

Online Comment by User: KevinBoske

Submitted on: 10/30/2006 11:13:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-12

Address: 8215 21st Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98115

Comment:

I support the 6-lane Pacific interchange option. As a daily commuter from NE Seattle to Redmond (Microsoft). Montlake along the University of Washington is perhaps the greatest bottleneck to my commute.

I-0655-001 |

Online Comment by User: kgp

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 8:20:00 AM

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98028

Comment:

My husband and I oppose widening SR520 to six lanes because of the impact on our beautiful treasure contained in the Washington Park Arboretum.

We MUST stop feeding the automobile/oil-based economy. Our climate is changing. New technologies are called for to preserve this fragile and marvelous web of life we take for granted.

Mass transit, passenger ferries across the lake, more busses (eco-friendly), etc. People will use mass transit if it is convenient. Look to great cities of the world for examples.

We add our voices to the UW Faculty Senate , Friends of Seattle Olmsted Parks and others who are deeply concerned about preserving the natural habitat for all the species who rely on it, including us.

Sincerely,
Karen and Richard Prince
Kenmore, WA 98028

I-0656-001

Online Comment by User: Khenwood

Submitted on: 10/30/2006 12:39:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Address: , , 98103

Comment:

I am writing to express my support of the Pacific Interchange Option for 520 and my opposition to the other options under consideration for replacing the 520 bridge.

The Pacific Interchange Option is a visionary solution to traffic congestion through the Montlake area. Growing up in the '70s, the only traffic problems that I ever experienced were on Montlake Boulevard -- even when our destination was not the 520 bridge. To this day, the bottleneck created by freeway backups stored in the Arboretum, along Pacific Avenue and Montlake itself hamper travel in this city.

The Pacific Interchange Option proposes solutions that will improve the driving experience for those of us who frequently use the 520, visit the Montlake neighborhood, and need to travel through Montlake to get to a destination on the Seattle side of the lake.

The Pacific Interchange option solves current traffic problems by eliminating backups on Montlake Boulevard from University Village to 520.

The Pacific Interchange option solves historic problems by reconnecting some of the divisions created when the original 520 bridge was constructed.

The Pacific Interchange option looks to the future by accommodating more than cars. The plan calls for a direct bike connection to the east side of Lake Washington and it enables a direct connection between 520 and the Sound Transit light rail station planned for the UW.

I hope that you give the Pacific Interchange Option favorable consideration as you review the build alternatives presented in the Draft EIS.

I-0657-001

Online Comment by User: kimmrr

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:40:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-12, Page-9

Address: 2310 14th Ave E, Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

I-0658-001 | I was unable to review and comment on the Appendices, They don't appear to be available as part of this draft EIS (I wanted to review "W" in particular).

Will you be providing these online, with an additional review period?

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-11

Comment:

I-0658-002 | Please elaborate on "provisions for high capacity transit". Does this include the roadway being stiff enough to accomodate rail tracks?

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-13

Comment:

I-0658-003 | Of the options, this one is the best choice.

- It minimizes visual impact in Portage Bay (and for all southerly vistas into Portage Bay)
- Along w/ the lid, it makes for a relatively small "visible concrete" footprint in Montlake.
- It more efficiently moves traffic to/from the north side of the cut.
- Allows us to keep the historic small-scale look of the current Montlake bridge over the cut.

However, the Union Bay bridge as you have shown it is quite ugly. I realize that these are conceptual designs, but this visual depiction, and description of it having a number of vertical supports will lead many to vote against this option, solely for the reason that it has such a negative visual impact.

If presented with a beautiful, striking design, I think you would get more support for this smart option.

I propose that you develop more elegant designs for this VERY visible structure that many drivers, boaters, walkers will have to live with on a daily basis. Specifically, use a minimum number of piers and go either with cantilevered or cable stayed supports.

Anotherwords, since we can't hide this new structure from view, then let's make it really beautiful to look at and proud to have in Seattle.

Maybe the best idea is to engage one of the design firms / architets that specializes in the newer cable stayed bridges.

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-9

Comment:

I-0658-004 | Two comments.

I-0658-004 | First regarding the 8 lane alternative. The impact of this to the Seattle neighborhoods, and to the Bellevue neighborhoods as well, is too drastic to consider, even without the choke point limitations. Those motorists who use SR520 everyday would clearly prefer it, but there has to be a limit to accomodating personal car use at the expense to our neighborhoods.

Second regarding the width of the 6 lane option. The inside shoulders should be eliminated. Yes, they would be ideal for breakdowns in the HOV lane. But if we eventually install light rail in these lanes, we won't have needed it.

I think the luxury of these extra shoulders for inside lane breakdown contingencies does not outweigh the benefits gained by reducing the width and hence the visual and enironmental impact and cost of the 6 lane option.

Comment Category: Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-20

Comment:

I-0658-005 | The lids for the 6 lane option are very important for the reasons stated. An additional consideration is that these lids will directly lead to increased property values and prevent the erosion of property values for those houses that border 520.

Please consider adding lids to the 4 lane option. I won't lobby too hard for this, because I think its clear that the 6 lane option is going to be the right decision. But, if the 4 lane option is selected, it would bring back the property values along 520.

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-24

Comment:

I-0658-006 | Regarding the Madison Park bicycle connection: Both options discussed do indeed improve bicycle connections with Madison Park. However, this is the wrong objective.

Much of the bike traffic connects to points south of Madison Park. Putting it through Mad Park slows it down (Mad Park has lots of small residential streets), and negatively impacts these neighborhoods with this through-traffic.

What makes the most sense is to put this traffic on a bike path through the Arboretum, parallel to L. W. Blvd, where it can connect easily to points south of Mad Park, the Central Area and First Hill. THIS is the option that the neighborhoods pursued in the 1990s. It benefits the most bikers; provides them with the fastest flow; and it keeps the character of Mad Park intact. Furthermore, in regards to these SR520 connections, it resolves the issue by having neither built, and instead, use the connector to LW Blvd.

Comment Category: Second Montlake Bridge

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-27

Comment:

I-0658-007 | This option, even if executed with a bridge that matches the current bridge in design, will visually interfere with it; the Montlake bridge has great character and visual integrity, and a second bridge next to it will give a cluttered industrial look to the Montlake cut.

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-30

Comment:

I-0658-008 | Consider covering the bike lanes over the lake to provide a dry ride on rainy days.

Comment Category: Ecosystems

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-41

Comment:

I-0658-009 | I think I read that the creation of new wetlands may have to take place elsewhere, such as the Skagit River.

The wetlands, wildlife habitat, and greenery in general are important to the look and feel of our neighborhoods, and we need to (a) preserve as much as possible, and (b) perform restoration locally. Maybe this requires a solution such as DOT purchasing private property near SR520 and reverting it to wetland / wildlife use. (Consider auction; I'm not proposing eminent domain)

Comment Category: Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-2

Comment:

I-0658-010 | Making aesthetically pleasing sound walls will be very important, as the visual impact of this big flat sided structure will be substantial. The usual approach is to use patterned concrete. I would propose that DOT work with a leading design firm to find alternatives to simply patterning the walls -- perhaps paintings? Perhaps mixed media using large bolt on wood surfaces which themselves have designs?

It is important that we find some visually compelling alternatives that complement our city's beautiful natural vistas.

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-4

Comment:

I-0658-011 | The reduced visual impact to Portage Bay of fewer lanes due to the Pacific Street Option is very important. Already, the visual impact of all the build alternatives is quite negative, so anything to minimize such impact is important.

Online Comment by User: kirk brewer

Submitted on: 10/24/2006 4:40:00 PM

Comment Category: Neighborhood Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-1

Address: , , 98115

Comment:

I-0659-001 | I live in the Ravenna Bryant Neighborhood and do not want the Pacific Interchange to increase traffic (specifically cut through traffic) in my neighborhood on 25th avenue and or around to Sandpoint Way. It seems this interchange is going down the road of the RH Thompson Freeway that was put down back in the sixties. This is not a positive affect on neighborhoods.

Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-1

Comment:

I-0659-002 | I prefer this alternative with the improvements to the current Montlake interchange and adding a second Montlake bridge. No added lanes on Montlake beyond Husky stadium.

Comment Category: Parks and Recreation

Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-1

Comment:

I-0659-003 | The arboredum I believe is Federal park land and should not be impacted with increased traffic or interchanges such as the Pacific Interchange.

Comment Category: Second Montlake Bridge

Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-1

Comment:

I-0659-004 | I prefer this alternative best! From a cost standpoint and least impact as a whole. It appears the Shelby-Hamlin group has been the force behind the Pacific Interchange to only increase the value of their neighborhood while putting the huge cost on the rest of us. Work with what we have. What is the cost of buying a few houses and building a second bridge verse millions spent on a huge concrete structure, parking garage, and all the other infrastuctures that are impacted while maintaining the view corridor of the UW (lowering the Pacific/ Montlake intersection). Yes traffic is bad at this bottle neck, but why extend it only further north into the already congested University Village and surrounding neighborhoods.

Comment Category: Comments on Construction Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-1

Comment:

Construction for the Pacific Interchange will cut off access to the UW hospital and many UW activities (Husky stadium and Hec Ed/ Bank of America Arena).

Online Comment by User: kizim

Submitted on: 10/7/2006 7:30:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2008 E. Louisa Street, Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

I support Pacific Street Interchange - After thorough review of this document.

Thanks,

Kimberly Welch

2008 E. Louisa (one street from the freeway!)

I-0660-001 |

Online Comment by User: knesz@comcast.net

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 5:15:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98107

Comment:

hello,

please, please , please dutifully study the impact on the Arboredum and surrounding area's environment, and don't just choose the plan of whichever neighborhood group screams the loudest. the entire city has a stake here, not only the neighborhoods directly impacted. i know the decisions are tough, but thats why you guys are in the position that you are.

concerned citizen

eric knesz

I-0661-001

Online Comment by User: krantz

Submitted on: 9/28/2006 10:47:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-28

Address: , , 98122

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange alternative.

I-0662-001 |

Online Comment by User: Kristine Wallen

Submitted on: 9/9/2006 12:21:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98112

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange Option.

I-0663-001 |

Online Comment by User: ksdj

Submitted on: 9/14/2006 9:35:00 PM**Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange****Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-10****Address: , Seattle, 98112****Comment:**

My husband and I heartily support the Pacific Street Interchange option as it is the only one that actually results in an elimination of all high congestion areas (see maps on previous page). In addition, and perhaps most importantly, it is the only one that links buses that cross the bridge with Sound Transit. If we are going to actually improve traffic flow throughout the region we have to do a better job of connecting our disparate transportation systems. This option does that! Lastly, there are better options for mitigating disruption to park lands, because the Pacific Street option creates space to increase park lands!

I-0664-001

Online Comment by User: ktorra

Submitted on: 9/10/2006 11:07:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98113

Comment:

I am a Montlake resident and as such think the best alternative for my family and neighborhood is the Pacific Interchange.

I-0665-001 |

Online Comment by User: Kurt Wieland

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 9:01:00 AM

Comment Category: Ecosystems

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: PO Box 1420, North Bend, WA 98045

Comment:

I wish to voice my strong opposition to any bridge widening for 520 that will impact the Arboretum and natural wetlands in the area.

Building a 110-foot-high bridge that would visually impair the quiet of the Arboretum and putting in more bridges and concrete columns is simply unacceptable.

I fully accept that 520 needs to be repaired, but I cannot support DOT's plans to widen the bridge to six lanes.

We saved the Arboretum and its neighboring wetlands 35 years ago from plans to put interchanges through it-- the dead end off-ramps that remain are reminders of that foolish plan. The simple fact is, the bridge was built in a terrible place and we're stuck with it-- like I-5 through downtown, there is not much you can do to widen the bridge without causing terrible harm to the values of the surrounding land.

I would rather continue to sit in traffic on a rebuilt, four-lane, earthquake-safe bridge, than sacrifice one view, cattail or quiet canoeing lagoon from the Arboretum.

The state must explore and select other options to protect this treasure, which is not just regionally important, but is internationally recognized as a unique urban oasis. The world is watching to see if Seattle will sacrifice yet another one of its icons in the name of "progress."

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Kurt Wieland

I-0666-001

Online Comment by User: kylefaino

Submitted on: 10/2/2006 4:42:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2419 11th ave e, seattle, wa 98102

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange Option!

I-0667-001 |

Online Comment by User: Lace Thornberg

Submitted on: 10/26/2006 3:21:00 PM

Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98103

Comment:

In my wallingford household, there is one bike to downtown commuter and one drive to the eastside commuter. we are both in favor of the proposed four lane version on 520 reconstruction. light rail/rapid transit and a bike lane are needed on 520. 6 lanes are both too destuctive and too expensive.

I-0668-001

Online Comment by User: lairdmcduff

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 8:13:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Address: 16204 Main St, Bellevue, Wa 98008

Comment:

I favor the 6-lane alternative. The lid will allow for increased park/play area and access while providing adequate traffic flow between Seattle and the Eastside. The HOV lane MUST be controlled, and there must not be any provision for 'HOT' access to the rich single-passenger cars. I also favor making the new stretch of 520 a tollroad - let the users pay for part of the cost.

I-0669-001

Online Comment by User: Larry Hard

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 9:11:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98105

Comment:

I live in the Laurelhurst neighborhood of Seattle, I am concerned about protecting the environment, and I am in favor of this alternative. It is the best overall solution for an extremely complex problem. It is the best solution for the Montlake Bridge mess and it is the best way to integrate our regional mass transit system with the replacement of the 520 Bridge.

The Laurelhurst Community Council does not speak for me or for many of my neighbors in this matter.

I-0670-001

Online Comment by User: Laura HW

Submitted on: 9/13/2006 4:38:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

Before going ahead with the original plan, consider the Better Bridge modification which a concerned group of citizens has come up with. That version makes more sense than the original land preserves the environment better. Thanks

I-0671-001

Online Comment by User: lckwhite

Submitted on: 10/3/2006 3:19:00 PM**Comment Category: General Comments****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: , , 98105****Comment:**

Hi

I am writing to express my concern about the potential plans for the 520 bridge replacement. It is critical that we protect the arboretum, the bird habitat around the Center for Urban horticulture, and the Laurelhurst neighborhood. Shifting the traffic north on montlake will only make the situation near the University of Washington athletic complexes worse.

The pacific interchange will have devastating effects on the Arboretum, UW athletics and hospital, the Center for Urban horticulture, and the environment in general.

Please do not consider this a viable option.

thanks very much

-Lisa White

I-0672-001

Online Comment by User: leiapico

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 6:20:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-1

Address: , Redmond, WA 98052

Comment:

I think a Pacific Street interchange is a great idea. I take the bus every day to the University of Washington and the 520 bridge causes a huge backup. The lack of an HOV lane on the bridge is horrible. Six lanes would be much better. Access to the University would be so much easier and faster for the high volume of traffic travelling there. It would also bypass the Montlake Bridge altogether, which would remove some of the heavy traffic load from that area.

