



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

COMMENT FORM

September 18, 2006 Draft EIS Public Hearings

We invite you to provide your comments on the Draft EIS.
 Please fill out this form, use additional sheets of paper if necessary.
 Deposit this in one of the marked boxes or mail it promptly to the address on the back.
 Please write clearly and be as specific as possible.
Thank you for your comments!

Please tell us your zip code: 98112

Would you describe yourself as primarily a:

- Resident in the project area
- Cyclist
- Park user
- Commuter who uses SR 520
- Pedestrian
- Interested citizen
- Other _____

Please select the topic most applicable to your comment.

Alternatives

- Comment on All Alternatives
- 4-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange
- 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge
- 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access
- Other 6-Lane Option

Environmental Topics

- Construction
- Cultural & Historic Resources
- Funding and Tolling
- Land and Structures
- Fish and Wildlife
- Neighborhoods & Communities
- Noise
- Other Environmental Effects
- Parks and Recreation
- Transportation and Transit
- Wetlands/Water Resources

Other Topics

- General Comment
- Urban Design

I-0295-001
 1) Mitigation of wetland damage + loss needs to occur in the effected area, not somewhere else.

I-0295-002
 2) Pacific Interchange is unacceptable because of the impact on the wetlands

I-0295-003
 3) bike connect in madison Park at 37th Ave E is unacceptable because of the impact to the wetlands.

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad Postcard in mail Community calendar
 Poster Email announcement Project webpage
 From a friend or neighbor Other: _____

Deposit your form in the boxes provided tonight or send your comment by mail to:

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
 c/o Paul Krueger
 414 Olive Way, Suite 400
 Seattle, Washington 98101-1209

Comments must be postmarked by October 2, 2006.

Prefer email?

Submit comments online at www.SR520DEIScomments.com.

Email comments to: SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov.

Do you want to stay involved in this project? We send monthly email updates, and periodic mail announcements about upcoming project meetings. If you would like to be included on the mailing list, please fill in the following information:

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

E-mail: _____

Also – check out our website at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

COMMENT FORM

September 18, 2006 Draft EIS Public Hearings

We invite you to provide your comments on the Draft EIS.
 Please fill out this form, use additional sheets of paper if necessary.
 Deposit this in one of the marked boxes or mail it promptly to the address on the back.
 Please write clearly and be as specific as possible.
Thank you for your comments!

Please tell us your zip code: 98112

Would you describe yourself as primarily a:

- Resident in the project area
- Commuter who uses SR 520
- Cyclist
- Pedestrian
- Park user
- Interested citizen
- Other _____

Please select the topic most applicable to your comment.

Alternatives

- Comment on All Alternatives
- 4-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange
- 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge
- 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access
- Other 6-Lane Option

Environmental Topics

- Construction
- Cultural & Historic Resources
- Funding and Tolling
- Land and Structures
- Fish and Wildlife
- Neighborhoods & Communities
- Noise
- Other Environmental Effects
- Parks and Recreation
- Transportation and Transit
- Wetlands/Water Resources

Other Topics

- General Comment
- Urban Design

I-0296-001 | I believe we must have HOV through the east side to encourage bussing and carpooling with either four or six lanes. Bike lanes are great when possible. I am against tolling for this bridge when other bridges and commuting routes are not tolled. I think tolls should be used on routes where there is an easy option. Either north around the lake or south to I-90 are terrible options for me. Thanks for having this hearing.

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad
- Postcard in mail
- Community calendar
- Poster
- Email announcement
- Project webpage
- From a friend or neighbor
- Other: Handout

Deposit your form in the boxes provided tonight or send your comment by mail to:

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
c/o Paul Krueger
414 Olive Way, Suite 400
Seattle, Washington 98101-1209

Comments must be postmarked by October 2, 2006.

Prefer email?

Submit comments online at www.SR520DEIScomments.com.

Email comments to: SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov.

Do you want to stay involved in this project? We send monthly email updates, and periodic mail announcements about upcoming project meetings. If you would like to be included on the mailing list, please fill in the following information:

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

E-mail: _____

Also – check out our website at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

COMMENT FORM

September 18, 2006 Draft EIS Public Hearings

We invite you to provide your comments on the Draft EIS.
 Please fill out this form, use additional sheets of paper if necessary.
 Deposit this in one of the marked boxes or mail it promptly to the address on the back.
 Please write clearly and be as specific as possible.
Thank you for your comments!

Please tell us your zip code: 98112

Would you describe yourself as primarily a:

- Resident in the project area
- Commuter who uses SR 520
- Cyclist
- Pedestrian
- Park user
- Interested citizen
- Other _____

Please select the topic most applicable to your comment.

Alternatives

- Comment on All Alternatives
- 4-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange
- 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge
- 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access
- Other 6-Lane Option

Environmental Topics

- Construction
- Cultural & Historic Resources
- Funding and Tolling
- Land and Structures
- Fish and Wildlife
- Neighborhoods & Communities
- Noise
- Other Environmental Effects
- Parks and Recreation
- Transportation and Transit
- Wetlands/Water Resources

Other Topics

- General Comment
- Urban Design

I-0297-001

#1 choice - leave as is - wait to coordinate with sound transect / mass transit

#2 choice - 4 lane w/ Pac. exchange.

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad Postcard in mail Community calendar
 Poster Email announcement Project webpage
 From a friend or neighbor Other: _____

Deposit your form in the boxes provided tonight or send your comment by mail to:

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
 c/o Paul Krueger
 414 Olive Way, Suite 400
 Seattle, Washington 98101-1209

Comments must be postmarked by October 2, 2006.

Prefer email?

Submit comments online at www.SR520DEIScomments.com.

Email comments to: SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov.

Do you want to stay involved in this project? We send monthly email updates, and periodic mail announcements about upcoming project meetings. If you would like to be included on the mailing list, please fill in the following information:

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

E-mail: _____

Also – check out our website at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

COMMENT FORM

September 18, 2006 Draft EIS Public Hearings

We invite you to provide your comments on the Draft EIS.

Please fill out this form, use additional sheets of paper if necessary.

Deposit this in one of the marked boxes or mail it promptly to the address on the back.

Please write clearly and be as specific as possible.

Thank you for your comments!

Please tell us your zip code: 98122

Would you describe yourself as primarily a:

Resident in the project area

Cyclist

Park user

Commuter who uses SR 520

Pedestrian

Interested citizen

Other _____

Please select the topic most applicable to your comment.

Alternatives

- Comment on All Alternatives
- 4-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange
- 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge
- 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access
- Other 6-Lane Option

Environmental Topics

- Construction
- Cultural & Historic Resources
- Funding and Tolling
- Land and Structures
- Fish and Wildlife
- Neighborhoods & Communities
- Noise
- Other Environmental Effects
- Parks and Recreation
- Transportation and Transit
- Wetlands/Water Resources

Other Topics

- General Comment
- Urban Design

I-0298-001

Close the Lake Washington Blvd ramps. This park boulevard, park and arborstone should not be used as a freeway access ramp. The proposal of the Pacific interchange funnels 4+ lanes of east, west, and north traffic into two lanes of park-owned boulevard heading south. How will this affect traffic at Madison and points south, Boyer and Interlaken boulevard. Lake Washington boulevard should function as a pleasure drive and bicycle route, not an arterial and freeway ramp.

