENT [18]:** I live in Montlake. I am a citizen and constituent. Option M is feasible once it is worked out. No one on either side is pleading “not in my backyard.” No one is saying that we should not build. We must solve this issue, but how. Two questions arise: ‘how does it work?’ and ‘are the costs real?’ Options A and A+ answer

no to both. These would cause worse pollution, no connectivity, and it is not clear that costs include people stuck, medical emergencies, air and noise, idling costs, and fish shading. State elected officials move people east-west. The City Council must protect the people of your city that are impacted. We want a 100 year solution.

**COMMENT [19]:** I live in condominiums in Madison Park. I face the bridge directly. I urge you to follow Option M over Option A+. Option A+ has big impacts. You lose all of the views. It is like having the Alaskan Way Viaduct in your view. It decreases property values. I am an engineer. Pontoons are a bandaid solution. I cannot sail from my property to Lake Washington. The Olmsted brothers would roll over in their graves with usage of parks as an on-ramp. We cannot have short-sighted thinking.

**COMMENT [20]:** I am a professor at the University of Washington. I lived in Montlake for 48 years. There is coming climate change legislation. Major development in the transportation system must occur as well. We need a multimodal transit system that is not fossil fuel dependent. Option A does the opposite, and is an error. It has large impacts. It blocks us into traffic patterns. Historically, the old expressway was planned. Citizens protested and won. Option A is a mockery of sustainability.

**COMMENT [21]:** My family lives in Montlake. I live in north Seattle. Montlake residents have worked in good faith with WSDOT and the process. The ramp with lids on it is an affront. We need time to present facts and opinions. All of a sudden Option A+ is recommended before all the facts and opinions are presented.

**COMMENT [22]:** I am a Montlake resident of 15 years, and I am here to speak about the Arboretum. I am concerned about the impact of plans on the Arboretum. We do not love the ramps sitting there. We used to jump off of them. But now removing them and putting in new ramps would be a disaster. Look at the fine print.

**COMMENT [23]:** I am a Montlake resident. I am CEO of a company that deals with large costs, and a history of large projects. The neighbors have come to Option M for a reason. Federal and government projects, once started, are hard to decide to stop. When they start, they need good decisions. States have made comments on costs that are deterministic. It is easier to get estimates on technical issues. Soft issues must be evaluated, and need support. Schedule and timing are key.

**COMMENT [24]:** We support the principles of the Arboretum to reduce traffic in the Arboretum permanently. We should remove the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps. Today there is a lot of traffic in the Arboretum. This is in part to get to jobs at Microsoft. We should instead look for community clinics and work stations to cut down on trips. I support Option A+. I would like to see a four lane alternative in the EIS. Funding is questionable; we may not have the money.

**COMMENT [25]:** I am a 40 year resident of north Capitol Hill. There are two meetings today, but this one is more important. City transportation should take initiative from Seattle. There should be a four lane transit optimized bridge. The six lane alternative was submitted by Olympia for outside of the city. Four lanes would be HOV optimized. We can look to our city for leadership with a transit plan. Transit, not motor vehicle

transportation is needed. This must come from city leadership, not Olympia. We should ask ourselves if our children and grandchildren would be happier without concrete added. Seattle is best planned by Seattle, for Seattle.

**COMMENT [26]:** The neighborhood leadership in my neighborhood has misrepresented the neighborhood's interests. I used to be a transportation planner. Option A+ will not preserve transportation in northeast Seattle. I oppose any effort by the state for Option A.

**COMMENT [27]:** Thank you for the forum here. I am a Seattleite. My grandmother's house is gone, next to I-5. My parents' house remains, but would have gone away from the R.H. Thompson expressway ramps. I now live in the Montlake area that will be impacted by the process. I hope that this city that is consensus oriented, for which 12 years is a drop in the bucket, to move forward quickly. I walk through the Arboretum every day. People turn around, and it is dangerous. Montlake has become a joke. Take it to the state and fix it.

**COMMENT [28]:** I have lived in northeast Seattle for 45 years. Why am I still at it? I am out to find a solution. The Seattle Chamber of Commerce and businesses have been actively involved for years. The bridge is at risk of sinking. A solution needs leadership. It has taken too long. Option A+ is the best. It helps capacity, transit, community, the economy, air, parks, the environment, salmon, Native American concerns, shoreline, shading, and is more permissible due to a lesser need for massive excavating. It makes a lot of sense. There is lots of support for that.