I-0673-001

Online Comment by User: Lekness

Submitted on: 9/13/2006 7:45:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-12, Page-15

Address: ,, 98112

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange Option

I support the Pacific Interchange option because if the base six is selected the Montlake streets will be condemned forever to never ending congestion and all the related ramifestations of congestion.

I-0674-001

Online Comment by User: Ielander

Submitted on: 9/1/2006 8:28:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-30

Address: 10325 NE 55th St, Kirkland, WA 98033

Comment:

INPUT ON ALTERNATIVES:

1) 4-lane vs. 6-lane vs. do-nothing: There's no question that the 6-lane alternative is the only logical option, given our state's ongoing desire for economic growth, and the limits we have already placed upon ourselves in terms of growth because of the Growth Management Act. Any decision to select the 4-lane option is simply naive and misguided. (By the way, I sincerely question the conclusion that under the "do nothing" option, over 1/3 of commuters will migrate to some form of transit. I therefore believe the relative benefits of "do-nothing" vs. either the 4-lane or 6-lane options are understated.)

2) Pacific Interchange vs. Montlake Bridge vs. do-nothing: Despite modest reservations about building a concrete structure over a very picturesque section of Union Bay, there's also no question that something needs to be done to improve the safety of the merge onto 520 from the U-district before the I-5 interchange. The Pacific Interchange seems to be the most effective.

INPUT ON FORMAT OF PRESENTATION ON THE WEB:

This is a difficult document to read in the current format, where each page change requires a new load. Even on a cable modem, the load delays are annoying. It's also *extremely* difficult to refer back to diagrams/exhibits that help illustrate whatever points are being made. I don't pretend to understand the tradeoffs that have to be made to make the document more accessible for readers, but this was very, very difficult to review in a meaningful way. I would hope that before you present the next round of documentation, you'll review alternatives. (Is it so difficult to load a chapter as just one .pdf as opposed to 49 different pages, for example??)

Thanks

Online Comment by User: Leonard Garfield

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 3:50:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: MOHAI, 2700 24th Avenue East, Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the SR520 Expansion Project.

Since 1952, the Museum of History & Industry has served millions of Seattle area families, schoolchildren, and visitors from around the world at its Montlake home. During that period, the museum not only built the facility but invested millions of dollars in subsequent site-specific improvements, including special climate-controlled galleries, a state-of-the-art research library and archives, a photographic lab and darkroom facility, specialized collections storage areas and conservation lab, and a 375-seat auditorium with full stage and high-quality technical infrastructure. In the 1950s, MOHAI deeded the museum building to the city and now operates under the terms of a long-term lease.

The EIS correctly notes that MOHAI has begun to explore options for the eventuality that the 520 expansion may result in the demolition of the Montlake building. Our plans include reviewing opportunities at the Naval Reserve Armory Building at South Lake Union, although much work remains before either MOHAI or the city will be able to determine if that site is feasible. It should also be noted that the South Lake Union option provides for additional MOHAI exhibit space, but does not include an auditorium, conservation lab, library or archives, collection storage or other specialized functions. MOHAI plans have always included continuing those functions and other programming at the current Montlake facility.

I look forward to discussing with you further the impacts on the proposed project on the Museum of History & Industry.

Sincerely,

Leonard Garfield
Executive Director
Museum of History & Industry
2700 24th Avenue
Seattle, 98112
(206) 324-1126 x 32

Online Comment by User: leonard

Submitted on: 10/27/2006 11:18:00 AM**Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: 1838 east shelby street, seattle, WA 98112****Comment:**

I want to support the Pacific Interchange 520 proposal. Every time I approach the Montlake Bridge from the north and am waiting in traffic for the bridge to open and close I think about that 520 proposal!! It seems to me it would be a great improvement if all the southbound cars who want to travel on 520 could simply get on the proposed interchange and avoid the Montlake Bridge congestion. Just think of how often that bridge is up and down and of all the delays it causes. Just that alone should be enough reason to go with the Pacific Interchange option. We all know there are no perfect solutions but please give this one very serious consideration.

I-0677-001

Online Comment by User: LeslieBrazeau

Submitted on: 9/13/2006 9:54:00 AM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange option. It is the only option that allows for reconnection of the Montlake neighborhood, new bus service on local streets, elimination of backups on Montlake Blvd, creation of a new transit hub at the UW and a new park connecting the Montlake playfield with the Arboretum.

Please support the Pacific Interchange Option.

thank you, Leslie Brazeau

I-0678-001

Online Comment by User: Linda Baker

Submitted on: 9/30/2006 1:17:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2426 E. Interlaken Blvd., Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

I am supporting the Pacific Interchange Option. I work at the University of Washington and live in Montlake. The traffic along 24th Avenue is increasingly bad- noisy, speeders, drive time congestion. Same with Boyer Avenue.

Getting across the Montlake Bridge is also a challenge many times of the day. There is a traffic bottleneck there. I believe the Pacific Interchange option mitigates these neighborhood problems better than the other options, and still meets regional transportation needs.

I also support high speed buses rather than rail as the rapid transit choice for 520.

Thank you,
Linda Baker

I-0679-001

Online Comment by User: lindafurney

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:43:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2350 Minor Ave E, Seattle, wa 98102

Comment:

I have lived in Seattle my entire life, and own a home in Eastlake where I live with my Husband and six-year-old son. I have worked for The Boeing Company for 20 years, the last four of which have been from my home as a Virtual Worker. Everyone in my organization telecommutes – and thousands of car trips daily in the Puget Sound area are eliminated – traffic congestion, energy consumption, and pollution are reduced.

I DO NOT support any increase in the number of lanes over the SR 520 bridge.
I DO NOT support a new ramp over Marsh Island (the "Pacific Street Interchange).

I support incentives for businesses that support telecommuting and virtual workforce.
I support rebuilding SR520 with a 4-lane alternative ONLY.
I support effective stewardship of Seattle's precious 'lung' - the Arboretum.

Building a (obscenely expensive) 6-lane 520, or the "Pacific Street Interchange" would have huge negative impacts on our living environment in Seattle. Whatever the perceived benefits are they are not worth it. I say perceived – because cars will fill however many lanes are built – and the new 6-lane 520 will STILL be a parking lot at rush hour – only an outrageously expensive one that is a bit wider than it is today.

The choices we make will form what Seattle becomes – it is your job to think of the long-term environmental cost of these decisions!

Linda G. Furney
2350 Minor Ave E
Seattle WA
98102
206-769-8278

Online Comment by User: LindaStoner

Submitted on: 9/15/2006 1:40:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 1847 E. Shelby St., Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

We wholeheartedly support the ideas of the Pacific Interchange option suggested by the Better Bridge organization. They have made an exceptional grass roots effort to improve our city's transportation future. Our only hope is that the Pacific offramp will be allowed at a reduced height. The coast guard would surely serve many more people and the environment by allowing a reduced height. Thank you very much.

I-0681-001

Online Comment by User: Linnea Hirst

Submitted on: 9/10/2006 5:11:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98112

Comment:

It's important that the state have a neutral engineering firm who has "tube" expertise, do a real feasibility study of the tube/tunnel alternative before we make any decisions on the SR-520 replacement.

If the tube/tunnel is feasible, and if it doesn't put an exit into the arboretum area, it is by far the best solution to air, water, visual and noise pollution on the western end of the 520 project.

I-0682-001

Online Comment by User: Lisa McCabe

Submitted on: 10/26/2006 8:12:00 PM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-3

Address: , , 98105

Comment:

I am concerned that a tube tunnel (a partial tunnel extending beneath Portage Bay & Montlake and extending out past Madison Park and Webster Point) was not seriously considered/studied as a viable alternative. It seems to have been eliminated from the menu of alternatives before evaluated by a professional team of consultants/engineers.

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-1

Comment:

Again, an appropriate place for my comment asking why tunneling was never considered or explored as a reasonable alternative? Just because we have a highway today running through one of the most beautiful and pristine natural areas doesn't mean we have the right to expand it further! I can't imagine that under today's environmental restrictions 520 would be built if there weren't already a structure in place. We should be better stewards of our environment and seriously explore cutting edge and environmentally sensitive ways of achieving better traffic flow without irrevocably damaging a unique and beautiful resource like the Arboretum.

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-5

Comment:

Aha! The tunnel idea! WSDOT studying the tunnel alternative is not the same as an independent engineering firm studying the tunnel alternative. Yes, it's costly. Yes, it initially might create more disruption in areas. Yes, it might take longer for vegetation to re-establish itself. BUT--- 50 years from now, what is going to look best? Are we focused on the cheapest and easiest alternative or the best?

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-11

Comment:

The Pacific Interchange option does very little to nothing to alleviate rush hour traffic north point #4 as shown on the map and outlined on the attached statistics. As a commuter to downtown Seattle from Laurelhurst who travels this route at least twice per day, this seems insane. The back up north of the Montlake Bridge all the way up 45th to Mary Gates Drive is also critical and sees little to no improvement.

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-7

Comment:

Why aren't renderings provided on the view impact from Webster Point looking south and east? Laurelhurst is one of the affected neighborhoods and I don't see this addressed anywhere. Additionally, this document is not clear (at least not to me) about how far east the sound walls will extend. It's my understanding that any sound walls will NOT extend fully past Webster Point on the north side of the bridge thereby exponentially increasing the noise level in this area.

Comment Category: General Comments

I-0683-001

I-0683-002

I-0683-003

I-0683-004

Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-2

Comment:

Consideration should be given (and realistic renderings provided to the public) regarding the view impact from Webster Point looking south and east as it will significantly change vs. what is in place today.

I-0683-005 |

Online Comment by User: ljosifek

Submitted on: 9/20/2006 5:28:00 PM**Comment Category: General Comments****Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-4****Address: 11429 179th CT NE, Redmond, WA 98052****Comment:**

Separate Bicycle pathway needed as part of the executed plan.

With the obesity and gasoline problems reaching an increasingly larger audience, more adults are turning to bicycle riding for commuting and performing daily tasks of living. I am an older women who has been riding again for about a year now. I ride about 20 to 50 miles per Burke- Gilman trip and about 100 miles a week in total. These trips include the library and groceries as well as trips for pleasure. My husband has been doing an increasing amount of bicycle commuting to work, clubs and business meetings. I think we are typical of a new group of riders who want more safe bicycle connections in the greater Seattle area.

I think Seattle's economic and livability index ratings will be well served by this kind of planning.

Please include bicycle pathways and their maintance in all of your planning.

Lorraine Josifek

I-0684-001

Online Comment by User: Imercer

Submitted on: 9/9/2006 7:15:00 PM**Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: , Seattle, WA 98112****Comment:**

I-0685-001 | After reviewing all the alternatives, I believe the only plan that will improve the backups on Montlake Blvd. is the Pacific Interchange Plan. This plan will absolutely positively impact my commute in to work at UW.

Please support the Pacific Interchange Plan. The other options spell disaster, as they will only create a blight in neighborhoods like Montlake and Portage Bay and will not improve the public transportation connections in Seattle.

Thank you.
Leigh Mercer

Online Comment by User: lorasdo

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 12:52:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98115

Comment:

Why must we be first in line to sacrifice our environment and one of our city's gems for the benefit of mostly single use automobile transportation? What happens when six lanes aren't sufficient to carry traffic? Roads only breed more trips, increase pollution and defer responsible investments in public transit infrastructure. Vancouver maintains Stanley Park inviolate, San Francisco chose not to replace the Embarcadero, and NYC, years ago, stopped Robert Moses from destroying lower Manhattan with a crosstown freeway. A new six lane interchange is not necessary. A better way would be to replace the Evergreen Bridge with a new structure to include dedicated mass transit while keeping the existing footprint for automobile traffic the same.

I-0686-001

Online Comment by User: lorriepeterson

Submitted on: 9/29/2006 6:16:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-11, Page-1

Address: 10606 NE 19th Place & 24037 NE 64th Court, Bellevue & Redmond, WA 98004

Comment:

Support the City of Bellevue's recommendation they discussed at their recent Council meeting and the letter they directed staff to forward.

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-4

Comment:

Support the City of Bellevues recommendation.

High occupancy transit should continue to downtown Redmond/Bear Creek Park and Ride behind Target, were SR520 ends.

Widening SR520, Bridge, and Transit options should be a top priority for the State and move forward with the project asap.

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-2

Comment:

Support the City of Bellevue's recommendation they discussed at their recent Council meeting and the letter they directed staff to forward.

I-0687-001

Online Comment by User: Louise Luthy

Submitted on: 9/15/2006 11:32:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98105

Comment:

I was able to attend a presentation this week at the Hard residence on the Pacific Interchange alternative to SR520. I was impressed with the fact that it will above all other plans: 1. Reduce the bottleneck thru the cut 2. Dovetail with proposed transportations developments to make a successful and quick East- West and maybe Northwest commute thru the light rail at the UW. Additionally, that Metro would add more busing along Montalke. 3. That parks will be minimally impacted and most likely enhanced. 4. That a ton of concrete is not poured over Montlake and surrounds 5. A bridge of incredible beauty could be built to enhance the beauty of our city at the same time being functional.

It is also wonderful that there will be a shoulder (especially for aid cars) and a bike path.

The concerns are for view and bike path: 1. the height of the bridge- 110 feet is double what is there now and seems excessive being both hard for bikers and a very serious view impediment. I understand the coast guard ultimately decides this and that there is to be no drawbridge and also thoughts to what the future of shipping will bring to the lake. 2.to reduce the noise as much as possible.

We don't have a panoramic view to be blocked by a bridge but rather peeking views. However, a bridge of stunning beauty while addressing the mountain and lake views of those who have them seems a stunning result in addition to all the other benefits this plan provides. We support it as the best and most productive on the table. Thank you, Louise Luthy

I-0688-001

Online Comment by User: Isanphil

Submitted on: 10/30/2006 12:36:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-1

Address: , , 98195

Comment:

I-0689-001 | It is clear that the 520 bridge needs to be replaced for structural reasons and increased traffic needs.

What is not clear, is why a tube tunnel was not one of the alternatives studied. It is just one option, but unlike the rebuild it could be the option that greatly reduces the impacts to the environment, to the Washington Park Arboretum and to the visual and audio impacts to the surrounding neighborhoods.

I-0689-002 | The loss of wetlands in a rebuild will affect many animals in the food web - among the most economically significant is salmon. Other animals affected would be the hundreds of species of migratory songbirds and waterfowl, the Merlin Falcon ("...the Merlin is less common than the Peregrine Falcon!" <http://www.merlinfalconfoundation.org/>), the mated American Bald Eagles (currently building a nest near Foster Island), the Beaver and the myriad of other important species that are integral to the food web.

The loss of wetlands reduces the number of school children who can be educated on the importance of the Food Web in an ecosystem such as the Fresh Water Marshes that surround Lake Washington. Of course, there are also the aesthetics of a wetland area and the psychological need for such spaces.