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad
- Postcard in mail
- Community calendar
- Poster
- Email announcement
- Project webpage
- From a friend or neighbor
- Other: News article

Deposit your form in the boxes provided tonight or send your comment by mail to:

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
c/o Paul Krueger
414 Olive Way, Suite 400
Seattle, Washington 98101-1209

Comments must be postmarked by October 2, 2006.

Prefer email?

Submit comments online at www.SR520DEIScomments.com.

Email comments to: SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov.

Do you want to stay involved in this project? We send monthly email updates, and periodic mail announcements about upcoming project meetings. If you would like to be included on the mailing list, please fill in the following information:

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

E-mail: _____

Also – check out our website at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

COMMENT FORM

September 18, 2006 Draft EIS Public Hearings

We invite you to provide your comments on the Draft EIS.
 Please fill out this form, use additional sheets of paper if necessary.
 Deposit this in one of the marked boxes or mail it promptly to the address on the back.
 Please write clearly and be as specific as possible.
Thank you for your comments!

Please tell us your zip code: 98112

Would you describe yourself as primarily a:

- Resident in the project area
- Commuter who uses SR 520
- Cyclist
- Pedestrian
- Park user
- Interested citizen
- Other _____

Please select the topic most applicable to your comment.

Alternatives

- Comment on All Alternatives
- 4-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange
- 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge
- 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access
- Other 6-Lane Option

Environmental Topics

- Construction
- Cultural & Historic Resources
- Funding and Tolling
- Land and Structures
- Fish and Wildlife
- Neighborhoods & Communities
- Noise
- Other Environmental Effects
- Parks and Recreation
- Transportation and Transit
- Wetlands/Water Resources

Other Topics

- General Comment
- Urban Design

I-0299-001

The Pacific Street Interchange provides the only traffic solution offered in the replacement of SR 520. The alternative is supported by Montlake residents because it provides mitigation of many issues around movement of traffic in the neighborhood, preservation of the Montlake Bridge (cut) and the possible return of a ground ~~level~~ Montlake Blvd. Other solutions offer only put pressure on the need for further expansion to address traffic flow. The Pacific Street Exchange offers an integrated approach to regional transportation need - but ~~from~~ regional transportation need - but from regional transportation hubs

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad
- Postcard in mail
- Community calendar
- Poster
- Email announcement
- Project webpage
- From a friend or neighbor
- Other: _____

Deposit your form in the boxes provided tonight or send your comment by mail to:

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
c/o Paul Krueger
414 Olive Way, Suite 400
Seattle, Washington 98101-1209

Comments must be postmarked by October 2, 2006.

Prefer email?

Submit comments online at www.SR520DEIScomments.com.

Email comments to: SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov.

Do you want to stay involved in this project? We send monthly email updates, and periodic mail announcements about upcoming project meetings. If you would like to be included on the mailing list, please fill in the following information:

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

E-mail: _____

Also – check out our website at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

COMMENT FORM

page 1 of 2

September 18, 2006 Draft EIS Public Hearings

We invite you to provide your comments on the Draft EIS.
Please fill out this form, use additional sheets of paper if necessary.
Deposit this in one of the marked boxes or mail it promptly to the address on the back.
Please write clearly and be as specific as possible.
Thank you for your comments!

Please tell us your zip code: 98039

Would you describe yourself as primarily a:

- Resident in the project area
- Commuter who uses SR 520
- Cyclist
- Pedestrian
- Park user
- Interested citizen
- Other _____

Please select the topic most applicable to your comment.

- | Alternatives | Environmental Topics | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Comment on All Alternatives | <input type="checkbox"/> Construction | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4-Lane Alternative | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural & Historic Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Environmental Effects |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane Alternative | <input type="checkbox"/> Funding and Tolling | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parks and Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange | <input type="checkbox"/> Land and Structures | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation and Transit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge | <input type="checkbox"/> Fish and Wildlife | <input type="checkbox"/> Wetlands/Water Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access | <input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhoods & Communities | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other 6-Lane Option | | |
| | Other Topics | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> General Comment | <input type="checkbox"/> Urban Design |

I-0300-001 * LAND ACQUISITION -> WHOLE LOT ACQUISITION ONLY

I-0300-002 QUIET PAVEMENT ON BRIDGES AS WELL AS ON LAND

I-0300-003 NO BIKE / PEDESTRIAN PATH ON BRIDGE / OR MADISON PARK

I-0300-004 NO WORK BEFORE SEVEN A.M. OR AFTER SEVEN P.M. CONVERTER

I-0300-005 IF 4 LANES, LEDS AND SOUND WALLS AS WITH THE 6 LANE OPTION

I-0300-006 HOW IS ANY COST OVERRAN FUNDED?

I-0300-007 LOSS OF QUIET ENJOYMENT OF PROPERTIES IMPACTED BY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY -> RESERVE PROPERTY

Continued on back

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad Postcard in mail Community calendar
- Poster Email announcement Project webpage
- From a friend or neighbor Other: _____

Deposit your form in the boxes provided tonight or send your comment by mail to:

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
c/o Paul Krueger
414 Olive Way, Suite 400
Seattle, Washington 98101-1209

Comments must be postmarked by October 2, 2006.

Prefer email?

Submit comments online at www.SR520DEIScomments.com.

Email comments to: SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov.

Do you want to stay involved in this project? We send monthly email updates, and periodic mail announcements about upcoming project meetings. If you would like to be included on the mailing list, please fill in the following information:

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

E-mail: _____

Also – check out our website at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

COMMENT FORM

page 2 of 2

September 18, 2006 Draft EIS Public Hearings

We invite you to provide your comments on the Draft EIS.
Please fill out this form, use additional sheets of paper if necessary.
Deposit this in one of the marked boxes or mail it promptly to the address on the back.
Please write clearly and be as specific as possible.
Thank you for your comments!

Please tell us your zip code: 98039

Would you describe yourself as primarily a:

- Resident in the project area
- Commuter who uses SR 520
- Cyclist
- Pedestrian
- Park user
- Interested citizen
- Other _____

Please select the topic most applicable to your comment.

Alternatives

- Comment on All Alternatives
- 4-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange
- 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge
- 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access
- Other 6-Lane Option

Environmental Topics

- Construction
- Cultural & Historic Resources
- Funding and Tolling
- Land and Structures
- Fish and Wildlife
- Neighborhoods & Communities
- Noise
- Other Environmental Effects
- Parks and Recreation
- Transportation and Transit
- Wetlands/Water Resources

Other Topics

- General Comment
- Urban Design

I-0300-008

STUDY SUBMITTER FOR TUNNEL OPTION

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad
- Postcard in mail
- Community calendar
- Poster
- Email announcement
- Project webpage
- From a friend or neighbor
- Other: _____

Deposit your form in the boxes provided tonight or send your comment by mail to:

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
c/o Paul Krueger
414 Olive Way, Suite 400
Seattle, Washington 98101-1209

Comments must be postmarked by October 2, 2006.

Prefer email?

Submit comments online at www.SR520DEIScomments.com.

Email comments to: SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov.