**COMMENT [29]:** I represent the Arboretum Foundation. I am on the board and a member of the transportation committee. We have fundraised for the Arboretum Foundation. We completed a \$2.2 million campaign for new connections and gardens. We are in the middle of a new \$3.5 million campaign. Seattle residents have supported us through donations and tax levies. They protect the Arboretum and their investments in it. It is a good place to walk off Thanksgiving pie. However, the Arboretum is compromised by traffic. It is diminished in its ability to function. We have laid out five principles. These include avoiding harm to the Arboretum. We are concerned with Option A+, but take no position. We are concerned with connectivity. Our principles are in a handout. These are similar to those stated by the Arboretum Committee.

**COMMENT [30]:** I represent the Arboretum and botanical garden. You as the city of Seattle own the Arboretum. Lake Washington Boulevard is a park road. This park road is being used as the ramp for a highway. It can be enhanced with design. We should do no harm to the Arboretum and its collection. We must respect history, reduce traffic, and restore peace and tranquility. We must protect against climate change.

**COMMENT [31]:** I work for King County trades. I am not in opposition to any particular plan. 12 years is a long time frame. I represent the thousands of people that will build the bridge. I want to find funding as satisfy everyone. I want to put my brothers and sisters to work.

**COMMENT [32]:** I am a 25 year resident of Portage Bay. We are home owners. On a trip to Washington D.C., I found respect for other cultures and the environment, parks,

and water quality. The Seattle shoreline is a dense residential shoreline. The Legislative Workgroup recommendations ignore this. There is an army of community relations staff and consultants. There is citizen containment to wear us down. Option A+ recommendation fails us. Replacing the Alaskan Way Viaduct helps aesthetics.

**COMMENT [33]:** I am an executive at the labor council. Laborers have not taken a position on options. Folks that rely on the corridor need jobs. 12 years is enough time. I was a part of the Alaskan Way Viaduct process. A journalist asked about that process. They like getting into the issues. They also like political leaders to make decisions. We implore this.

**COMMENT [34]:** I represent the Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks. We support the option with the least impact on parks, and less traffic to parks. This aligns with the Arboretum Foundation's goals. We want a transit optimized four-lane option, if it relieved traffic. We support Option A prime without the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps.

**COMMENT [35]:** I am a 30 year resident of Capitol Hill. I have been to meetings like this before. This is the most important meeting I have been to. You people, the council, are the only ones that can stop WSDOT from doing this. They will put legislation in with loopholes. You are the only ones who can stop this. That is the only power to stop this, and you have it. There will be no end to public meetings held, and public ignored. Option A+ is one issue. The pontoons are another issue.

**COMMENT [36]:** I live at Montlake and Shelby. I pass the bridge every morning and evening. I built my own concrete wall in my yard to keep the noise out. No one has spoken about the quality of life in Montlake. That is the number one issue. They live in Olympia, Spokane, and West Seattle. Move to Montlake. I came from a communist country. It is more liberally minded here, with equality. I would be 100 percent affected by this. I live only one block from the bridge. How can you put a big ugly concrete structure there? WSDOT should listen, and look at other countries' construction.

**COMMENT [37]:** This is the tragedy of commons. It happens in all communist and capitalist countries. Everyone wants to go somewhere. I am a biologist. I have gone 12 years, and found problems in the EIS: there is no analysis of traffic, or bikes. A six lane option is worse than a four lane option. Build for the future, not for now. Clearly, if you build it, people will come. However, there will be peak oil and less water resources in the future. Old money and old ideas. We cannot build our way out of this. This tunnel is not affordable.

**COMMENT [38]:** In resolutions, the City Council has not endorsed the six lane alternative. Caution is wise. None of them are realistic or affordable. Traditionally the City Council and mayor have exerted their role and protected the city from further expansion. The six lane alternatives have bells and whistles, but we cannot afford them. The City Council resolutions ask to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and have transit improvements.

**COMMENT [39]:** I represent the University of Washington. The University of Washington can work with any of the three options, and will work with the city, as stated by President Mark Emmert in a 2008 letter. UW prefers Option A+ based on what is known in the EIS. This works with UW, with transit, with the environment, and with costs. At the Legislative Workgroup, it was shown that Option A+ could be permitted. Option A+ has the least impact on the Universities resources and campus.

**COMMENT [40]:** I come rarely, but you are here daily. Thank you to the City Council for your efforts.

**COMMENT [41]:** I am from north Madison Park. There are 92 units in my condominium. There is a 300 unit apartment building near me. We are next to the bridge, and the bridge is there, but it is proposed to have a 30 foot viaduct there. Options K and M are favored because they are lower.

**Richard Conlin, City Council President, Adjourns Meeting**