I-0689-003 | Something that is not really present in the EIS is how these alternatives interact with Mayor Nickels 2006-2007 Environmental Agenda (see below for the full press release) or how it interacts/takes into account the Kyoto Agreement standards - at least for the portion of the project that takes physical space in Seattle.

I-0689-004 | How is it effective or efficient to build something that removes trees considering the City of Seattle is going to great lengths and expense to ADD trees to the urban environment. The city recently spent time and money restoring many wetlands around Lake Washington just in time for a 520 rebuild alternative to remove and shade out - that doesn't make any sense.

I-0689-005 | Would a tube tunnel be less destructive? Would more trees and more wetlands and more vistas be left in tact? How can we possibly make a decision on something as important as this project until an impartial study is done on how a tube tunnel will affect the environment, the neighbors and the traffic?

I implore you to allow the tube tunnel to be studied and considered as an alternative to rebuilding.

From the Mayor's website <http://www.seattle.gov/mayor/>

NEWS ADVISORY

SUBJECT: Mayor Nickels Announces 2006-2007 Environmental Agenda
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
7/27/2006 11:00:00 AM FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:
Steve Nicholas (206) 615-0829
Martin McOmber (206) 684-8358

Mayor Nickels Announces 2006-2007 Environmental Agenda
Builds on climate change leadership; announces first-ever forest management plan

SEATTLE -- Mayor Greg Nickels has released the city's 2006-2007 Environmental Action Agenda, which builds on Seattle's leadership in the fight against climate change and outlines how the city will restore its urban forest, protect water quality and build healthy communities.

The four pillars of the Action Agenda - the Climate Change Initiative, the Restore Our Waters program, the Green Seattle Initiative and Healthy People & Communities - link the health of the urban ecosystems to the prosperity, health and social equity of the city as a whole.

"A healthy urban environment isn't just a nice thing to have," Nickels said. "It's vital to the health of our residents and our economy. That's why this Environmental Action Agenda is such an important part of my administration."

This fall the city will release for comment the Urban Forest Management Plan -- the first-ever comprehensive plan for restoring and managing Seattle's urban forest. Because of construction, invasive plants and old-age, the city's tree cover has shrunk from 40 percent of the city in 1972 to just 18 percent today.

The plan will guide the city as it strives to meet aggressive tree planting goals on public and private land, and will detail tree maintenance and restoration plans that will preserve the forest's beauty and ability to help clean the air and water.

Also this fall, the mayor will unveil the Seattle Climate Action Plan, which will guide the city in specific measures to further reduce its greenhouse gas emissions as well as detail ways the city can lead residents and businesses in the fight against climate disruption.

The city is succeeding in protecting aquatic habitat and water quality and will continue to do so under the 2006-2007 Agenda. It has completed shoreline restoration of Green Lake and Lake Washington, built 42 blocks of natural drainage systems, and enacted progressive development protections for ecologically sensitive areas. The agenda calls for new incentives for property owners to manage storm water on their own land and new capital improvement projects aimed at improving water quality.

The Healthy People & Communities program will continue to strengthen the city's Green Building Program; push for improvement of transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and work to increase housing choices in neighborhoods across the city.

To see the recent accomplishments and key next steps in each of the four Agenda areas, go to www.seattle.gov/environment.

Online Comment by User: Ishifflette

Submitted on: 10/19/2006 2:10:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 13053 42nd Avenue NE, Seattle, WA 98125

Comment:

We use the Montlake corridor a great deal and the alternative proposed in the Pacific Interchange Plan appears to make far better sense to us than other alternatives and it appears to improve traffic in this area . We endorse it. Thank you.

I-0690-001

Online Comment by User: Islarson

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 5:32:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you in advance for your time. As a Seattle native (born and raised) and a longtime resident of the Madison Park, Arboretum/Interlaken and Montlake neighborhoods, I am deeply concerned about the "520 Pacific Interchange" proposal.

The widening of roads around and within a very delicate ecosystem (i.e. Arboretum and Foster Island), as well as the proximity of this proposed interchange to a renowned area of the University of Washington campus is not a viable solution. On a larger scale, the introduction of new roadways (or widening of lanes) is not necessarily the most effective measure to remedy transportation concerns. In this specific case, the location at which the proposed interchange would be built is in direct conflict with the natural settings that have been protected for decades by the State of Washington, the University of Washington and residents of surrounding communities (particularly Montlake).

Frequently I walk the Foster Island trail and the paths around the Montlake Cut and the University of Washington climbing rock with my family. I have been doing this for over thirty years, long before the 520 floating bridge became a "reverse commute" to such growing cities and metropolitan areas as Bellevue and Redmond.

In addition, I am a longtime Husky season ticket holder who has enjoyed the sense of community and loyalty that is evident in the 70,000+ fans who gather before, during and after the Husky games in the adjacent parking lot. Removing this traditional gathering venue (which has been around as long as, if not longer than the existence of the 520 floating bridge) would be a travesty. I speak on behalf of not only my family, friends and colleagues, but also the thousands of Husky football fans and supporters. This has been reiterated dozens of times in local press and television interviews with University of Washington supporters, as well as Montlake residents.

I support the financing proposal to improve the condition of the existing two-lane 520 floating bridge. However, the proposed development of the "520 Pacific Interchange" is counterproductive to both the environment and the community as a whole (University of Washington, surrounding neighborhoods and the people of Washington State who appreciate and enjoy the natural beauty of the campus at our state's largest university).

Commuters from the eastside neighborhoods to Seattle (and vice-versa) will always have the option of Interstate 90 for their cross-lake commute. Move forward with repairing the existing structural damage on the 520 floating bridge. Going beyond this step with the proposed interchange does not have my support.

Thank you again for your time.

I-0691-001

Respectfully submitted,

L.S. Larson
Seattle, Washington

Online Comment by User: LStenkamp

Submitted on: 9/18/2006 12:21:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

comment on alternitives

I-0692-001 |

My family supports the Pacific Interchange plan. We lived in the area which is most affected in Seattle.

Online Comment by User: luarendt

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:55:00 AM**Comment Category: General Comments****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: ,, 98028****Comment:**

I drive the 520 bridge each day from the eastside to Madison Park and then return. I experience the same traffic snarls, backups, disabled vehicles on the bridge that everyone else does. But where is there any place more beautiful to be stuck in traffic than near Foster Island. I have observed bald eagles, great blue herons sitting on the sculptures, comorants with wings spread, Canada geese flotillas, grebes and ducks. This small piece of marshland is so important to the entire Lake Washington environment that every effort must be made to protect and even enhance this city gem.

Please consider other options, such as a second "lid" over the existing 520 or even a cross lake tunnel. It is easy to pour more concrete, but replacing the ecosystem of the marsh and the adjoining arboretum would be next to impossible.

I-0693-001

Online Comment by User: lucascupps

Submitted on: 8/25/2006 9:56:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-6

Address: , , 98105

Comment:

This is the reason I support the Pacific Interchange Option. I do not want to experience increasing traffic congestion from University Village to Montlake.

I-0694-001 |

Online Comment by User: Lyle Appleford

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 9:31:00 PM

Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

The Arboretum has already been damaged too much, and the 6-lane with a high bridge from Pacific would be even worse. A 4-lane with a minimum footprint, and a bicycle/pedestrian lane should be the solution.

Lyle Appleford

Madison Park

I-0695-001

Online Comment by User: Lynnvo

Submitted on: 10/26/2006 11:03:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98052

Comment:

I do not regularly commute over the 520 bridge, but the impact of the traffic going over the bridge has a direct impact on my commute every day as I travel from Redmond heading South. This area is not known for its foresight into traffic issues and now is a good time to change that perception. The 6-lane alternative with an HOV lane sounds like the best alternative and shows planning. Why would we not take advantage of the construction time and build for the future. We are already decades behind on our traffic needs and it's only going to get worse.

I've been in a vanpool for over 12 years and the surge in HOV lane usage is unbelievable this year. In fact, our van and two others that I know of are both having to leave 1/2 hour earlier each morning just to get to work on time. This shows the success of van and carpooling and should most definitely be a consideration for any major highway project.

Thank you

I-0696-001

Online Comment by User: M. C. Halvorsen

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 2:53:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-1

Address: 10002 Aurora Ave. N., #5546, Seattle, WA 98133

Comment:

I-0697-001 | I have lived in the Seattle area since 1965 and I have never seen anyone bicycle across 520. I think the bicycle lane is unnecessary and only adds to the width of the proposed bridge.

I believe that the six lane proposed bridge is much too large in width. A four lane bridge is more acceptable.

M. C. Halvorsen

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-7

Comment:

I-0697-002 | I do not believe that there has been enough consideration of the effects of this proposed new bridge on the Arboretum. More study is needed.

M. C. Halvorsen

Online Comment by User: maizels

Submitted on: 9/19/2006 3:18:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98112

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange option. It is only option that improve transit in both Seattle and the eastside and keeps the neighborhoods near 520 intact.

I-0698-001 |

Online Comment by User: marcia baker

Submitted on: 9/10/2006 2:49:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98112

Comment:

I strongly support the Pacific Interchange Option for the following reasons:

1. It is the most efficient way to link cross-lake transportation to north south mass transit. It can eventually provide a convenient, smart, mass transit system for both sides of Lake Washington, and thus it (unlike either base-6 option) can lead to decreasing greenhouse gas emissions, an avowed goal of our city and county government.

2. It provides maximum greenspace, minimum concrete and minimum community disruption.

Our city has to move toward the future we all know is coming, when our population soars, gas prices are high and our air quality is even more endangered than it is now. Simply adding more concrete will only intensify these problems.

Yours

M. B. Baker

I-0699-001

Online Comment by User: marciam

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:06:00 AM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-1
Address: ,, 98144

Comment:

I-0700-001 | Why do our "solutions" always come at the cost of our environment? And, where do we stop? Will four lanes be enough? For how long? Ten years from now it will be eight lanes? These bandaid approaches are clearly not the answer or the long term solution. We have to get people to carpool and we need rapid transit.

I-0700-002 | I'm a third generation Washingtonian and I am so disheartened to hear about this proposed expansion of 520 at the Arboretum. What will you do with the beaver dam -- located on the north side of 520 by the Nellie Cornish fountain? I think you lack imagination and empathy for the environment.

Online Comment by User: margaret carr

Submitted on: 10/27/2006 8:57:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-10

Address: 3608 Lakewood Ave So, Seattle, Wa 98144

Comment:

I-0701-001 | As a life-long Seattle area resident, member of the Arboretum Foundation, active
community volunteer and commuter, I strongly support the position of the Arboretum
Fondation and support other options with less impact on the Arboretum.

I-0701-002 | I am dismayed that I was not informed of the community meetings, and feel that two of
them is not nearly enough for public involvement.

I-0701-003 | Hopefully, the Puget Sound really is a part of the green movement (i.e. Mayor Nickels tree
planting program), and this emphasis on impacting existing wetlands and reducing green
spaces for the sake of concrete structures to afford more space for automobile exhaust is
ludicrous.

Online Comment by User: Margaret Kitchell

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 4:33:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-7

Address: , , 98122

Comment:

I am against all six lane alternatives and in favor of the 4 lane alternatives for a number of reasons. I am very concerned about global warming, and in the news today are reports that Great Britain considers it a serious emergency, which I believe it is. We have a mayor in Seattle who is a leader to combat this, and also county executive, but we have only made relatively small steps so far. On the other hand we are responsible, in the US, for 25% of the world's global warming emissions, so I believe we need to take much more serious steps, and looking to options that don't add more lanes is part of that.

I believe we have not invested enough in public transportation and in transportation demand management, using a variety of methods to encourage people to travel in more efficient modes. A fairly small amount of money invested in demand management would go very far to decrease single occupancy vehicles. There are many people on 520 who take transit, but more could if TDM was used.

I believe we need to have excellent pedestrian and bicycle access between areas north and south of the canal, and that the cross-lake bike/ped lane should be connected south of SR 520 to Madison Park. We need to invest more in efficient, safe, attractive walking routes and bicycle routes, both to lessen global warming, and also improve our health.

I-0702-001

Online Comment by User: marge

Submitted on: 9/10/2006 8:36:00 PM**Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: 1885 E Hamlin Street, Seattle, WA 98112****Comment:**

I-0703-001 | My husband and I support the Pacific Interchange option for the SR520 project. This alternative would provide solutions to current traffic problems for everyone in this region while preserving the beautiful Montlake area that we love. A really good solution is one that is sensitive to all of the parties concerned-the Pacific Interchange alternative is a win-win solution.

Thank you for considering my comments

Sincerely,

Marge Bodre
Montlake Resident

Online Comment by User: margot

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 8:37:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-4

Address: , , 98115

Comment:

Dear Paul,

I-0704-001 | All i can say on this 6 lane expansion plan is NO NO NO. You're just making the ride over the water faster. The jam-up once here in Seattle still exists. This solution is poorly planned.

I-0704-002 | The plan must preserve the the Arboretum as a historical park & wetlands. Most of the other wetlands already have been ruined by the UW (Montlake Parking for Husky Stadium & students). Magnuson Park wetlands now under serious threat by a Parks Levy (that i thought was to maintain & preserve existing parks) that will use \$12 million to develop a "for profit" sports complex on top of the wetlands there. I thought it was the law to protect the wetlands. I guess just us private individuals have to abide by that SEPA law??

I-0704-003 | The expansion will ruin the park, the ecosystem. Just like Joni Mitchell's song goes, "Pave paradise, put up a parking lot". Your plan & its creators really scare me. You are ruining the quality of life around here trying to accomodate cars. Encourage current drivers to have to pay a toll on the existing bridge. I bet then if bus transportation is free (paid for by the tolls charged) more people would use the Park & Ride lots & take the bus. Make it cost prohibitive to use the existing bridge & watch the change.....

I-0704-004 | I will vote no to every Transportation Proposal until you come up with a better thought-out plan. Whoever came up with this idea needs to be terminated.

Conside more Park & Ride lots on the Eastside with better bus service & a toll fee.

Sincerely,

M.M. Nims

Simple idea but ever so practical & so much less expensive in dollars and lost quality of life.

Online Comment by User: mariakaufman

Submitted on: 9/18/2006 9:25:00 AM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98112

Comment:

I fully support the PACIFIC INTERCHANGE option. It is the only option that works for our region.

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

Comment:

This is THE best option on the table.

I-0705-001

Online Comment by User: Marie McEwen

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 5:05:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-2

Address: , , 98052

Comment:

I fully support creating a 6 lane 520 bridge. The current bridge configuration does not meet the needs of our communities. It is disgraceful that this problem has been allowed to go on for so long. Now that we have to replace the bridge, let's do it right and build a bridge that will take us into the future.

The bike and pedestrian lane on 520 is very important. We need to continue to make the Seattle area more friendly to walkers and bikers.

All improvements to intersections that will significantly reduce congestion are critical. Seattle had some of the worst traffic problems in the nation. Light rail will be a major step forward and we need to make the links to light rail easy for commuters and travelers.

We need to continue to address the problem areas in our region and this is a major step we can take now.