Do you want to stay involved in this project? We send monthly email updates, and periodic mail announcements about upcoming project meetings. If you would like to be included on the mailing list, please fill in the following information:

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

E-mail: _____

Also – check out our website at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

COMMENT FORM

September 18, 2006 Draft EIS Public Hearings

We invite you to provide your comments on the Draft EIS.
 Please fill out this form, use additional sheets of paper if necessary.
 Deposit this in one of the marked boxes or mail it promptly to the address on the back.
 Please write clearly and be as specific as possible.
Thank you for your comments!

Please tell us your zip code: 98039

Would you describe yourself as primarily a:

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident in the project area | <input type="checkbox"/> Cyclist | <input type="checkbox"/> Park user |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Commuter who uses SR 520 | <input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian | <input type="checkbox"/> Interested citizen |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |

Please select the topic most applicable to your comment.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alternatives | <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Topics |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Comment on All Alternatives | <input type="checkbox"/> Construction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4-Lane Alternative | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural & Historic Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane Alternative | <input type="checkbox"/> Funding and Tolling |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange | <input type="checkbox"/> Land and Structures |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge | <input type="checkbox"/> Fish and Wildlife |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access | <input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhoods & Communities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other 6-Lane Option | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Topics |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> General Comment |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Urban Design |

I-0301-001

The Governor's Expert Review Panel
 9-01-06 report indicates "unrealistic" escalation
 factors for out-years - leading to possible
 large cost overruns. What is WSDOT
 plan for cost escalation - who pays
 for overruns?

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad
- Postcard in mail
- Community calendar
- Poster
- Email announcement
- Project webpage
- From a friend or neighbor
- Other: _____

Deposit your form in the boxes provided tonight or send your comment by mail to:

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
c/o Paul Krueger
414 Olive Way, Suite 400
Seattle, Washington 98101-1209

Comments must be postmarked by October 2, 2006.

Prefer email?

Submit comments online at www.SR520DEIScomments.com.

Email comments to: SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov.

Do you want to stay involved in this project? We send monthly email updates, and periodic mail announcements about upcoming project meetings. If you would like to be included on the mailing list, please fill in the following information:

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

E-mail: _____

Also – check out our website at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

COMMENT FORM

September 18, 2006 Draft EIS Public Hearings

We invite you to provide your comments on the Draft EIS.
Please fill out this form, use additional sheets of paper if necessary.
Deposit this in one of the marked boxes or mail it promptly to the address on the back.
Please write clearly and be as specific as possible.
Thank you for your comments!

Please tell us your zip code: 98039

Would you describe yourself as primarily a:

- Resident in the project area
- Commuter who uses SR 520
- Cyclist
- Pedestrian
- Park user
- Interested citizen
- Other _____

Please select the topic most applicable to your comment.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>Alternatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Comment on All Alternatives <input type="checkbox"/> 4-Lane Alternative <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane Alternative <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access <input type="checkbox"/> Other 6-Lane Option | <p>Environmental Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Construction <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural & Historic Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Funding and Tolling <input type="checkbox"/> Land and Structures <input type="checkbox"/> Fish and Wildlife <input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhoods & Communities <input type="checkbox"/> Noise <input type="checkbox"/> Other Environmental Effects <input type="checkbox"/> Parks and Recreation <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation and Transit <input type="checkbox"/> Wetlands/Water Resources |
| <p>Other Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> General Comment <input type="checkbox"/> Urban Design | |

I-0302-001
Recommend that WSDOT conduct another study of the submersible ^{tubular} tunnel option

I-0302-002
@ Montlake - do not proceed with the Pacific St. Intersection (6-lane alternative) unless agreed to by neighborhood community councils, the Arboretum & the U of W.

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad Postcard in mail Community calendar
 Poster Email announcement Project webpage
 From a friend or neighbor Other: _____

Deposit your form in the boxes provided tonight or send your comment by mail to:

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
 c/o Paul Krueger
 414 Olive Way, Suite 400
 Seattle, Washington 98101-1209

Comments must be postmarked by October 2, 2006.

Prefer email?

Submit comments online at www.SR520DEIScomments.com.

Email comments to: SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov.

Do you want to stay involved in this project? We send monthly email updates, and periodic mail announcements about upcoming project meetings. If you would like to be included on the mailing list, please fill in the following information:

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

E-mail: _____

Also – check out our website at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

COMMENT FORM

September 18, 2006 Draft EIS Public Hearings

We invite you to provide your comments on the Draft EIS.
 Please fill out this form, use additional sheets of paper if necessary.
 Deposit this in one of the marked boxes or mail it promptly to the address on the back.
 Please write clearly and be as specific as possible.
Thank you for your comments!

Please tell us your zip code: 98034

Would you describe yourself as primarily a:

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resident in the project area | <input type="checkbox"/> Cyclist | <input type="checkbox"/> Park user |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Commuter who uses SR 520 | <input type="checkbox"/> Pedestrian | <input type="checkbox"/> Interested citizen |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |

Please select the topic most applicable to your comment.

Alternatives

- Comment on All Alternatives
- 4-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange
- 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge
- 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access
- Other 6-Lane Option

Environmental Topics

- Construction
- Cultural & Historic Resources
- Funding and Tolling
- Land and Structures
- Fish and Wildlife
- Neighborhoods & Communities
- Noise
- Other Environmental Effects
- Parks and Recreation
- Transportation and Transit
- Wetlands/Water Resources

Other Topics

- General Comment
- Urban Design

I-0303-001

The 4-lane alternative, if selected as preferred, should include (3) sidewalks at Evergreen Pt. Rd; 8' x 4' x 8' noise walls & quiet pavement. No Madison Park bicycle bridge connection.

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad
- Postcard in mail
- Community calendar
- Poster
- Email announcement
- Project webpage
- From a friend or neighbor
- Other: _____

Deposit your form in the boxes provided tonight or send your comment by mail to:

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
c/o Paul Krueger
414 Olive Way, Suite 400
Seattle, Washington 98101-1209

Comments must be postmarked by October 2, 2006.

Prefer email?

Submit comments online at www.SR520DEIScomments.com.

Email comments to: SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov.

Do you want to stay involved in this project? We send monthly email updates, and periodic mail announcements about upcoming project meetings. If you would like to be included on the mailing list, please fill in the following information:

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

E-mail: _____

Also – check out our website at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

COMMENT FORM

September 18, 2006 Draft EIS Public Hearings

We invite you to provide your comments on the Draft EIS.
 Please fill out this form, use additional sheets of paper if necessary.
 Deposit this in one of the marked boxes or mail it promptly to the address on the back.
 Please write clearly and be as specific as possible.
Thank you for your comments!

Please tell us your zip code: 78039

Would you describe yourself as primarily a:

- Resident in the project area
- Commuter who uses SR 520
- Cyclist
- Pedestrian
- Park user
- Interested citizen
- Other _____

Please select the topic most applicable to your comment.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Alternatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Comment on All Alternatives <input type="checkbox"/> 4-Lane Alternative <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane Alternative <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access <input type="checkbox"/> Other 6-Lane Option | <p>Environmental Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Construction <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural & Historic Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Funding and Tolling <input type="checkbox"/> Land and Structures <input type="checkbox"/> Fish and Wildlife <input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhoods & Communities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Noise <input type="checkbox"/> Other Environmental Effects <input type="checkbox"/> Parks and Recreation <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation and Transit <input type="checkbox"/> Wetlands/Water Resources |
| Other Topics | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Comment | <input type="checkbox"/> Urban Design | |

I-0304-001

Quiet pavement should be a requirement on the rebuilt bridge deck as well as the land sections.