Marie McEwen

I-0706-001

Online Comment by User: Mark Nerheim

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 12:45:00 AM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2707 11th Avenue East, Seattle, WA 98102

Comment:

I-0707-001 | I have lived in my home in the Roanoke Park/Portage Bay neighborhood for 22 years. I used to live in Kirkland while attending the University of Washington, so I have first hand experience with the commute across 520 also. (Believe me, it was bad in the 1970s and early 1980s too).

I am very concerned about the adverse impact that the current proposals will have upon our neighborhood, Seattle, and the Eastside communities alongside the path of 520. I am concerned about the impact upon wetlands, fish, fowl, and wildlife populations. I am amazed that anyone would consider a 6 lane alternative as being at all reasonable and appropriate. Further, from what was presented at the meetings that I was able to attend, the 6 lane proposals are in reality 8 lane or larger proposals because of the current requirements for shoulders, "emergency" lanes, and bus acceleration/merge lanes. Even the 4 lane proposal is too big, given the current highway design standards.

Seattle fought the RH Thompson Expressway and we can only thank those residents who stood up to the pressures to build that highway. I cannot believe that we are again facing similar choices, with such limited options.

In many ways, the DEIS has shown itself to be woefully inadequate -- especially in its global failure to consider seriously aggressive peak-load or congestion pricing (tolls shouldn't be used simply to raise project funds), the environmental impacts, and the impacts upon surface streets and I-5 within Seattle. I also do not understand the shortshrift given tunnel options.

I-0707-002 | It is also troubling that many of the public meetings were set on very short notice.

I-0707-003 | I also don't understand the apparent interest in making a decision so soon.

Before considering the current proposals, I believe that the WSDOT should first consider instituting aggressive congestion pricing tolls and see how rush hour traffic is affected -- in terms of getting people out of single occupancy vehicles, changing trips patterns to different times of the day, and encouraging people to live near where they work. All of these are laudable goals and warrant careful review.

I-0707-004 | [In passing, I note that the current DEIS suggests that income redistribution effects would be both significant and socially unacceptable such that they would swamp any proposed benefit (which might not be true). But what benefit is met by having people, of all income levels, sit and waste time in traffic jams? It should be obvious (but to many it isn't) that time is the one resource that cannot be recaptured or recycled. Further, if one is truly concerned that income redistribution effects could be very great, several public sector economists have suggested mechanisms to return supposed "excess receipts" back to low income groups

I-0707-004

through a variety of alternative programs. Professor Halvorsen (now chair) of the Department of Economics at the University of Washington is an economist who has explored such issues with respect to other public services such as electrical utility pricing models.]

In summary, I can only hope that the WSDOT (and its consultants) for once will and resist the WSDOT's natural tendency to build and build and build again.

Respectfully,
MARK B. NERHEIM

Online Comment by User: Mark Wener

Submitted on: 10/12/2006 8:14:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-6

Address: ,, 98112

Comment:

I appreciate DOT's process.

The tunnel/tube clearly is not feasible.

The Pacific Street Interchange is the only proposal that seems to help traffic and is the only one that connects Sound Transit with a cross-bridge express bus system. It also will have some impact on improving traffic at the University of Washington and University of Washington Medical Center continue to grow and need improved access.

I favor the 4-lane alternative with the Pacific Interchange.

Thanks,

Mark Wener

I-0708-001

Online Comment by User: markgosselin

Submitted on: 9/13/2006 9:19:00 PM**Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: 2307 19th Avenue East, Seattle, WA 98112****Comment:**

I-0709-001 | Please only consider the Pacific Street Interchange option. The standard 6-lane option will just leave another short sighted concrete monolith as our legacy. Do we want a beautiful well functioning city or gray mess of misguided capacity? We marvel at the amazing structures from the early 1900's that are still standing and cherished. How come we wouldn't build something of the same class today? Why have we lowered our standard for building projects to such mediocracy? Do we want to keep Seattle special ... or just another undescrpt US city made from masses of stamped concrete. Worry about how your decision will be preceived from a community living with the result, not the far off forces that lack the vision to be great.

Best Regards,
Mark Gosselin

Online Comment by User: markjon

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:09:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-2

Address: 2923 277th Ter SE, Fall City, WA 98024

Comment:

I-0710-001 | There is too much focus here on "better transit options to automobile commuting" which aren't actually better. I like my car and think it's the best option for commuting. The mass transit options that have been discussed around here are slow (even when running in dedicated roadways), inconvenient and waste valuable public resources that could be devoted to the more realistic and practical option that we have today...the automobile. I'm not aware of any other city that "grew up" on the car (e.g. not NY or Chicago or European cities) which has successfully adopted mass transit as the primary transportation method. I don't see why Seattle would be any different and so far the Sound Transit effort is proving me correct. The commuter trains are expensive and carry few passengers (relative to total commuter volume), the upcoming light rail line is a slow-moving waste of space and the silly "T" interchanges for carpool lanes are monuments to waste.

I favor alternatives that recognize the reality that I'm going to continue driving my car, as will nearly everyone else. I do not favor government attempts to "socially engineer" my habits to accept the inferior lifestyle required by mass transit. I'm particularly tired of the attitude that making life in the SOV lanes painful will motivate me toward mass transit. The social contract I have with my government (see John Locke) does not allow it to intentionally reduce my daily quality of life while it conducts an ill-conceived "experiment".

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-9

Comment:

I-0710-002 | But we know that traffic will probably continue to grow even past 2030 so why not take the opportunity now to build an 8-lane capable bridge? Isn't it more cost-effective to build room for 2 additional lanes now (even if we only use 6 lanes) than to come back later and start up a separate project to build 2 more lanes? I remember the huge project from the early '90s to add only one lane in each direction on I-405 (HOV of course...what a waste!). That was the one where the sides of bridges were torn up and retrofitted to add just enough room for a single lane. And what's happening right now on 405? Another huge project that involves tearing out edges of roadways that are only 15 years old to add, you guessed it, one additional lane. Did anyone in 1993 seriously believe that adding one HOV lane was really going to solve the problem long-term? It was obvious to people I talked to that it was too little and we'd be right back there again soon adding more lanes and now that's come true, although I doubt any of us thought that congestion on 405 would be allowed to get so bad before anything was done. So why would we place ourselves in the same position on the 520 bridge? Build the extra capacity while we're at it even though we can't use it fully until 5/405 are improved.

Online Comment by User: markqcotter

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 1:54:00 PM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Address: 2125 169th. Place S. E., Bothell, Washington 98012

Comment:

I prefer any alternative that has more than four lanes. The Pacific Street Interchange would appear to be the best option, but I support any six lane (four general purpose plus two HOV) or eight lane (six general purpose plus two HOV) option. I oppose any four lane option.

I-0711-001

Online Comment by User: markrevere

Submitted on: 10/3/2006 10:32:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 4750 45th Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98105

Comment:

I-0712-001 | As a Laurelhurst resident, I strongly support the Pacific Street Interchange option for the sr520 bridge improvement, primarily because it is the only solution offered that addresses the significant traffic problems on 25th NE to the Montlake bridge. In doing so, this option also provides the best possibility for increased transit usage along 25th NE (either Metro or Sound Transit, or both), affording the opportunity of increased ridership.

I strongly encourage limiting the height of the Union Bay Bridge associated with this option to 70 feet, and I am opposed to a 110 foot structure.

Finally, I encourage the use of noise-reducing techniques to the extent possible in the final plan.

Thank you,
Mark Revere

Online Comment by User: marlys7

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 2:01:00 PM**Comment Category: General Comments****Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-1****Address: ,, 98118****Comment:**

A 6-lane bridge is not an acceptable solution to the eastside problem of single car commuters. This current design does not show any of the previous design review comments or recommendations so it is unreasonable to proceed with this project review without first seeing recommended changes to the design. Having someone from WSDOT verbally confirm that there will be some changes to the design is not a conformed standard of design practices. This current design has severe negative effects to the arboretum, residential areas and natural habitats through the montlake/u district area. As a seattle city resident, i would prefer to see a design that works with the limits of the area rather than trying to increase the footprint on an existing eyesore.

I-0713-001

Online Comment by User: marsh

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:05:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-8

Address: ,, 98119

Comment:

Please takje the Pacific Street interchange alternative off the table. The damage to the arboretum and to Marsh Island, its wildlife, and user enjoyment of these areas would be unacceptable.

Michael Marsh

I-0714-001

Online Comment by User: martha73

Submitted on: 10/26/2006 11:00:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-11, Page-1

Address: ,, 98103

Comment:

The UW climbing rock located near Husky Stadium is an important part of Seattle--I believe it is one of the oldest man-made climbing structures in the country (if not the oldest). It illustrates the long history Seattle has had with the outdoors. The UW rock is the classic training area for aspiring climbers. It is the only training area with challenging cracks. I have spent many days relieving stress by climbing on this structure.

The Pacific St Alternative will destroy the UW rock. Please save the rock!

A better option would be "no change" or the "4-lane alternative" which won't harm the UW and the UW rock.

Martha Stevens

I-0715-001

Online Comment by User: Mary Ann Trower

Submitted on: 10/8/2006 9:40:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2077 East Howe, Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

As a 46 year resident of Montlake, I strongly support the Pacific Interchange Option. This would preserve the neighborhood, increase access to the U of W from the east side and encourage the use of public transit for many.

I-0716-001

Online Comment by User: Mary Lynn Jensen

Submitted on: 10/30/2006 6:29:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2419 E Helen St, Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

Dear reviewers,

I live 2 blocks from the Arboretum and walk through the Arboretum 2 to 3 times per week.

I am not supportive of the Pacific Interchange proposal because of its negative environmental impacts and the negative impacts on the view corridors.

My first preference is the 4 lane option.

Thank you,

Mary Lynn Jensen
2419 East Helen Street
Seattle WA 98112

I-0717-001

Online Comment by User: Mary Merlino

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:37:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

I live in Interlaken,north capital hill.. I am very concerned about the arboretum...very sacred ground..I already avoid Montlake. I commute to Bellevue. Refuse to drive on 520. I can already hear the traffic most of the day. I support the minimal impact on the Arboretum and my neighborhood. I also want easy access to information about the planing process.
Thanks

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Comment:

I live in Interlaken,north capital hill.. I am very concerned about the arboretum...very sacred ground..I already avoid Montlake. I commute to Bellevue. Refuse to drive on 520. I can already hear the traffic most of the day. I support the minimal impact on the Arboretum and my neighborhood. I also want easy access to information about the planing process.
Thanks

I-0718-001

Online Comment by User: Mary_Hausladen

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 4:56:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 5015 9th AVE NE, Seattle, WA 98105

Comment:

October 31, 2006

Paul Kruegar
WSDOT Environmental Manager
SR 520 Project Office
414 Olive Way, Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98101

Dear Mr. Krueger,

I-0719-001 | We are writing on behalf of the Roosevelt Neighbors' Alliance (RNA), an organization representing a community bounded by I-5 on the west, 45th St on the south, Ravenna Boulevard to the north and 11th Ave NE on the east. We have reviewed the DEIS on the SR 520 Replacement project and would like to offer the following comments.

First, our organization strongly opposes the Pacific Street Interchange option. This option would have a host of adverse effects on the University of Washington, Union Bay, and the Arboretum and surrounding wetlands. In particular the Arboretum is a vital sanctuary in our city that must be preserved. Additionally traffic in and around our neighborhood, as well as neighborhoods surrounding the University will become worse, as drivers use already clogged neighborhood streets to enter and exit 520 via any Pacific Street Interchange. We strongly urge you to remove this option from consideration.

I-0719-002 | Second, we wish to express our support for a four-lane replacement for the SR 520 Bridge. It is also our position that the design should include lids to mitigate the higher levels of noise and adverse environmental effects of a rebuilt SR 520. Lids should be required regardless of whether or not a four or six lane alternative is ultimately adopted. A six-lane alternative (but NOT the Pacific Interchange) might be more attractive to our group if there were a strong commitment to future addition of high capacity transit in the SR 520 corridor. As things stand now, the design alternatives do not support such an addition, and we are convinced that the six-lane alternative will only encourage more single occupant vehicles and create more, rather than less, congestion on SR 520 and in our community.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

Mary A. Hausladen Angela Storey
RNA Co-President RNA Co-president
(206)465-4684 cell

Roosevelt Neighbors' Alliance • 4534 University Way NE • Seattle, WA • 98105

Online Comment by User: Maryfreiburger

Submitted on: 9/17/2006 6:53:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2611 25th Ave E, Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

I would like to express my comments on the new 520 bridge.

I would like to recommend the Pacific Interchange option.

The alternatives would create a massive bridge that would have detrimental effects to our neighborhood and I am not sure they would resolve traffic problems like the Pacific Interchange option would. i am also concerned about noise and environmental impact from a larger bridge.

The avenue running from the Montlake Bridge to University Village and north is such a mess. We routinely have doctors appointments, and similar matters north of the Montlake bridge. The traffic on 520 backs up on to this avenue creating such a mess.

We rarely take 520 but its impacts are definitely felt in surrounding neighborhoods.

We plan on living in Montlake for many many years and enjoy our neighborhood so much.

Thank you for taking our comments.

Mary Freiburger

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Comment:

I would like to express my comments on the new 520 bridge.

I would like to recommend the Pacific Interchange option.

The alternatives would create a massive bridge that would have detrimental effects to our neighborhood and I am not sure they would resolve traffic problems like the Pacific Interchange option would. i am also concerned about noise and environmental impact from a larger bridge.

The avenue running from the Montlake Bridge to University Village and north is such a mess. We routinely have doctors appointments, and similar matters north of the Montlake bridge. The traffic on 520 backs up on to this avenue creating such a mess.

We rarely take 520 but its impacts are definitely felt in surrounding neighborhoods.

We plan on living in Montlake for many many years and enjoy our neighborhood so much.

Thank you for taking our comments.

Mary Freiburger

I-0720-001

Online Comment by User: maryfroese

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 9:34:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Address: , , 98033

Comment:

I-0721-001 | This is an amazing and thorough study. I appreciate all the work that has gone into it and the sensitivity to areas affected, the history of these regions that would be affected, the environmental, ecological, social and aesthetic considerations, as well as the well-laid-out options for response. Congratulations on all this work!

I-0721-002 | Now, I have to say, that considering building more roads is just crazy. We have to get people out of their cars and into low impact, high density modes of travel. We have a serious greenhouse gas problem and the biggest contributor is CARS! So is the pollution of Puget Sound - CARS - water run-off from our roadways.

Our glaciers are melting. Our air quality has worsened dramatically since I moved here 20 years ago. The history of Los Angeles has proved that building more roads only encourages more automobile traffic, rather than lessening the congestion problem. People need to work where they live and developers cannot go on creating housing farther and farther out and expecting the taxpayers to build the roads to carry all those people. No, we need an infrastructure that does NOT RESPOND to urban sprawl, but rather makes it possible for people to move efficiently and with low environmental impact.

Why doesn't Microsoft move some of its offices to Seattle, so people who live in Seattle can work in Seattle. UW has a Bothell Campus- Use it More! Etc, Etc Etc.

We have to draw the line.

Also, I'm sick of seeing all the natural elements and habitats destroyed for the sake of us humans who can't seem to figure out how to live in a balanced manner with the rest of the creatures and within the limited capacities of the ecosystems of our earth. Everyone thinks, well, its just this little corner of Lake Washington, or this strip of trees - Mayor Nickels will plant some more somewhere else and it doesn't matter!

Here where I live, in the Rose Hill- Bridle Trails area of Kirkland, a beautiful strip of Madrona trees was recently cut down (one of the very rare and in my mind precious Madronas left over here and something I enjoyed driving by every day.) They were cut down. Why? So that the city of Redmond could widen Old Redmond Road and put some sort of center island thing in so traffic could move in and out of the side streets without crashing into each other - or some such. Or so more Micosrofies could get to work quicker. I don't know why. But do you know how hard it is to grow a Madrona? They are a gift. They aren't even sold in nurseries because they are so fragile and dependent on just the right soil.

What a lack of understanding of the preciousness of these beings we cohabit the earth with. They are there only to serve us and to be chopped down when they get in the way. There is no intrinsic value given to anything in our natural environment if it gets in OUR WAY.

I-0721-002

So,Sorry for the rant, but I think we have to JUST SAY NO to more roads! Period. And find another way. Get over it with the need to drive our individual cars back and forth everywhere we go. Our city Cannot Sustain it and shouldn'e even be trying. Let's chart a new path.

Thank you.

Comment Category: Neighborhood Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-9, Page-2

Comment:

I-0721-003

That day care center should never have been allowed to be built there in the first place. At that current busy intersection the children are being exposed to hazardous exhaust all day long. I can't imagine any parent putting their child there and considering that a building with an asphalt playground in the middle of a busy intersection backing up to a major freeway consitutes a healthy envrionment for their kids. What was everyone thinking, including the Day Care licensers?

If you add more lanes and an expanded intersection, forget the day care. It would be a crime to have children there!

Online Comment by User: Matt Geyman

Submitted on: 9/9/2006 7:13:00 PM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

I strongly support the Pacific Interchange Option. It is clearly the best option for the city and the region, and I urge you to select it. I live in Montlake and have lived here for many years. I know from years of personal experience that the Montlake Boulevard bottleneck is a major transportation issue in this part of Seattle. The Pacific Interchange Option is the only alternative that will address this problem. In addition, the Pacific Interchange Option will help the overall transportation network by connecting to the transit hub at UW. It makes no sense for the UW transit hub not to connect to the transportation corridor between Seattle and the East Side, yet that is what would happen if any of the other options were selected. The Pacific Interchange Option will also create additional green space and connect the Montlake Playfield with the Arboretum, which will be a terrific addition to our greenbelt and park system. I believe that the decisionmakers need to take a long view and choose the option that will be the best for the neighborhoods, the city and the region for the next 100 years or more, and that is clearly the Pacific Interchange Option. The Base Six alternatives (even with a new Montlake bridge next to the existing bridge) would simply add to the congestion and would not have any of the huge advantages of the Pacific Interchange Option listed above. Please do the right thing and select the Pacific Interchange Option.

I-0722-001

Online Comment by User: Matt Weber

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 5:15:00 PM**Comment Category: General Comments****Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-14****Address: 3220 103rd Pl NE, Bellevue, 98004 98004****Comment:**

To whom it may concern:

I-0723-001 | We believe that the expansion between NE 92nd Street and Bellevue Way is much to far south. We believe that there should be more consideration of expansion to the North along this stretch. We believe that the solution for sound abatement has not been given enough consideration and that the proposed walls are inadequate. The proximity to the Spring Hills neighborhood will lower the value of our homes and impact our quality of life for our families. We strongly encourage you to provide a solution that minimizes the expansion to the south between NE 92nd Street and Bellevue Way by pushing the expansion to the North where it will not impact as many residences. Additionally, the impact to the wetlands in this area has not been studied adequately. We experience an abundance of wildlife in our neighborhood on the ground, in the streams, and in the trees and air. This impact should not be overlooked.

Sincerely,

Matt Weber

Online Comment by User: MattRosoff

Submitted on: 8/22/2006 10:11:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-10

Address: 5549 31st Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98105

Comment:

I-0724-001 | I strongly support the Pacific Street Interchange and 6-lane option. It is the Option that the EIS predicts will have the most positive effect on neighborhood traffic, particularly the intersection at NE 45th and Montlake Blvd. See Exhibit 5-6 for evidence. It will reduce time from 45th to 520 by 20 minutes during peak hours, according to the EIS; the other options will not. Reducing neighborhood traffic should be one of the goals of the 520 project--it's not fair to reduce freeway traffic at the expense of neighborhoods. It's also better for transit, restores the character of the Montlake neighborhood, and has a lesser visual effect and footprint on the marshland east of Montlake compared with the other 6-lane options (since the 520 roadway will be able to be narrower).

Comment Category: Second Montlake Bridge

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-10

Comment:

I-0724-002 | I do not support the Second Montlake Bridge plan for the 6-lane alternative. It would not have a positive effect on neighborhood traffic, and in fact would increase traffic through the Montlake neighborhood. The Montlake Bridge opening causes major bottlenecks in the evenings--sometimes it can back traffic up for 30 minutes or longer back up to 24th St. Adding a Pacific St. Interchange is a much better option--it reduces neighborhood traffic, improves peak travel time from 25th Ave to 520 by 20 minutes, and eliminates the drawbridge bottleneck. Reducing neighborhood traffic should be a goal of the project--it's not fair to reduce highway traffic at the expense of local neighborhoods. Thank you.

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-10

Comment:

I-0724-003 | We have a once-every-hundred-year opportunity to alleviate traffic on 520. Spending more than 2 billion dollars without increasing traffic capacity is insane. The 4-lane option would be a waste of taxpayer dollars. The only option that makes sense is the 6-lane option. Specifically, the option with the Pacific St Interchange, which would also help reduce neighborhood traffic.

Online Comment by User: mawilloughby1

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 7:56:00 AM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , Seattle, WA 98103

Comment:

Hello 520 Decision Makers-

I-0725-001 | Because the area around the Montlake Bridge, Foster/Marsh Island and the Arboretum is so important to me, I was compelled to write to you concerning the 520 rebuild.

I understand the need to repair and/or rebuild 520 to make it safe for drivers. I simply urge you to do so with the least amount of negative impact on the precious wetlands surrounding the west side of the bridge.

Just last weekend (10/28/06), I took a long walk through the Arboretum to look at the fall colors. Amazing yellows, reds, oranges and sunshine made for a spectacular walk.

The peak of my loop walk was the wetland area just north of the Arboretum visitor center. I stood by the waters edge on the trail and saw the following within just a 10 minute timeframe:

Four breeding pairs of Wood Ducks (not many places to easily view them in Seattle)

Heard Pine Siskins (winter visitor)

Saw a Red Breasted Nuthatch

Saw a flock of American Goldfinches fly over head

Saw a perched Sharp-Shinned Hawk take off in a flash to chase the goldfinches (exciting to see)

Two adult Bald Eagles fly overhead, one carrying a large stick (nest material)

Several pair of Mallard, Gadwall, American Coots, Green-winged Teals and other ducks

To see such a variety of songbirds, raptors and ducks in a beautiful wetland unique to our area, is a treat not to be taken for granted. There were many, many people walking around the area enjoying its beauty. There's no guarantee the area will recover or rebuild itself to ever be the same.

Please do your best to protect this urban gem and vital wetland habitat.

Sincerely,

Melissa Willoughby

4121 Linden Ave N #201

Seattle, WA 98103

Seattle resident since 1992

206-399-4239

I-0725-001
Seattle resident since 1992

Comment Category: Ecosystems

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Comment:

Hello 520 Decision Makers-

Because the area around the Montlake Bridge, Foster/Marsh Island and the Arboretum is so important to me, I was compelled to write to you concerning the 520 rebuild.

I understand the need to repair and/or rebuild 520 to make it safe for drivers. I simply urge you to do so with the least amount of negative impact on the precious wetlands surrounding the west side of the bridge.

Just last weekend (10/28/06), I took a long walk through the Arboretum to look at the fall colors. Amazing yellows, reds, oranges and sunshine made for a spectacular walk.

The peak of my loop walk was the wetland area just north of the Arboretum visitor center. I stood by the waters edge on the trail and saw the following within just a 10 minute timeframe:

- Four breeding pairs of Wood Ducks (not many places to easily view them in Seattle)
- Heard Pine Siskins (winter visitor)
- Saw a Red Breasted Nuthatch
- Saw a flock of American Goldfinches fly over head
- Saw a perched Sharp-Shinned Hawk take off in a flash to chase the goldfinches (exciting to see)
- Two adult Bald Eagles fly overhead, one carrying a large stick (nest material)
- Several pair of Mallard, Gadwall, American Coots, Green-winged Teals and other ducks

To see such a variety of songbirds, raptors and ducks in a beautiful wetland unique to our area, is a treat not to be taken for granted. There were many, many people walking around the area enjoying its beauty. There's no guarantee the area will recover or rebuild itself to ever be the same.

Please do your best to protect this urban gem and vital wetland habitat.

Sincerely,

Melissa Willoughby
4121 Linden Ave N #201
Seattle, WA 98103
206-399-4239

Seattle resident since 1992

Online Comment by User: maxmorris

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 5:16:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2614 E. Helen St., Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

(I drafted comments for over 2 hours, but your system timed me out, so they are lost. You should design better software for your comments system or advise commenters about their session time remaining. I will try to summarize my earlier comments here.)

I am a 12 year resident of the Montlake/Arboretum area and I commute to Microsoft daily.

The EIS report and the plans available do not give full information about many of the options, especially the Pacific Interchange Option. This is irresponsible. In particular, no written or mapped information adequately depicts the actual route cars will take to get to or from the new south-side ramps on Union Bay Bridge. Are there planned improvements to Lake Washington Boulevard to connect to 23rd/Montlake Boulevard? Will there be a lot more traffic on Lake Washington Boulevard connecting to Madison Avenue? It seems like there will not be.

I object to the tone of the EIS, particularly in how it frames the Pacific Interchange Option. For example, in chapter 4 in summarizing the visual impact, the monstrous new structure of the Union Bay Bridge is simply and briefly described as a prominent new bridge. The flawed framing continues in chapter 5 where more detail is provided but the bland, neutral tone is maintained, as though the Pacific Interchange Option were just yet-another-option among equals. It is NOT such a thing! In truth, the Pacific Interchange Option -- with its monstrous new Union Bay Bridge, the essential relocation of the major Montlake Boulevard thoroughfare, and the reconfiguration of 30 acres of property from the UW and the Arboretum -- amounts to a massive reengineering of a huge (over five neighborhoods are directly affected) and historical area of Seattle. This kind of back-door public policy is poor government. Decisions on this scale rightly belong within a direct and transparent political process, not under the rubric of building a new bridge.

I support replacing the 520 bridge with a six lane bridge. I think the Six Lane Alternative is great work! It may need some minor changes to align it better within the neighborhoods, for example, the second Montlake bridge. But otherwise, it represents balanced, constrained, and targeted design. I am not a fan of many of its impacts. But overall it seems like some good tradeoffs were made to have it fit as well as it can within the existing footprint, with minimal reengineering of the way people live, while still bringing all the transportation benefits.

The Pacific Interchange Option is an entirely different matter. It is not just a new bridge; it amounts to a change in how people will live their lives in the huge affected area of Seattle. First, because it is doing so much more, it costs quite a lot more and will have a big construction impact. Second, I believe it would be a disaster on commuting overall, on the historically-emergent configuration of the Montlake neighborhood, on the Arboretum itself, on the wetlands environment to the north of the Arboretum, on the University of

I-0726-003 | Washington (its endowed lands and its activities), and on the overall aesthetics of a monumental 100-year-old waterway.

The benefit of significantly lowering average wait times for drivers north of the ship cut is important, though the Pacific Interchange Option was not originally pursued for that reason. Rather, it was proposed and devised by some residents of Montlake/ Arboretum to selfishly insulate the neighborhood by reengineering everything away from it. But Montlake's configuration as a transit area was settled 40 years ago when the original freeway was put in, and even before that back to before recorded history. Not everyone in the Montlake/ Arboretum area agrees with the Better Bridge Coalition or the Montlake Community Club! Montlake/ Arboretum is great in many ways because of its historical charm and its centrality of access. With the stability of the last 40 years, basic patterns of value in Montlake/ Arboretum have been settled -- from the profound (per house land values throughout the area relative to street traffic) to the mundane (timing morning and afternoon and weekend plans, laundry drop-off / pick-up). Reconnecting a 100 year old neighborhood is an absurd abstraction -- more like resurrecting the dead, or really, pulling the wool over your eyes regarding the real agenda. Indeed, now that the impact of the Pacific Interchange Option, on commuting and the Arboretum in particular, is becoming clear, residents of Capitol Hill and Madison Park/Valley are clamoring in alarm. Some Montlake/ Arboretum residents have been clamoring all along.

I-0726-004 | I believe that northside wait times can be improved in other ways that do not drastically reengineer our entire area. The UW -- both the institution and its community of 60,000 -- suffers much of the traffic. But even the UW objects -- if coyly -- to the Pacific Interchange Option. That's no surprise -- a loss of 1000 parking spots and 15 acres, plus major disruption to its master plan, will not go over well. Yet even your own analysis shows that there are other options to impact northside wait times that have less cost and much less impact. For example, the second Montlake bridge is just one example that would improve flow as much as 50 percent of what the Pacific Interchange Option is expected to achieve. The second Montlake bridge has the added benefit of tying in well with the originally-proposed Six Lane Alternative because it wouldn't require major reengineering or people's lives or significantly expand the constrained footprint of the Six Lane Option. Indeed, with minor modifications to improve merging (reducing interarrival times, e.g. smoothing and reducing the gaps between cars), traffic should flow very well relative to shunting queueing cars over to ramps on the Union Bay Bridge. I'm disappointed there was no analysis of this; I think this represents incomplete planning around the second Montlake bridge option. Also, the second bridge can be built to aesthetically and architecturally complement the existing and historical bascule bridge.

I-0726-005 | Finally, I will address the Arboretum. The impact on the Arboretum is the most under-discussed item in the EIS, I believe. It is easy to compare wait times, abstract notions of neighborhood reconnection, and properly configuring public transit options. I wish there were more data on some of these things, i.e. expected impact of the Pacific Interchange Option on traffic flow throughout the Madison/23rd/Montlake/Lake Washington Boulevard area. People understand and can transact cost/benefit analysis in their mind when they have data. It is much harder to analyze ineffable value. What's so important about a park and its quietude? How do you place value on the aesthetics of a view from

I-0726-005 | Foster Island or Marsh Island on Opening Day, or in the storming rain? How can you transact in the impact on one of the remaining wetlands when, following proper procedures, the impact on the aquatic environment can actually be fairly mitigated? I am disappointed that there was so little effort put into prominently framing and trying to answer these important questions. I am confident, though, that you will learn about the value of the Arboretum and the negative impact on it the Pacific Interchange Option will have. You will learn a lot about the value of the Arboretum from people's emotional connection to it via comments like mine. I expect you will truly learn the value of the Arboretum when that emotional connection gets translated into a swelling and focused nexus within the political process that opposes the Pacific Interchange Option and its social engineering.