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad
- Postcard in mail
- Community calendar
- Poster
- Email announcement
- Project webpage
- From a friend or neighbor
- Other: _____

Deposit your form in the boxes provided tonight or send your comment by mail to:

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
c/o Paul Krueger
414 Olive Way, Suite 400
Seattle, Washington 98101-1209

Comments must be postmarked by October 2, 2006.

Prefer email?

Submit comments online at www.SR520DEIScomments.com.

Email comments to: SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov.

Do you want to stay involved in this project? We send monthly email updates, and periodic mail announcements about upcoming project meetings. If you would like to be included on the mailing list, please fill in the following information:

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

E-mail: _____

Also – check out our website at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

COMMENT FORM

September 18, 2006 Draft EIS Public Hearings

We invite you to provide your comments on the Draft EIS.
 Please fill out this form, use additional sheets of paper if necessary.
 Deposit this in one of the marked boxes or mail it promptly to the address on the back.
 Please write clearly and be as specific as possible.
Thank you for your comments!

Please tell us your zip code: 98039

Would you describe yourself as primarily a:

- Resident in the project area
- Commuter who uses SR 520
- Cyclist
- Pedestrian
- Park user
- Interested citizen
- Other _____

Please select the topic most applicable to your comment.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>Alternatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Comment on All Alternatives <input type="checkbox"/> 4-Lane Alternative <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane Alternative <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access <input type="checkbox"/> Other 6-Lane Option | <p>Environmental Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Construction <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural & Historic Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Funding and Tolling <input type="checkbox"/> Land and Structures <input type="checkbox"/> Fish and Wildlife <input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhoods & Communities <input type="checkbox"/> Noise <input type="checkbox"/> Other Environmental Effects <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parks and Recreation <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation and Transit <input type="checkbox"/> Wetlands/Water Resources |
| <p>Other Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> General Comment <input type="checkbox"/> Urban Design | |

I-0305-001

The need for ^{a bridge} a bicycle path is not clear - how many bicycle commuters would use SR520? Increase bus-rack capacities for carrying bicycles for commuters.

Continued on back

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad Postcard in mail Community calendar
 Poster Email announcement Project webpage
 From a friend or neighbor Other: _____

Deposit your form in the boxes provided tonight or send your comment by mail to:

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
c/o Paul Krueger
414 Olive Way, Suite 400
Seattle, Washington 98101-1209

Comments must be postmarked by October 2, 2006.

Prefer email?

Submit comments online at www.SR520DEIScomments.com.

Email comments to: SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov.

Do you want to stay involved in this project? We send monthly email updates, and periodic mail announcements about upcoming project meetings. If you would like to be included on the mailing list, please fill in the following information:

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

E-mail: _____

Also – check out our website at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

COMMENT FORM

September 18, 2006 Draft EIS Public Hearings

We invite you to provide your comments on the Draft EIS.
 Please fill out this form, use additional sheets of paper if necessary.
 Deposit this in one of the marked boxes or mail it promptly to the address on the back.
 Please write clearly and be as specific as possible.
Thank you for your comments!

Please tell us your zip code: 48034

Would you describe yourself as primarily a:

- Resident in the project area
- Commuter who uses SR 520
- Cyclist
- Pedestrian
- Park user
- Interested citizen
- Other _____

Please select the topic most applicable to your comment.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>Alternatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Comment on All Alternatives <input type="checkbox"/> 4-Lane Alternative <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane Alternative <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge <input type="checkbox"/> 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access <input type="checkbox"/> Other 6-Lane Option | <p>Environmental Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Construction <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural & Historic Resources <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funding and Tolling <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land and Structures <input type="checkbox"/> Fish and Wildlife <input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhoods & Communities <input type="checkbox"/> Noise <input type="checkbox"/> Other Environmental Effects <input type="checkbox"/> Parks and Recreation <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation and Transit <input type="checkbox"/> Wetlands/Water Resources |
| <p>Other Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> General Comment <input type="checkbox"/> Urban Design | |

I-0306-001 | *land acquisition for SR520 right-of-way should not include "slices" of property as shown on ^{WS DOT} Land & Structures chart - it's substantive (define "slice") property acquisition should include entire property.*

How did you hear about this open house? Newspaper ad Postcard in mail Community calendar Poster Email announcement Project webpage From a friend or neighbor Other: _____

Deposit your form in the boxes provided tonight or send your comment by mail to:

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
 c/o Paul Krueger
 414 Olive Way, Suite 400
 Seattle, Washington 98101-1209

Comments must be postmarked by October 2, 2006.

Prefer email?

Submit comments online at www.SR520DEIScomments.com.

Email comments to: SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov.

Do you want to stay involved in this project? We send monthly email updates, and periodic mail announcements about upcoming project meetings. If you would like to be included on the mailing list, please fill in the following information:

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

E-mail: _____

Also – check out our website at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge

STATEMENT OF DWIGHT BAKER

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I-0307-001 I'm Dwight Baker, in Kirkland, 11645 -- 11647 --excuse me -- 108th Avenue Northeast.

I have reviewed the displays here for the 520 Bridge studies, and I have been for the last couple of years trying to follow the development of these alternatives.

I intend to make some further comments at the east side review meeting similar to this one which is scheduled for this week also; but I have some general comments now which I think are important to make and I will make also at that east side conference.

Mainly my concern is that the traffic level throughout the day is depicted on some of the graphs for 520 Bridge traffic as well as I-90 freeway traffic, and at the west end of the proposed alternatives of four lanes or six lanes that are being reviewed now, there appears to be very little interchange improvement to connect I-5 with 520 at all hours of the day particularly peak hours.

And the original design problems of I-5 are still existing, namely that you are required to do a braided skip over of about four lanes in extremely fast traffic during rush hours going south from the 520 ramps because you're on the wrong side of the freeway to reach most of the access points in Seattle downtown; namely the Mercer Street and

I-0307-001 1 the off ramp at Stewart near the REI and also downtown.

2 And I believe that those I-5 design problems should be
3 addressed as part of the engineering studies on 520 and the
4 connections; and not only going south from 520, but also
5 the connections to I-5 going north.

6 And the engineers have told me that the only
7 connection considered right now is reversible express lane
8 connections to the lower level of I-5 going south; and I
9 believe that you need to consider the upper level for
10 general traffic on I-5 as further interchange connection
11 with 520.

12 These design problems have existed since I-5 was built
13 and are very serious, and they do relate even to downtown
14 Seattle.

15 And I believe you need to get a solution for those to
16 do a proper evaluation of all the alternatives for 520 that
17 are being considered here at this display. And I hope that
18 somebody will consider finding the money or whatever is
19 necessary to do the engineering studies to take it further
20 than the connections that are now considered for I-5 from
21 520, both directions, and that will impact almost all the
22 alternatives you're showing here today and influence them.

I-0307-002 23 Another major comment is that I believe that Sound
24 Transit in their proposal to put a major tunnel under the
25 Montlake canal and a major station at the Husky Stadium is

I-0307-002 1 the wrong side of the University campus. That they should
2 have made a further effort to cross either under or over
3 near the University Bridge area and stay on the west side
4 of the campus to go all the way to Northgate. And that
5 those alternatives should be studied even though, I
6 believe, they're quite far along with plans to go under the
7 southeast end of the campus.

8 I think there would be much less impact on the
9 University and all the traffic in that area, and the
10 medical school traffic would be served equally by accessing
11 the freeway -- or rather the Sound Transit traffic on the
12 west side of the medical school, which is almost the same
13 distance or even closer than walking all the way from a
14 station at Husky Stadium.

15 So these are major comments I realize, but I think
16 it's not too late to consider those because they are still
17 going to be influenced by the decisions made on the
18 waterfront for the seawall and the viaduct.

19 And all of those studies that going on in the state of
20 Washington and the city of Seattle and King County now are
21 going to impact these studies that going on on 520, and
22 there needs to be an integration of all of this engineering
23 information and further studies of alternatives beyond what
24 this display is today.

25 Thank you very much.

Please enter your contact information below. (Last name and zip code are required to save comment.) If you would like to be added to the project mailing list, please fill out the rest of the contact information and check the box below.

CommentDate: 9/18/2006

First Name: Mark

Last Name: Bandy

Organization/Membership Affiliation:

Address: 627 N 65th St

E-mail: miebandauli@comcast.net

City: Seattle

State: WA

Zip Code: 98103

Check here if you would like to be added to the project mailing list.

Alternatives

- Comment on All Alternatives
- 4-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange
- 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge
- 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access
- Other 6-Lane Option

Environmental Topics

- Construction
- Cultural and Historic
- Funding and Tolling
- Land and Structures
- Fish and Wildlife
- Neighborhoods and Communities
- Noise
- Other Environmental Effects
- Parks and Recreation
- Transportation and Transit
- Wetlands/Water Resources

Other Topics

- General Comment
- Urban Design

Enter your comment below. Please be as specific as possible.

I-0308-001

Given the cost of either proposed alternative and that tolling is identified as being necessary to fund the project it doesn't seem equitable to allow vanpools and carpools to use the bridge without paying a toll. I also don't see how you could do this in the 4-lane alternative because there aren't HOV lanes to separate them from the other users. All traffic crossing the bridge needs to pay the toll.

I-0308-002

As this project will be one of the key ones in the joint ballot next year, along with Sound Transit expansion, it seems like there should be identified transit service enhancements on the 520 corridor. Something similar to the Rapid Ride concepts described in King County's ballot measure for this fall. It would be imprudent to simply rely on pontoon capacity for future HCT - there's already a lot of transit on the bridge and it could be better branded and organized to get from north Seattle to the eastside, or vice versa.

I-0308-003

Design the bridge structures, noise walls, luminaires, etc in the right context. I would particularly like to see much of the Olmstead treatments brought into the 520 design. Art Nouveau is the way to go!

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad
- Postcard in mail
- Community Calendar
- Poster
- Email announcement
- Project webpage
- From a friend or neighbor
- Other work

STATEMENT OF RANDY BANNECKER

I-0309-001 3 My name is Randy Bannecker, and I would like to
4 comment on the proposed bicycle/pedestrian connections from
5 Madison Park to the new 520 bridge and ask that the 37th
6 Avenue East alignment be taken off the table due to the
7 severe impact it would impose on the Foster Island
8 wetlands. The technical memorandum connected to the DEIS
9 reveals a number of impacts associated with the 37th Avenue
10 East alignment impacts to the wetland, loss of wildlife
11 habitat, earthquake liquefaction risk, archaeological
12 resource potential, and then United States Department of
13 Transportation 4F conflict -- potentially conflicting that
14 4F Rule.

15 Additional concerns with this alignment are that that
16 street end, the 37th Avenue East street end, provides a
17 rare quiet street end park space that's used consistently.
18 The swath of wetland habitat clearing may approach 30 feet
19 due to the need for a work bridge to construct this
20 alignment. The introduction of lighting once the structure
21 is completed during nighttime I think has the potential to
22 interfere with wildlife, and I believe that what is
23 probably an add-on of 25 million perhaps more cost wise
24 would be better spent mitigating other impacts of 520 or
25 perhaps making other improvements to the bicycle

I-0309-001 | 1 connectivity.

2 I think if any connection should be pursued, it should
3 be the 43rd Avenue East connection. Thank you.

- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

Please enter your contact information below. (Last name and zip code are required to save comment.) If you would like to be added to the project mailing list, please fill out the rest of the contact information and check the box below.

CommentDate: 9/18/2006

First Name: Bill

Last Name: Barnes

Organization/Membership Affiliation:

Address: 2518 Royal Ct. E

E-mail: bill@barnacle.org

City: Seattle

State: WA

Zip Code: 98112

Check here if you would like to be added to the project mailing list.

Alternatives

- Comment on All Alternatives
- 4-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange
- 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge
- 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access
- Other 6-Lane Option

Environmental Topics

- Construction
- Cultural and Historic
- Funding and Tolling
- Land and Structures
- Fish and Wildlife
- Neighborhoods and Communities
- Noise
- Other Environmental Effects
- Parks and Recreation
- Transportation and Transit
- Wetlands/Water Resources

Other Topics

- General Comment
- Urban Design

Enter your comment below. Please be as specific as possible.

The Pacific Street Interchange is the obvious choice here. Safety concerns are the forcing function behind changing from the status quo, but after that the conversation immediately turns to traffic flow and neighborhood impact. The Pacific St. option make traffic flow much more appropriate, and mitigates the neighborhood impact substantially. In fact it actually improves the current situation, rather than making it less bad.

I live in Montlake in a part of the neighborhood where the new bridge would impact sightlines and potentially noise. So I realize it's not without consequences. But we should do the right thing here, and clearly the right thing is the pacific st. option.

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad
- Postcard in mail
- Community Calendar
- Poster
- Email announcement
- Project webpage
- From a friend or neighbor
- Other

I-0310-001

Please enter your contact information below. (Last name and zip code are required to save comment.) If you would like to be added to the project mailing list, please fill out the rest of the contact information and check the box below.

CommentDate: 9/18/2006

First Name: Kate

Last Name: Battuello

Organization/Membership Affiliation:

Montlake resident

Address: 2814 West Park Drive East

E-mail: kateandkaj@msn.com

City: Seattle

State: WA

Zip Code: 98112

Check here if you would like to be added to the project mailing list.

Alternatives

- Comment on All Alternatives
- 4-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange
- 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge
- 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access
- Other 6-Lane Option

Environmental Topics

- Construction
- Cultural and Historic
- Funding and Tolling
- Land and Structures
- Fish and Wildlife
- Neighborhoods and Communities
- Noise
- Other Environmental Effects
- Parks and Recreation
- Transportation and Transit
- Wetlands/Water Resources

Other Topics

- General Comment
- Urban Design

Enter your comment below. Please be as specific as possible.

I support the Pacific Street Interchange option for SR520 and I oppose all other DEIS alternatives. My support is based upon the following considerations: a) traffic mobility; b) transit access and connectivity; and c) park impacts and opportunities.