In the meantime, I hope you will invest in investigating other, more effective, less impactful, and less costly adjustments that can make the Six Lane Alternative succeed.

-Max Morris

Comment Category: Second Montlake Bridge

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-10

Comment:

I-0726-006 | More capacity for flow through Montlake from the 2nd bridge and less congestion on the larger freeway should tend to substantially mitigate queueing and reduce wait times. Further optimizing this by placing the queue on expensive ramps suspended over an park, historic waterway, and wetlands shouldn't be your only goal here.

Also, it's not clear what the real benefit of Montlake Boulevard acting as more of an arterial is when most of the traffic on it is bridge related anyway.

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-26

Comment:

I-0726-007 | You minimize the visual impact the Pacific Interchange Option. Currently, the Montlake Ship Cut is a beautiful, historical waterway enjoyed by many people from many angles -- car, kayak, canoe, walkers on the many trails. SR520 is not at all visible. The Pacific Interchange Option destroys the entire view by imposing a huge, aesthetically disconnected structure into the middle of it all. It is not just a "prominent bridge" and calling that does not properly frame the discussion.

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-30

Comment:

You claim that you'll be acquiring lots of new parkland with the Pacific Interchange Option. What you don't note is that you'll be building a huge new structure on top of a scenic waterway and destroying the aesthetic and environmental of existing parkland including and around Marsh Island.

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-31

Comment:

The Pacific Interchange Option permanently removes 15 acres from the UW endowed lands. The UW should be getting more land, not less.

Comment Category: Second Montlake Bridge

I-0726-007

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-6**Comment:**

You say that with the 2nd Montlake Bridge Option, the amount of traffic between I-5 and Montlake would be very similar to the 6 lane alternative, vs the great benefit of the Pacific Interchange option. This doesn't make sense, or perhaps it represents an incomplete option. The 2nd Montlake Bridge Option would support plenty of traffic between SR520 and the Pacific Street area. You could redo the Pacific Street interchange to connect to this new capacity, without building a whole bridge above Marsh Island or taking land from the UW.

Comment Category: Second Montlake Bridge**Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-7****Comment:**

Again, you are saying that throughput will be better in the Pacific Interchange option vs. the 2nd Montlake Bridge option. But that's because of the combination of surface street work around Pacific Street connecting to better throughput on the Pacific Interchange Bridge. But the Pacific Street work could also be done in conjunction with the 2nd Montlake Bridge, though that's not what your considering here. With those two elements combined together - - appropriately (it must still be designed it seems) -- equivalent flow capacity should be achieved compared to the Pacific Interchange option, as less cost and at much less impact on the UW, Arboretum, and the waterway.

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange**Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-10****Comment:**

The worst overall effect of the Pacific Interchange Option is that it will create a massive amount of traffic at the north end of the Arboretum, where the Union Bay Bridge would terminate. How is traffic supposed to get there from where it is now, namely on the Montlake Blvd / 23rd artery??? Go over the Montlake Bridge, then double back on the Pacific Street Ramps? That seems crazy and it won't improve traffic flow. The alternative is to jam through the Arboretum, either on Boyer or on Lk WA Blvd. Your engineers tell me this loading won't change, but I don't agree with that -- people won't want to drive up to the UW to get onto 520. And you will have 3 lanes and an HOV lane connect there, so why go up to the UW? So the Arboretum will become a parking lot. That is bad! At a minimum, much more detailed study and discussion of impact on flow through the area south of the new bridge in Seattle is desperately called for!

Online Comment by User: mckaysteven

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 5:26:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 55407

Comment:

I-0727-001 | I have been watching this process unfold over the past several months with much dismay. A former 13 year resident of Seattle who has every intention of returning, I take great interest in this project.

I am disappointed at the lack of vision in these alternatives. These are basically just more road. I am not convinced that the parties involved in the initial screening of options have the expertise to eliminate some of the modern, yet expensive, options, namely a subsurface tunnel across Lake Washington.

I-0727-002 | I am disappointed that the significance of the Washington Park Arboretum does not seem to be recognised. This is one of the more important arboreta on the North American continent, with a unique collection of living plants. The WPA has no serious competition within the regional climate zone of the Pacific Northwest and is the premier collection of living trees and shrubs in Washington. As an alum of the University of Washington College of Forest Resources (MS 1996), I am appalled that the Washington Park Arboretum and the other components of the University of Washington Botanic Gardens could be at such great risk from the Washington State Department of Transportation.

I-0727-003 | I am also appalled that the Montlake neighborhood has such weight in this process. The Pacific Street Interchange alternative seems to be designed specifically with Montlake, and only Montlake, in mind. I have spent much time on Pacific Street over the years, and see no traffic alleviation for this already congested street in this alternative. Property values in the Montlake neighborhood, however, will only rise.

I also commuted over the 520 bridge for two years, by bus, by bicycle, and by car. Yes, changes are needed, but changes designed simply to increase the number of cars crossing the bridge are short-sighted, and uninspired. This is going to cost a fortune, regardless of the options. Do it right, not just building more highway lanes.

Very disappointing.

Steven McKay
Department of Horticultural Science
University of Minnesota
1970 Folwell Ave
St. Paul, MN 55108

Comment Category: Comments on Construction Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-9

Comment:

I-0727-004 | Great. A staging area will be located right at the north entrance to the arboretum along lake Washington Blvd, another could be in a park. Nice job. Actually not.

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-11, Page-12

Comment:

It's nice to know that a single neighborhood, namely Montlake, has enough pull to essentially veto the closure of the Lake Washington Blvd ramps. The current levels of traffic along Lake Washington Blvd are unacceptable, so much so that crossing the road on foot within the Arboretum is very dangerous.

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-6

Comment:

"A tube submerged below the lake surface ... could interfere with navigation or fish passage." "Could" is not adequate reason to eliminate this as an option. Do the parties that investigated this option have the expertise and supporting data to determine whether or not a submerged tunnel is indeed a feasible option or not? And what about the costs? Have they ever been estimated?

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-14

Comment:

The inclusion of a pedestrian/bicycle lane is absolutely essential.

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-13

Comment:

I find it hard to imagine that simply replacing the stop sign at the Lake Washington Blvd/SR520 interchange will "virtually eliminate severe congestion in both the morning and afternoon peak hours." This is especially unlikely in those scenarios that are likely to funnel even more traffic onto the already severely overloaded Lake Washington Blvd.

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-13

Comment:

Exhibit 5-6 clearly demonstrates that the biggest benefactors of the Pacific Interchange alternative is likely to be the Montlake neighborhood.

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-15

Comment:

Removing the freeway station would have a major impact on bus commuters beyond the University District residents. Already, many people don't take the bus because they have to transfer first at Montlake and then at Overlake. Changes that require people, particularly from north of the Ship Canal, to ride a bus further south to downtown Seattle, transfer there and then quite likely transfer again on the Eastside will only reduce ridership.

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-24

Comment:

None of the proposed alternatives are necessary if the reconnection of severed communities is an objective. The construction of lids should not be dependent upon which of the options are chosen, but rather on whether they merit construction in their own right.

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-27

Comment:

I-0727-012

The spatial extent of construction effects upon the Arboretum, as presented in Exhibit 5-13, are bad enough in the 4-lane and 6-lane options, but are absolutely horrifying in the Pacific Street Interchange option. The designers should be ashamed of themselves.

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-9

Comment:

I-0727-013

It is obvious to me that the only images illustrating the visual impacts on the Washington Park Arboretum are from locations at which the current bridge already dominates. What is noticeable absent is any indication of how the proposed alternatives will visually impact locations that are currently not significantly impacted, such as from the Visitor Center or across Duck Pond.

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-9

Comment:

It is quite unlikely that the shadows cast by the alternatives in Exhibit 5-4 are at all realistic. In fact, the larger the bridge, the smaller the shadows as presented in these images. Also the rather lush undergrowth as presented is suspicious. It is an unusual bridge that casts no shadows and promotes plant growth underneath.

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-2

Comment:

I cannot help but wonder what these images would look if they were aimed only slightly to the right. As displayed, they are aimed away from the areas of greatest change.

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-3

Comment:

Where are the views from Broadmoor? The Montlake Bridge? The UW's Waterfront Activity Center?

Online Comment by User: mclifton

Submitted on: 10/26/2006 9:53:00 AM**Comment Category: Parks and Recreation****Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-1****Address: ,, 98103****Comment:**

Several of the proposed designs would adversely affect the outdoor climbing area at UW. This is completely unacceptable when there are alternatives that leave the climbing area untouched. The 4-lane alternative is the best option to leave the climbing area untouched and still allow for the flow of traffic. If this is not possible, I would prefer to see no change before this landmark is destroyed.

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange**Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-1****Comment:**

I am opposed to the Pacific St. Alternative or the off ramp. The 6-Lane Alternative is a poor option for the community and the UW as a whole. Please consider better options such as the 4-lane alternative or make no change at all.

I-0728-001

Online Comment by User: mcraemer

Submitted on: 10/23/2006 4:13:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

I-0729-001 | Based on what I've read and heard, I would like the governor to consider what makes sense as the best solution for all who are impacted by this project. I am especially concerned with cost and time estimates in the same way I have concerns over the downtown viaduct. Given these concerns, I believe the best solution on the 520 bridge project would be either the Pacific Interchange 6-lane option or the simple 4 lane replacement option. My reasons are as follows:

Pacific Interchange 6-lane option

This can help solve the bottleneck problems in the Montlake and U-district that is currently a big mess and will only get much worse. By diverting traffic north of the Montlake bridge, there should be much better traffic flow. I also believe this option provides much greater options for mass transit between downtown and U-district as well as the Eastside and all points west.

4-lane replacement option

Given the cost of the above option, I believe the 4-lane replacement option be a viable alternative. My reasons have to do with the fact that much of the single-occupancy traffic currently on 520 will find an alternative once tolls are in place. This means drivers may very well begin using I-90, or using carpools and bus transit to save on tolls. Paving more of our planet to solve a transportation is such a 20th century notion. The price of oil is not going to get any lower. To keep Washington a beautiful place to live and work, we must choose the right plan for the future and that plan includes choosing a solution that looks beyond today's transportation issues.

Mark Craemer

Online Comment by User: me

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 5:51:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98005

Comment:

I support as many lanes as possible. There is no point in investing billions of dollars just to create another choke point. The current 4 lanes is clearly inadequate. 6 will be an improvement but 8 would be even better. I'm sure that at least 2 lanes will be dedicated to HOV so a 6 lane bridge will effectively add no general purpose lanes to the current configuration.

I-0730-001

Online Comment by User: Mel Vannice

Submitted on: 9/6/2006 2:31:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 8247 4th Ave. NE, Seattle, WA 98115

Comment:

I have lived in the area since 1968 so have lots of experience driving on the bridge and approaches. I have reviewed all the plans and find the PACIFIC INTERCHALNGE the most well-thought out, user friendly and logical. I hope you will consider it. Mel Vannice

I-0731-001

Online Comment by User: Michael Hintze

Submitted on: 8/23/2006 2:52:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98103

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange alternative for the SR 520 replacement. This alternative meets community objectives of having a more aesthetically enriching design while improving traffic flow and minimizing environmental impacts better than any of the other alternatives, specially the 'Base 6' alternative.

thank you

I-0732-001

Online Comment by User: Michael

Submitted on: 8/23/2006 10:10:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Address: 2701 11th Avenue East, Seattle, WA 98102

Comment:

I am a Seattle resident with a daily commute over 520 to work on the Eastside. I am supportive of the Pacific Street Interchange option. I believe it provides many benefits to the city, businesses, and neighborhoods. While no option is perfect, I believe the Pacific Street Interchange is the best compromise.

Michael Bronsdon

I-0733-001

Online Comment by User: MicheleLeCompte

Submitted on: 10/30/2006 5:43:00 PM

Comment Category: Transportation and Traffic

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98102

Comment:

I received the notification for the September 18th meeting for public comments by US mail on the evening of the 18th.

I have read through the EIS and wanted to voice objection to the Pacific Interchange option as it appears detrimental to the Arboretum. Seattle is considered to be a scenic and environmentally consciuous location; however, to impact a park of historical significance seems to be the anthesis of what Seattle stands for. Once the park is impacted, we will not regain the space created by the Olmstead brothers. Not only does this option cover over native environments, but the staging for this option creates a larger footprint of impact.

Additionally, many other countries have a foundation of public transportation in the larger metropolitan areas. For example, Stockholm, Sweden has a subway system that can take you into town during rush times in 10 minutes, while driving a vehicle would take over one hour. Mayor Nickels has been espousing ways to help the environment and touts Seattle as "forward thinking." I do not feel building a 6 lane highway for a future with an uncertainty for the use of single occupancy vehicles is a sound decision. By making it easier for people to drive cars, we are in essence encouraging more people to drive. I endorse the four lane proposal, with the safety curbs; however, would like 2 of the lanes to be utilized solely by public transit. Everyone taking public transit could make it to Seattle in about 15 minutes. As drivers are passed by buses or trains while they are sitting in a single occupancy vehicle, it may give them more encouragement to take the public transportation.

It astounds me that we are considering paving over our precious park land and adversely impacting the beauty of our region for eternity for the convenience of an automobile. Our region does not seem so foward thinking.

I-0734-001

Online Comment by User: mihatch

Submitted on: 9/18/2006 2:10:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange Option. Not only does it preserve the Montlake neighborhood, but it is the only option that will really do something about the traffic problem within Seattle and to the Eastside.

I-0735-001

Online Comment by User: Mike Moran

Submitted on: 10/8/2006 1:13:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 7600 NE 16th Street, Medina, WA 98039

Comment:

I very much like the Pacific Exchange Idea. It cleans up the bottleneck at Montlake without causing any ill effects. If it costs more, it is worth it.

Mike Moran

I-0736-001 |

Online Comment by User: mimideburle

Submitted on: 10/28/2006 1:57:00 PM**Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: 1935 E. McGraw, Seattle, Washington 98112****Comment:**

I-0737-001 | My first choice would be to leave well enough alone, or to build another bridge at some other location across Lake Washington. Because I know that neither of these options would be seriously considered, then I think the only feasible alternative would be the Pacific Interchange plan. I realize that many of the surrounding neighborhoods are opposed to this because of the perceived impact that it would have on their neighborhoods. If indeed there would be an impact, I think it is time that some other neighborhoods bear the brunt of 520. Just because Montlake has been singled out in the past as the neighborhood that should have the most traffic funneled through it, I beleive this is the time to change that concept.