The Pacific Street Interchange is the only option that provides a direct link for transit from SR520 to the Sound Transit light rail station that will be located on the UW campus adjacent to Husky Stadium. It is also the only option that METRO-KingCounty has concluded provides a realistic opportunity to restore bus service to NE Seattle along the N-S Montlake Blvd. arterial that begins at the current Montlake interchange for SR520 and heads N past University Village. Finally, the rebuilt SR520 bridge will include two dedicated HOV lanes. These three factors have the potential to significantly increase transit opportunities and ridership, which in turn will be good for traffic mobility and the environment in the neighborhoods adjacent to and dependent upon SR520.

The Pacific Street Interchange is the only option that traffic studies suggest will effectively mitigate - if not resolve - the notorious Montlake bottleneck. This bottleneck effectively backs up traffic from the current SR520 interchange in Montlake to University Village, resulting in traffic and transit delays of 20 to 30 minutes. In addition to creating huge delays for commuters these backups impede the access of emergency vehicles to University Hospital and Children's Hospital. The backups also erode the air quality in the neighborhoods adjacent to the SR520 Montlake interchange and the Montlake blvd, including the University of Washington. The traffic studies demonstrate significant mitigation in traffic congestion through this corridor will occur because the addition of the Union Bay bridge will permit SR520 traffic and transit destined to the University of Washington and points North to by-pass the Montlake bridge and that section of Montlake blvd. south of the Montlake Bridge that was designed as and intended to function as a local access residential arterial instead of an access ramp to a major freeway. The traffic mitigation that will occur with the Pacific Street Interchange should dramatically improve commute times and access for residents in Laurelhurst, Ravenna Bryant, Sand Point and other communities in NE Seattle.

The Pacific Street Interchange, like the base 6 alternative, will have a larger footprint through the Arboretum, however the net park impacts with the Pacific Street Interchange suggest that it is the only option that has the potential to actually increase useable green space and parks through a Montlake lid that could be extended to create a continuous greenbelt from Portage Bay through the Montlake Community Center greenspace, up over SR520 and north to the Arboretum. The base 6 lane alternative, in contrast, because of the 9 lane configuration across Portage Bay adversely impacts both the Arboretum and the green space adjacent to Portage Bay and further destroys the residential character and Olmstead legacy of Montlake Blvd., south of the Montlake bridge.

In sum, the Pacific Street Interchange is the only option that provides increased HOV lanes, with HOV speed and reliability; provides a direct link between HOV bus rapid transit on SR520 and the Sound Transit Light Rail station; effectively addresses the notorious Montlake bottleneck thereby improving traffic mobility and transit access for the University of WA and communities in NE Seattle; and mitigates the impacts on parks and greenspace in and around the Arboretum and Montlake and provides an opportunity to actually expand available green space and trails from the Arboretum to Portage Bay.

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad
- Postcard in mail
- Community Calendar
- Poster
- Email announcement
- Project webpage

Please enter your contact information below. (Last name and zip code are required to save comment.) If you would like to be added to the project mailing list, please fill out the rest of the contact information and check the box below.

CommentDate: 9/18/2006

First Name: Dominique

Last Name: Blachon

Organization/Membership Affiliation:

Address: 1855 McGilvra blvd e

E-mail:

City: seattle

State: wa

Zip Code: 98112

Check here if you would like to be added to the project mailing list.

Alternatives

- Comment on All Alternatives
- 4-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange
- 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge
- 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access
- Other 6-Lane Option

Environmental Topics

- Construction
- Cultural and Historic
- Funding and Tolling
- Land and Structures
- Fish and Wildlife
- Neighborhoods and Communities
- Noise
- Other Environmental Effects
- Parks and Recreation
- Transportation and Transit
- Wetlands/Water Resources

Other Topics

- General Comment
- Urban Design

Enter your comment below. Please be as specific as possible.

I-0312-001

I have been a Madison park resident for 20 years, and I currently live on McGilvra boulevard. I frequently commute to the East side or to the University district. I'm disappointed that the pedestrian/bicycle on-ramp from Madison park has been dropped from the presentation on display, and would like this option to still be studied, and, I hope, approved.

A Pedestrian/bicycle onramp from the Madison park neighborhood would offer a wonderful opportunity to motivate neighbors to choose alternative transportation, foot or bike, to head to the East side or to the University district. It's currently a ~4 mile ride to reach the University, on a fairly challenging course (both geographically (twist and turns, elevation gains) and in terms of street hazards). A number of neighbors would walk or bike to the U or to U village if it was an easier path. I currently have to ride over I90 in order to go to the East side (I realize that I can hop on a bus, but this is not an ideal solution, between delays waiting for the bus, bike racks often full at rush hour, cooling down and freezing when nice and sweaty after riding, etc.) An easy access to the 520 multiuse path would make this commute much more natural. It really wouldn't take much to get a number of people interested in leaving their car at home, which will go along way towards relieving the pressure on surface streets and on the bridge.

I-0312-002

I've lived in the neighborhood for over 20 years now and am well aware that there is a very vocal, and well organized, opposition to any path leading into Madison park. I do not agree with the arguments usually put forth, fears of crime or danger of increased bike traffic on our streets. I would actually welcome an increase of bike traffic on my street as a way to calm the traffic. I am definitely in favor of such an option. I couldn't begin to say if the majority of residents are leaning one way or the other, but please do NOT believe that we are all opposed to the onramp: many families would love to walk with their children, or with a stroller, or bike, to the path. Many commuters would embrace an easy alternative. My 11 year-old children, along with many of the children growing up in our neighborhood, will probably end up going to the University of Washington. A foot/bike path would be a wonderful way for them to head for their classes. I have to believe that there is already a number of people who would be interested, and I'd be ready to bet that within a few years of increased traffic congestion and high gas prices, many more would look favorably on this.

Thank you.

Dominique Blachon

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad
- Postcard in mail
- Community Calendar
- Poster
- Email announcement
- Project webpage
- From a friend or neighbor
- Other

Please enter your contact information below. (Last name and zip code are required to save comment.) If you would like to be added to the project mailing list, please fill out the rest of the contact information and check the box below.

CommentDate: 9/18/2006

First Name: Dominique

Last Name: Blachon

Organization/Membership Affiliation:

Address: 1855 mcgilvra blvd e

E-mail:

City: seattle

State: wa

Zip Code: 98112

Check here if you would like to be added to the project mailing list.

Alternatives

- Comment on All Alternatives
- 4-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange
- 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge
- 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access
- Other 6-Lane Option

Environmental Topics

- Construction
- Cultural and Historic
- Funding and Tolling
- Land and Structures
- Fish and Wildlife
- Neighborhoods and Communities
- Noise
- Other Environmental Effects
- Parks and Recreation
- Transportation and Transit
- Wetlands/Water Resources

Other Topics

- General Comment
- Urban Design

Enter your comment below. Please be as specific as possible.

I would like to see a "lid option" studied for the 4-lane alternative in Montlake. A lid would be very welcome as noise (and fumes?) abatement, and offers a way to increase the amount of open space, to be used as park, community gathering space, pedestrian/bike routes.

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad
- Postcard in mail
- Community Calendar
- Poster
- Email announcement
- Project webpage
- From a friend or neighbor
- Other NPR

I-0312-003

Please enter your contact information below. (Last name and zip code are required to save comment.) If you would like to be added to the project mailing list, please fill out the rest of the contact information and check the box below.

CommentDate: 9/18/2006

First Name: Dominique

Last Name: Blachon

Organization/Membership Affiliation:

Address:

E-mail:

City:

State:

Zip Code: 98112

Check here if you would like to be added to the project mailing list.

Alternatives

- Comment on All Alternatives
- 4-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange
- 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge
- 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access
- Other 6-Lane Option

Environmental Topics

- Construction
- Cultural and Historic
- Funding and Tolling
- Land and Structures
- Fish and Wildlife
- Neighborhoods and Communities
- Noise
- Other Environmental Effects
- Parks and Recreation
- Transportation and Transit
- Wetlands/Water Resources

Other Topics

- General Comment
- Urban Design

Enter your comment below. Please be as specific as possible.

Just one vote for tolling. It seems to me that variable tolls (higher at rush hour) make sense. I'm also in favor of tolls on I-90, while we're at it.

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad
- Postcard in mail
- Community Calendar
- Poster
- Email announcement
- Project webpage
- From a friend or neighbor
- Other NPR

I-0312-004 |

Please enter your contact information below. (Last name and zip code are required to save comment.) If you would like to be added to the project mailing list, please fill out the rest of the contact information and check the box below.

CommentDate: 9/18/2006

First Name: Susan

Last Name: Black

Organization/Membership Affiliation:

Address: 7025 5th Ave. N. W.

E-mail: sblack@sbassociates.com

City: Seattle

State: WA

Zip Code: 98117

Check here if you would like to be added to the project mailing list.

Alternatives

- Comment on All Alternatives
- 4-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange
- 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge
- 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access
- Other 6-Lane Option

Environmental Topics

- Construction
- Cultural and Historic
- Funding and Tolling
- Land and Structures
- Fish and Wildlife
- Neighborhoods and Communities
- Noise
- Other Environmental Effects
- Parks and Recreation
- Transportation and Transit
- Wetlands/Water Resources

Other Topics

- General Comment
- Urban Design

Enter your comment below. Please be as specific as possible.

I-0313-001

I have read the executive summary thoroughly, and the appendices that further explain the alternatives to the proposals. I found the organization confusing, as there is no stated preferred alternative, inadequate traffic and impacts data relative to the implications of tolls on use and new capacity on traffic patterns.

Specifically: I oppose the Pacific Interchange options completely, due to visual, cost and impacts to wetlands, the navigable channel, views from Laurelhurst, the Arboretum, Rainier Vista. I oppose any form of viaduct reaching to Husky Stadium.

I-0313-002

Further I believe that if the on and off ramps to and through the arboretum are closed for 3-5 years, people would have found another way to get home, and can/should be encouraged to continue to use that rather than LWB through the Arboretum.

As such, I find no alternative acceptable, because they all continue to use the undersized LWB to carry the traffic volume of today plus the traffic volume of tomorrow.

I would like to see serious examination given to enhancing the capacity of 23rd Avenue to carry the bridge traffic south.

I-0313-003

Prioritize transit for the 4 lane option, even at the expense of pedestrian bicycle lane. 6 lanes can fit into the 4-lane bridge section (97 feet wide) with HOV and two SOV lanes and two shoulders each way. All need to be narrowed to minimum dimension, but they fit, and this would be preferable.

Finally, with a second Montlake Bridge to carry dedicated HOV traffic, whose exit lights are prioritized to pass them through to the Pacific Street/Montlake Boulevard Intersection, traffic would be flowing much better, 770 parking stalls at the U would not be lost/or have to be replaced, and impacts would substantially be contained in the already impacted area.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment: In the end I:
oppose Pacific Interchange Option
endorse 2nd Montlake Bridge
oppose any off/on ramps directly into arboretum
suggest 4 lane option prioritized for transit
traffic control prioritized for transit at every intersection
hope to see better analysis on 23rd than has been done before.

Susan Black, Landscape Architect

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad
- Postcard in mail
- Community Calendar
- Poster
- Email announcement
- Project webpage
- From a friend or neighbor
- Other



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

COMMENT FORM

September 18, 2006 Draft EIS Public Hearings

We invite you to provide your comments on the Draft EIS.
 Please fill out this form, use additional sheets of paper if necessary.
 Deposit this in one of the marked boxes or mail it promptly to the address on the back.
 Please write clearly and be as specific as possible.

Thank you for your comments!

Please tell us your zip code: 98112

Would you describe yourself as primarily a:

- Resident in the project area
- Commuter who uses SR 520
- Cyclist
- Pedestrian
- Park user
- Interested citizen
- Other _____

Please select the topic most applicable to your comment.

Alternatives

- Comment on All Alternatives
- 4-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane Alternative
- 6-Lane with Pacific Street Interchange
- 6-Lane with Second Montlake Bridge
- 6-Lane with South Kirkland Transit Access
- Other 6-Lane Option

Environmental Topics

- Construction
- Cultural & Historic Resources
- Funding and Tolling
- Land and Structures
- Fish and Wildlife
- Neighborhoods & Communities
- Noise
- Other Environmental Effects
- Parks and Recreation
- Transportation and Transit
- Wetlands/Water Resources

Other Topics

- General Comment
- Urban Design

I-0314-001

I have been a resident of Montlake and a daily 520 commuter for 19 years. I believe that the 4-lane alternative is the best choice.

Four lanes, including pedestrian/bicycles and breakdown space, will sufficiently improve the travel experience for commuters while also preserving abutting communities and keeping down costs.

How did you hear about this open house?

- Newspaper ad Postcard in mail Community calendar
 Poster Email announcement Project webpage
 From a friend or neighbor Other: _____

Deposit your form in the boxes provided tonight or send your comment by mail to:

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
 c/o Paul Krueger
 414 Olive Way, Suite 400
 Seattle, Washington 98101-1209

Comments must be postmarked by October 2, 2006.

Prefer email?

Submit comments online at www.SR520DEIScomments.com.

Email comments to: SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov.

Do you want to stay involved in this project? We send monthly email updates, and periodic mail announcements about upcoming project meetings. If you would like to be included on the mailing list, please fill in the following information:

Name: RICHARD BROWN

Address: 1969 26th E

City: SEATTLE State: WA Zip: 98112

E-mail: RWAYBROWN@MSN.COM

Also – check out our website at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge

STATEMENT OF CHIP BYRNE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I'm Chip Byrne, and I'm here to talk about the impact of the 520 -- the suggested one right now is the 520 and the HOV, and I totally disagree with that because of a couple of things: the impact to the University of Washington, both physically and the dollars lost for the University of Washington Medical Center, the stadium; the long length of the construction and then how it affects the Arboretum with that link coming in, and you're knocking out a lot of the Arboretum.

The use of the corridors of the existing 520 would in my mind would make the most sense, and it keeps the sanctity of the campus and the University over a thousand years.

So the cost I think is three times as much as using the corridors and the existing, and it's incompatible with what the Sound Transit is trying to do given that you're trying to get buses on an HOV lane faster, and they'd have to sit in traffic for quite a number of time, and you're just moving the problem from Montlake to the University of Washington, which in my mind makes it even much more of a mess.

So it's dubious as far as the traffic benefits. So I would say cost and just construction and just the whole

I-0315-001 | 1 University, and what it's going to do to that area is just
2 amazing to me that they would even consider that. So thank
3 you.