Mimi DeBurle

Online Comment by User: Mister B

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 3:15:00 PM

Comment Category: Transportation and Traffic

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 20225 Bothell Everett Hwy 131, Bothell, WA 98012

Comment:

Making SR 520 wider -- without also making I-5 and I-405 wider in the area -- will just create bigger problems.

Adding shuttle buses (and getting the word out about them) would be faster and cheaper.

This area doesn't have the room for more roads so unless we want a limit on the number of people that can live or work here, we need to come up with ways to get those cars off the roads we already have.

And adding another level to I-405 would eventually create an "I-880 in the SF Bay Area after the 1989 quake" effect, not to mention cost a prohibitive amount.

Anyone like myself who has been on a bus in the carpool lane on 520 passing hundreds of people in cars by themselves stuck outside the carpool lane understands the solution isn't building more roads.

Thanks you for your time.

Michael

I-0738-001

Online Comment by User: mitchell hymowitz

Submitted on: 8/30/2006 11:03:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 6807 38th ave ne, seattle, wa 98115

Comment:

Could you make the EIS printable so that I wouldn't have to read it on the computer screen

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-1

Comment:

The Montlake Mess is as much a problem as 520 itself. Any solution that does not adequately address both is not a worthwhile solution. From what I've seen so far, the Pacific Interchange solution is preferred.

I-0739-001

I-0739-002

Online Comment by User: mjdanos

Submitted on: 10/27/2006 11:47:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98115

Comment:

I oppose the Pacific Street Interchange option.

I live in NE Seattle and use the Arboretum frequently. Please consider preserving this wonderful park, there is nothing like it near my family.

I-0740-001

Online Comment by User: mkeller

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 4:11:00 PM**Comment Category: General Comments****Comment Location: Chapter-11, Page-1****Address: ,, 98112****Comment:**

The Pacific Interchange is the only option that will maintain the integrity of our neighborhoods as an integral part of King County. To expand further than the Pacific Interchange suggests would create extreme bottlenecking at I405 and I5, and would not relieve the congestion on Montlake Boulevard. Furthermore, it would increase negative environmental impact on the region. Please give the Pacific Interchange your full support.

I-0741-001

Online Comment by User: MKGillespie

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 12:09:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-1

Address: , , 98102

Comment:

I-0742-001 | It is certain that the SR520 bridge must be replaced. It will become increasingly unsafe, and it does not in its current configuration permit reasonable traffic flow. Problems include lack of breakdown lanes, which results in too many backups, and the inability to permit the speedy flow of public transportation.

However, the 6-lane alternative is seriously flawed. A road structure of that size over the sensitive Arboretum and Union Bay and their wetlands and fish and wildlife habitats will create a negative impact on the habitat and on the recreational uses and quality of life in the adjacent neighborhoods. The loss of habitat, recreation, and quality of life, and the increase in noise, will not be offset by the gains in traffic speed. It is also too expensive. In addition, adding more traffic lanes will only encourage more single-occupancy vehicles travelling from the Eastside into Seattle, and will overload and cause further traffic problems on I-5, I-405, and local streets. Only mass transit alternatives should be encouraged in our road planning, especially in the face of the predictions of population growth in the Puget Sound area. We cannot lay down enough asphalt to accommodate our present driving habits, much less future growth! The 4-lane alternative is the only fiscally and environmentally responsible alternative, and must include designated HOV lanes at least during rush hours, limited to buses and 3+ carpools.

I-0742-002 | The so-called Pacific Street Interchange, which more accurately should be called the Union Bay and Marsh Island Interchange is not a community-generated alternative. It was proposed by WSDOT in the 1960s and emphatically rejected by Seattle voters and the City Council in the 1970s, but resurrected by a neighborhood that, in order to push SR520 traffic into other neighborhoods and natural areas, is willing to expand that traffic further. The six-lane alternatives, especially the Pacific Interchange (estimated cost \$4.38 billion!) are not affordable. The preferred alternative must be one which can be responsibly financed.

I-0742-003 | The Governor's expert review panel finds that even the four-lane alternative is too big to be affordable. The four-lane must be scaled back by reducing width of lanes, shoulders, and ramps, cutting the proposed Portage Bay Viaduct from seven (!) lanes to the current four, and making the shoulders intermittent (pull-out) rather than continuous (and thus avoiding future pressure to convert them to traffic lanes).

The draft EIS failed to study, and the final EIS should study, the strong possibility that the current four-lane bridge's excellent transit share of total persons who cross would decline with the six lane alternatives. Transit share can best be maintained and improved not by more lanes, but by bus priority not only on SR520 but also on the way to and from SR520 (such as on ramps and local streets, and on nearby parts of I-5 and I-405). The draft EIS fails to study converting any of the existing four lanes to HOV or transit-only. The draft EIS fails to consider the impacts of noise under 66 decibels and above the first floor, both of which are worst with the six lane alternatives.

Online Comment by User: mmaclean

Submitted on: 9/22/2006 7:52:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98109

Comment:

My wife and I commutte accross the 520 Bridge every day from Seattle to Kirkland and have family that live in Montlake. We support the Pacific Interchange Option.

Thanks

Matt MacLean

I-0743-001 |

Online Comment by User: mnagle

Submitted on: 9/18/2006 4:25:00 PM**Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: , , 98105****Comment:**

I support the 4 lane SR520 replacement.

I oppose the Pacific Street interchange as proposed by the montlake neighborhood as it simply moves congestion further North.

The impacts of the interchange are significant cost, and little benefit except to the montlake neighborhood. The impact to traffic would not be to help the existing or future issues, rather exacerbate them - but in a new location.

Thank you,

Mark Nagle
3871 43rd ave NE
Seattle, WA 98105

I-0744-001

Online Comment by User: monetcasper

Submitted on: 9/10/2006 2:52:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2309 25th Ave E, Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange Option -- it is the only option to the connecting neighborhoods. Anything else will destroy the connecting neighborhoods by creating more traffic and delaying the neighbors to travel in a timely matter. Other options also ruin the existing neighborhood of Montlake by removing existing long standing home for unnecessary reasons.

Sincerely,
Laurie Frink

I-0745-001

Online Comment by User: Moonbeam

Submitted on: 10/23/2006 1:44:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98112

Comment:

I'd like to place my "vote" for the Pacific Street interchange option. I've been a Seattle resident for 15 years now but have worked on the eastside all of those years. I have seen the congestion of the commute reverse during that time.

Today, my wife and I live in N. Capitol Hill. Sometimes I ride my bike to Montlake but most of the time I get across 520 in my car and travel to Microsoft in Redmond, via the Arboretum.

I firmly believe that replacing the bridge with AT LEAST 6 lanes is critical to the long-term well being of the area. I also believe that the following are important:

- 1) Bike lane that connects to Microsoft, Kirkland and downtown Bellevue
- 2) Rapid Transit, including light rail

Thanks,
John

I-0746-001

Online Comment by User: MoonRider

Submitted on: 10/29/2006 12:02:00 PM**Comment Category: Parks and Recreation****Comment Location: Chapter-11, Page-1****Address: , , 98023****Comment:**

This new pacific interchange will totaly screw Washington University football, there are litterally hundreds of different tailgates for the games each saturday homegame. Everyone has a lot of fun and can get peped up before the game. However with this new interchange it will destroy a lot of the tailgators area. Also it will have adverse affects on the UW hospital and Arboretum as well as the UW campus. I know me and my dad will probably miss most husky football games from now on, as well as probably giving up on season tickets as the tailgating is the main reason we go to the games.

I-0747-001

Online Comment by User: MrDave27

Submitted on: 10/8/2006 2:41:00 PM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-9

Address: , Seattle, WA 98109

Comment:

I strongly support the six lane alternatives. Either of the six lane alternatives are better than the no-build or the four lane alternative. The NIMBYs around 520 have stood in the way too long. The region is choking on traffic, the economic health of Seattle depends on fixing the cross lake commute. Just build it!

I-0748-001

Online Comment by User: mrdonner

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 8:53:00 AM

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-14

Address: , Seattle, WA 98117

Comment:

I-0749-001 | The Six-Lane alternative is the one I think that makes the most sense. We desperately need a new bridge and one that includes transit options. At the very least we need:

1. Bike Lane across the bridge
2. Transit Lane across the bridge (HOV)
3. Possibility for light rail across the bridge in the future.

Doing anything less than adding transit and bike lanes to the new bridge would be short sighted and selfish.

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-8

Comment:

I-0749-002 | The Pacific Interchange impacts on the Arboretum are appalling. The Arboretum is one of the gems in King County and the impacts to it should be minimized. The Pacific Interchange would have huge negative impacts on the Arboretum, impacts far worse than any of the other alternatives. Marsh Island would be significantly negatively effected. The Arboretum is a unique natural resource in our city and its value is immeasurable. There is already an interchange at Montlake, we should use the existing Montlake interchange as upgrading the Montlake Interchange would have the lowest impacts on the natural resources of the Arboretum.

Online Comment by User: Mrs. Barker

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 9:44:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , Seattle, 98115 98115

Comment:

As an area resident, I am well aware of the awful traffic situation in the vicinity. I am also aware that Seattle's treasured open spaces are being eaten away by ambitious private developers sanctioned by the city. Magnusen Park is a horrible example of what can happen when private greed intersects with negligent government. Please do not encroach on and destroy the Lake Washington waterfront and arboretum for the sake of traffic flow. The existing natural habitat is of vital significance to both people and flora/fauna. Once the arboretum is compromised/destroyed, we will never be able to reclaim it from Blacktop Sprawl. Please put a halt to the ignorant paving of our natural assets! Let's focus on transit that works for the future, once the gasoline is long gone and God willing, we finally learn to live in harmony with the natural environment. By the way, if football traffic is so important, how about relocating the Husky stadium instead of dislocating the arboretum. Thank you.

I-0750-001

Online Comment by User: mshearer

Submitted on: 9/12/2006 9:34:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2219 E. Calhoun St., Seattle, 98112 98112

Comment:

Our family strongly supports the Pacific Interchange Option.

Thank you for your consideration.

The Shearers

2219 E. Calhoun St.

I-0751-001 |

Online Comment by User: mstaples

Submitted on: 10/30/2006 9:49:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-9, Page-1

Address: , , 98074

Comment:

Serious consideration of a 4-lane alternative is, given the current inadequacy and the obvious and apparent demographics of the region, ludicrous. Indeed, if light rail is at some point added to the 6-lane alternative, would the trains cut down the available lanes to two (or, worse yet, to one general purpose lane and one HOV lane)? That would be absolutely ridiculous. Traffic is the biggest issue in this region. It affects all of our lives, from requiring me to leave at 6:30 a.m. and to return at 7:30 p.m. to avoid traffic, to not allowing my friend's children to participate in after-school activities. It chases businesses away and prevents others from relocating here. Environmentalists and, in the absence of other terminology that might be more specific, "liberals," have their place in the debate, but they should not frame and control it. The mere fact that we have to fight for a 6-lane bridge, when the current 4-lane model is so absurdly inadequate *without* 1.3 million additional people in the region, boggles the mind.

I-0752-001

Online Comment by User: mstoner

Submitted on: 9/17/2006 1:07:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98105

Comment:

I have been closely following the development of this project, and it's clear to me that the Pacific Interchange alternative is the best option by far. The pacific interchange is the only alternative that actually fixes the montlake bottleneck and restores transit reliability, and I fully support this alternative.

Thank You,
Mark Stoner

I-0753-001

Online Comment by User: msussex

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 6:21:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-30

Address: , , 98103

Comment:

The effect of the Pacific interchange option on the Arboretum is close to catastrophic. The Arboretum is a local and national treasure that cannot be replaced; it is a legacy that our children and future generations deserve to enjoy.

All of the alternatives have a negative effect on the Arboretum, though the Pacific interchange would have the most.

I believe, as a taxpayer and a resident of Seattle, that we deserve to have a tunnel option explored in the same manner and detail as the alternatives that are currently on the table.

I-0754-001

I-0754-002

Online Comment by User: muratd

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 1:28:00 AM

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-1

Address: ,, 98005

Comment:

Yes, we need to look out for the environment - but we need to have decent infrastructure for our economy as well - so let's get ourselves a deluxe bridge with all the trimmings.

I-0755-001 |

Online Comment by User: namioka

Submitted on: 9/24/2006 3:20:00 PM**Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: ,, 98112****Comment:**

Montlake Boulevard is almost always very congested because of the traffic nexus between SR 520 and the Pacific St. From our house in Montlake we prefer to use the University Bridge, but sometimes this is too out of the way.

After comparing alternatives for replacing the 520 bridge, my wife and I came to the following conclusion: The best option is doing nothing. But if you must build one, we support the Pacific Interchange plan. It is the only plan which might relieve the present condition instead of making things worse.

Thank you for your attention.

Isaac and Lensey Namioka

I-0756-001

Online Comment by User: Nancy Anderson

Submitted on: 10/25/2006 2:06:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98102

Comment:

As an 11-year resident of North Capitol Hill (and a former 20-year houseboat resident on Portage Bay off Boyer Ave. E), I am well qualified to comment on the impact the 520 bridge and past repair projects on it have had on both neighborhoods. First of all, both neighborhoods have been devastated by I-5 and 520, especially the noise and overflow of traffic from both into our neighborhoods. I feel the 4-lane with the Pacific Avenue Interchange option is the only option that will save the quality of life in Montlake, Portage Bay, and North Capitol Hill. Furthermore, the bridge must be a toll; it should be user-financed. ABOVE ALL, there cannot be 24-hour construction. There have been repairs done in the past that have pounded through the night--residents of these well-established and highly-populated areas should not be expected to go without sleep for months!

I-0757-001

I-0757-002

Online Comment by User: Nancy Van Leuven

Submitted on: 9/14/2006 9:14:00 AM**Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives****Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-1****Address: 1815 East Calhoun St, Seattle, WA 98112****Comment:**

Thank you for posting the plan online so interested folks can read and comment!

Because I live in Montlake, I have followed the issue rather closely and am very happy that the community club and other orgs, plus private citizens, have come up with the Better Bridge as opposed to the original WSDOT plan. As a result of listening and reading about both sides, I strongly support the Pacific Interchange Plan as opposed to the Base-Six plan. My reasons: the PI is much more environmentally sound, creates a new park, enhances public transit issues, etc.

Please keep us in the loop about this issue. Thank you!

Online Comment by User: Natasha

Submitted on: 9/23/2006 7:32:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 633 NW 75th Street, Seattle, WA 98117

Comment:

The Pacific Interchange plan is the best one. Let's do it.

I-0759-001 |

Online Comment by User: Nathalie Gehrke

Submitted on: 9/12/2006 1:03:00 PM**Comment Category: General Comments****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: , , 98112****Comment:**

I strongly support the Pacific Interchange Plan and am much opposed to the Base-Six option. The Pacific Interchange Plan, which is endorsed by my Montlake Community Council as well as the North Capitol Hill Neighborhood Council, the Queen City Yacht Club and the North Seattle Industrial Association as well as the Bicycle Alliance will best serve the needs of the various stakeholders of the greater Seattle area. I find it especially important that our Montlake neighborhood be reconnected and enhanced, and that traffic on our streets move smoothly and efficiently AND safely. The Pacific Interchange Plan does those things. Other plans do not, the worst of which is the Base-Six plan.