4 This is Chip Byrne again, and the point that I forgot
5 to mention was that the impact to the wetlands using that
6 one that's being proposed is more obtrusive to current
7 wetland properties. So by using the existing corridor,
8 there's less impact on the wetlands. Thanks.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATEMENT OF CAROL CHAMBERS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I-0316-001 Carol Chambers. Many people I speak with are urging at least a study of the tunnel tube option which would perhaps cost somewhat more but at least deserves to be studied and would be able then to lessen the impact visually for private property as well as public property. It seems like something that - there's many tunnels built around the country, and the land is flat coming in there, and it could go underneath the current access to I-5 and have much less impact on Seattle's beautiful waterways and community.

STATEMENT OF GLENN CHRISTY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I-0317-001 My name is Glenn Christy. And I live in Bellevue, and my problem is twofold -- actually threefold.

The worst thing is this bridge is scheduled for only being four or six lanes and not including any dedicated transit lanes, even though one of the most important things is not only dedicated transit lanes but transit runs that runs on a continuously perfect --effectively perfect schedule and not hindered by regular traffic.

Dedicated transit lanes down the middle of the 520 Bridge itself actually across the lake would eventually cut down on a lot of the noise just because of the reduction of traffic. Because it would actually be easier and better for people to actually take the transit as opposed to driving themselves.

If you're on a regular bridge competing with transit or, obviously, you know -- competing with them -- and one of my -- my problem is I feel that transit needs its own dedicated lanes up front; making it a six or eight lane bridge actually across the lake.

You can't get six or eight lanes on the west side to 520. You probably don't need to; they don't need to go any farther than the bus tunnel would take them under Capitol Hill.

I-0317-001 1 Another other problem that I have is sound. You have
2 on the west side -- probably there will be a requirement
3 for stacked lanes, three or four lanes stacked on top of
4 three or four lanes, just to get the lanes out of the way
5 of anybody -- possibly even to cut down on noise -- can't
6 do that on the bridge itself, but you can at least do that
7 on the west side to get the bridges through neighborhoods,
8 whatever. That would allow for an eight-lane bridge. You
9 can't get an eight-lane bridge in any other way.

10 Another problem I have is sound. The west end of the
11 520 Bridge just north of the Magnuson Park neighborhood is
12 a little bit too far south.

13 My opinion is the entire 520 Bridge from the east side
14 -- where it will probably need to stay -- to the west side,
15 on the west side needs to be several hundred feet to the
16 north just to cut down on some of the noise in the Madison
17 Park neighborhood.

18 My opinion is that if you move it a few hundred feet
19 to the north where if you possibly can there will be a
20 considerable advantage in that to the people in Magnuson
21 Park as far as noise is concerned without harming the
22 people north of the bridge too much. Because the people
23 north of the bridge already have to put up with boat
24 traffic already that goes through the Montlake cut, so
25 there shouldn't be too much trouble with noise if they move

I-0317-001 1 the bridge a little farther north on the west end.

2 Okay. Noise is a big problem. I'm against any type
3 of pavement that would be sound reduction because of the -
4 my -- what is my understanding the problems that it would
5 cause as far as traffic accidents when it's wet out. I'm
6 not aware of any noise reduction pavement, but any other
7 noise reduction system they really need to put a lot of
8 money into that.

9 I don't live close enough to have to worry about it,
10 but it is a problem. And I do sympathize with the people.
11 Which is another problem; I can't understand why housing is
12 being built on the east side within only a few hundred feet
13 of 520 right now in the municipalities of Yarrow Point and
14 Hunts Point. It's on the south side of 520, but why -- I
15 don't understand.

I-0317-002 16 I'm trying to think of anything else that I was
17 thinking of. I'm very much in favor of an eight-lane
18 bridge. I'm very much in favor of sound reduction if at
19 all possible, especially -- even though I don't live on the
20 west side -- I can clearly sympathize with the people in
21 Magnuson Park. And other than the transit and the sound,
22 really there isn't too much I'm very much concerned with.

23 But it is very important to me that the transit
24 situations be straightened out better than what King
25 County, Sound Transit, or the State are currently aiming

I-0317-002 1 towards.

2 Okay. And that's about it. I can't think of anything
3 else. So that will be about it then.

- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

STATEMENT OF LINDA CODY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I'm Linda Cody. I'm on the Madison Park Community Council. I have comments regarding the SR520 Bridge replacement and HOV Project Draft EIS regarding Madison Park and the bicycle pedestrian path options.

There are several comments made by the writers of this document that are misstatements in regard to Madison Park. And I called Mr. David Allen about this, and he had not even read the report; and he's the Senior Transportation Director.

His understanding is that this was -- a third-party was hired to do this and put this together. And he had not read the report, and it's been publicized. and this is the information that's going - it's misrepresenting the Madison Park community.

I would like to read one statement to you that is misstated. It's stating, Bicycle and pedestrians traveling to and from either option route would use existing roadways and sidewalks including existing street crossings, East Madison Street, which is the busiest street that pedestrians and bicycles may need to cross, has many well marked, highly visible walk-style crosswalks.

Because the Madison Street/McGilvra Boulevard East intersection is near the Madison Park commercial district,

I-0318-001
1 drivers are accustomed to pedestrian/bicycle traffic at
2 these crossings.

3 We have been working with many members of the
4 transportation center trying to work out all our traffic
5 problems and safety issues. We've had a death in one of
6 these crossings approximately a year ago. And we haven't
7 been able to rectify the traffic safety issues.

8 We've got a very busy intersection that we're looking
9 at; that we can't seem to resolve speeding issues. People
10 are -- and this is -- the intersection that they want to
11 put this bike path through -- this is the intersection that
12 they would add more traffic and bike paths through -- and
13 my concern is that we have -- that our concerns regarding
14 safety in Madison Park are not addressed in any of these,
15 and the bike path is just going through there without any
16 of our concerns being recognized.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

9/18/06

COMMENTS OF DONALD JOHN CONEY RE/RTID AND SOUND TRANSIT II

RTID:

- I-0319-001 | - The list of King County items to be funded by RTID on the '07 ballot should include The Two-way Mercer/Narrow Valley St. project and the Lowered Aurora elements of the SR99 Project north of the Battery St. tunnel mouth.
- I-0319-002 | - The Pacific St. interchange is the appropriate one to ensure smooth connections between Link Light Rail at the Husky Stadium Station and Metro BRT service on the SR520 Bridge.
- Mass transit lanes are important on the SR520 Bridge. Additional general purpose lanes are not appropriate.

SOUND TRANSIT II:

- I-0319-003 | - The streetcar route offered by Sound Transit in mitigation for the deletion of the Beacon Hill Link Light Rail Station should be funded from Sound Transit I funds. The Beacon Hill Station was part of the package of Sound Transit I transit development which the voters approved eight years ago. To fund the streetcar route from Beacon Hill to Broadway/John St. in Sound Transit II dollars would ensure that the streetcar would lag behind Link Light Rail service in Seattle by seven or eight years. Access to the hospital complexes on the hills is too important to wait for that period for service. Please meet the Sound Transit I commitments, before asking for Sound Transit II dollars.

Donald John Coney
3227 – 13th Ave. W., Seattle WA 998119
206/283-2049