Please be guided by the needs of our community, and of those traveling through our community not just on 520, but on the other streets and the boulevard.

Nathalie Gehrke

Resident of Montlake and

Professor, University of Washington

I-0760-001

Online Comment by User: nchernia

Submitted on: 9/29/2006 10:37:00 AM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-6

Address: 2335 Boylston Ave E #C, Seattle, WA 98102

Comment:

The Pacific Interchange option is terrible. It would ruin the University of Washington marina, with its fun and inexpensive boating options; it would create an ugly eyesore over Union Bay; and it would destroy the experience of walking, running, and boating in and around the arboretum.

I-0761-001

Online Comment by User: Neala Kendall

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 12:21:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 3521 Densmore Ave. N. , Seattle, WA 98103

Comment:

Hello,

I-0762-001 | I am not in favor of an additional bridge going over the Montlake cut. I think that this open area is a very important part of Seattle. The arbo trail is fantastic and the open area for boats and crew races and kayaking is a unique part of Seattle.

I-0762-002 | In addition, I think that if new roads are built, having dedicated transit lanes is essential. We want Seattle to be a model for the future of getting people out of their cars and into transit, and having transit move quickly and efficiently in dedicated lanes is very important. I also am a bit disgusted thinking of Seattle having a huge, 6-lane road system. This is not the Seattle I know and love. This encourages driving and cars rather than other important uses of space, and is also very loud. By making transit efficient, hopefully people will get out of their cars and a 6-lane system will not be needed. Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment.

Online Comment by User: nemesis338

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:57:00 AM

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-2

Address: ,, 98296

Comment:

leave it at four lanes. the Loss inflicted on the environment is too much. top is best option, bottom is worst.

I-0763-001 |

Online Comment by User: neseattle

Submitted on: 9/21/2006 3:21:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2127 E. Shelby Street, Seattle, Washington 98112

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange Option.

Kim Murphy
Seattle

I-0764-001 |

Online Comment by User: Nicole Chicoine

Submitted on: 9/11/2006 4:38:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 1905 East Blaine, Seattle, Washington 98112

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange Option. It is the only option that: (1) improves transit within Seattle to the Eastside; (2) significantly relieves traffic bottleneck along Montlake; (3) allows for a viable lid through Montlake; and (4) enhances the integrity and character of the Montlake neighborhood.

Nicole Chicoine- Montlake Resident

I-0765-001

Online Comment by User: nitajo

Submitted on: 10/22/2006 9:42:00 AM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-11, Page-1

Address: 3025 102nd Ave. N.E., Bellevue, WA 98004

Comment:

Although a tunnel is the most expensive alternative to the current 520 bridge, the advantages far outweigh the costs. At some point, taxpayers desperately need to be educated on environmental aspects to the arboretum and noise pollution.

I-0766-001 |

Online Comment by User: njlind

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 2:00:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98103

Comment:

I believe the idea of the Pacific Interchange is definitely out of the question. Parking for the UW is at a premium now, and adding this Pacific Interchange would remove absolutely essential parking space for UW students and others using the existing lot. I also believe that the Pacific Interchange would only worsen the traffic jams that exist at the present time. Drop the idea of this interchange!

I-0767-001

Online Comment by User: noah

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:14:00 AM**Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives****Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-6****Address: 2205 22nd Ave E., Seattle, WA 98112****Comment:**

I support the Pacific Interchange option. Clearly it will promote good environmental practices (carpooling, use of transit, biking) while providing an improvement in traffic. The no build option is not an option unless we plan to abandon the 520 corridor. I don't think our economy can support such an approach. The other options, that don't address the surface street and I-5 interchange issues will not make a meaningful dent in traffic and will not provide enough of an incentive to move people to alternate forms of transportation.

I-0768-001

Online Comment by User: Noel Sherrard

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:15:00 PM**Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: ,, 98103****Comment:**

To whom it may concern,

I'm a resident of Greenlake who knows all too well the pains of the 520 commute. But when I heard the solution to it's miserable traffic was "more lanes," my heart sank a little further. As a Seattle native, I know that the "more lanes" option is the city's band-aid for our more complex traffic problems. That's why I love the Pacific Street Interchange. It's the solution that cuts to the heart of 520's problems, not one that just throws money at it. I urge the City of Seattle to build the Pacific Street Interchange. It's the real solution to our worsening transit crisis.

I-0769-001

Online Comment by User: NoelRMason

Submitted on: 9/11/2006 5:39:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Address: 7860 Stroud Avenue North, Seattle, WA 98103

Comment:

The clear choice is the Pacific Interchange Option with the 6-Lane Alternative. If we are going to do this, we should put out the money and the effort to do it right - or we'll just have to be fixing it later. The 6-lane Pacific Interchange option is the friendliest in reducing traffic congestion - especially around Montlake - offers the opportunity to connect the buses to the light rail in the future and enhances the overall environment - including greenery. Please make sure the new bridge is sound and aesthetically pleasing to match the distinction of the nearby neighborhoods. Also, a bike trail linking the proposed SR520 bike trail to Madison Park would be essential.

I-0770-001 |
I-0770-002 |
I-0770-003 |

Online Comment by User: north65

Submitted on: 8/24/2006 4:41:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-10

Address: , , 98115

Comment:

I strongly support the Pacific Interchange alternative. As we try to move more people out of their cars, this option seems to offer the best transit connections and bicycle access to the Eastside. Even though I'm a Ravenna resident, I currently NEVER use Montlake Blvd. when I have to be somewhere on time since it can be such a complete bottleneck. The Pacific Interchange alternative appears to offer the best chance of reclaiming Montlake Blvd. as a local street that the local residents can actually use.

I-0771-001

Online Comment by User: nsphilip

Submitted on: 9/12/2006 10:31:00 AM**Comment Category: General Comments****Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-1****Address: 10842 NE 148th lane A2, Bothell, WA 98011****Comment:**

I would like to applaud the civil servants with the foresight to realize the need for this project. It is my sincere request of you to employ the greatest environmental standards, regardless of cost. This is a structure that should serve the community for at least 100 years. The toll is the fairest of taxes, since it taxes use, and, furthermore, a King County tax (sales tax bump) would also be fair in my opinion. As a community, we need to rally around this project to build the infrastructure required in a post-modern civilization; taking the next step toward mass transit to provide a critical conduit of goods, services, and persons trying to experience the pleasures of urban life. We should be setting an example the rest of the nation, and therefore the world, can appreciate as a testament to a populace that not only retained the environmental benefits of their region, but one with the ingenuity to blend modern ingenuity with savage beauty to create a solution that will serve generations to come.

Build the bridge with reservations for HOV, pedestrian, and bicycle transit. Build it to accommodate light rail; certainly a necessity in the future.

And, above all, good luck.

Noel S. Philip

I-0772-001

Online Comment by User: owens0601

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 8:30:00 AM**Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: ,, 98115****Comment:**

I-0773-001 | I do not support any of the alternatives proposed in teh EIS. I am especially concerned about the impacts the Pacific Street Interchange alternative would have on the Arboretum - on the wetland and the historic integrity of the Olmstead park design.

I-0773-002 | I do not believe that all feasible options have been considered in this EIS. I would like the EIS to consider another alternative referred to as the "SR520: Arboretum Bypass Plan" that has been proposed by Craig Dalby. I believe the Bypass alternative has the potential to meet all goals and concerns by not just protecting and restoring important natural and historic resources, but also improving traffic congestion.

Online Comment by User: Pamela Brown

Submitted on: 9/26/2006 2:59:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-2

Address: 10 East Roanoke ST. #11, Seattle, WA 98102

Comment:

Please note that I am a voter, a resident of a Seattle houseboat living on Lake Union and I support the 6 lane Pacific Interchange plan.

Thanks for all your efforts to create the best possible solution.

Pamela Brown

I-0774-001

Online Comment by User: Pat & Katie Mahoney

Submitted on: 9/19/2006 10:17:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-2

Address: 3657 42nd Ave NE, Seattle , WA 98105

Comment:

We have attended your presentations at MHI on the possible 520 bridge replacements. At both presentations we came away with the strong impression your Pacific Interchange was the only long term answer to the traffic / parking lot on Montlake Blvd.

This is an existent problem which we have observed growing worse each of the 37 years we have lived in the Laurelhurst area. Originally it was caused by bridge openings for every tall vessel at any time / improved by limiting the hours of opening.

Now it appears to be primarily increased by the steadily increasing number of commuters who need to return to the Eastside, both morning or evening.

I must say, they are a courteous and patient group BUT...

Yesterday, in the mail we received our Laurelhurst Newsletter. We were shocked to read the Community Club is endorsing the 4 LANE option. Our visit to MHI has endorsed our support for the Pacific Interchange; because we feel strongly that the neighborhood from University Village east to the lake and both south into Laurelhurst and north to 65th St. has been impacted by the inability of the residents to use Montlake Blvd. (Not to mention the struggle to pass through the Univ. District at rush hours.)

There are many in this area who do not support the LCC position.

Thank you for listening; and keep up the good work.

I-0775-001

Online Comment by User: pat mccabe

Submitted on: 10/30/2006 11:38:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-2

Address: , , 98105

Comment:

I-0776-001 | More emphasis should be placed on the scale of the Pacific interchange and it's impact on the historic Canoe House and Montlake Cut.

Consideration should be given to a Pacific interchange tunnel option, effectively putting the UW linkage under the navigational channel rather than over it.

Comment Category: Cultural and Historic Resources

Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-2

Comment:

I-0776-002 | Aside from the Canoe House impacts, more consideration should be given to the Seattle Yacht Club (a national registered historic structure), Queen City Yacht Club, and the dozens of historic register-eligible residences on Laurelhurst's Webster Point, throughout Montlake, and within the Broadmoor neigorhood. The estate known as "Colonsay", one of Seattle's oldest and grandest homes is located on the tip of Webster Point, should be given special consideration.

I-0776-003 | Sound walls should be a standard feature on all Alternatives, at least 4' tall across the lake, and at least 6' tall from east of Webster Point west to I-5, and from west of Evergreen Point east to Yarrow Point. Landscaped lids should be included through the Arboretum and Montlake, as well as at Evergreen Point and Hunt's Point.

Online Comment by User: Pat

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 7:47:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98115

Comment:

I am concerned that traffic problems north of the Montlake Bridge have not been adequately addressed. On many days, not peak traffic times, not Husky game days, heading south from the University Village to the 520 bridge is a nightmare. Any kind of problem on 520 causes severe backups along Montlake Boulevard and a trip that should take 10 minutes takes 30-45 minutes. Will building the Pacific Interchange address these issues? The 6 lane plan will definitely bring more traffic both north and south of the existing 520 bridge. Possible issues south of the bridge seem to have been addressed, but I find nothing addressing the problems that will result north of the Interchange. In fact, none of the plans seems to be concerned with the areas north of Montlake; in fact, they will only create more traffic problems in that area. I personally consider this to be a flaw in any of the scenarios presented thus far. Those of us who live in 98105 and 98115 zipcodes and travel frequently to the Eastside should not be negatively impacted by a new 520 bridge.

I-0777-001

Online Comment by User: Patti Gorman

Submitted on: 9/12/2006 8:45:00 AM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-1

Address: 1824 East McGraw Street, Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

I strongly support the Pacific Interchange plan for SR520. Any other would have disastrous results for the environment, the neighborhood and the quality of life.

Patti Gorman

1824 East McGraw Street

98112

I-0778-001

Online Comment by User: PaulFChapman

Submitted on: 10/18/2006 7:01:00 AM

Comment Category: Other 6-Lane Options

Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-2

Address: , , 98103

Comment:

I-0779-001 | A Montlake Freeway stop is critical hundreds (if not thousands) of commuters use that stop!

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-1

Comment:

I-0779-002 | The No-Build alternative has got to be DOA. We can't wait until the bridge sinks in rush-hour traffic to replace it!

Comment Category: Second Montlake Bridge

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-28

Comment:

I-0779-003 | Eliminating the Montlake stop is a bad, bad idea. Right now I (and many others) connect to bus routes coming from downtown at Montlake. We do this because it is much faster and convenient to get the bus at Montlake than to get the bus downtown (going downtown would add half an hour to my already 1-hour commute each day! I've tried it!). Unless these numerous bus routes are re-routed to go through the Pacific Street Transfer Point (not likely!), eliminating the Montlake Stop is going to cut off hundreds of commuters from convenient bus access.

Clearly even a rebuilt or expanded 520 bridge is not going to accommodate all of the traffic in the corridor in the future. It is critical that transit service be improved by the new bridge. And that means keeping the Montlake Flyer stop.

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-7

Comment:

I-0779-004 | The 4-lane alternative should be a non-starter. It is critical to the economic future and the livability of the Seattle region that we improve mass transit options. Mass transit is attractive only when it provides a better service than driving alone: cheaper or faster or more convenient. A 4-lane replacement simply forces mass transit into the same bad traffic as everyone else, except that you have to wait for the bus and sit next to people you don't know.

I-0779-005 | The 6-lane alternative with HOV lanes is, in my opinion, the only viable option as it improves mass transit options. Please do not listen to the detractors who live in the neighborhoods next to the bridge. They bought their house knowing that there was a major freeway there. They should not now complain that there is a major freeway nearby.

I-0779-006 | I also hope that part of this project includes moving the HOV lanes to the inside of the highway rather than the outside. The current 520 HOV lanes are of limited value because HOV & Transit get stuck in traffic from on/off ramps.

Comment Category: Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-2

Comment:

I-0779-007

the 6-lane alternative & the Pacific Street Interchange look great to me!

Comment Category: Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-3

Comment:

6-lane option looks great to me!

Online Comment by User: PaulFChapman

Submitted on: 10/18/2006 7:01:00 AM

Comment Category: Other 6-Lane Options

Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-2

Address: , , 98103

Comment:

A Montlake Freeway stop is critical hundreds (if not thousands) of commuters use that stop!

I-0780-001 |

Comment Category: Second Montlake Bridge

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-28

Comment:

I-0780-002 | Eliminating the Montlake stop is a bad, bad idea. Right now I (and many others) connect to bus routes coming from downtown at Montlake. We do this because it is much faster and convenient to get the bus at Montlake than to get the bus downtown (going downtown would add half an hour to my already 1-hour commute each day! I've tried it!). Unless these numerous bus routes are re-routed to go through the Pacific Street Transfer Point (not likely!), eliminating the Montlake Stop is going to cut off hundreds of commuters from convenient bus access.

Clearly even a rebuilt or expanded 520 bridge is not going to accommodate all of the traffic in the corridor in the future. It is critical that transit service be improved by the new bridge. And that means keeping the Montlake Flyer stop.

Online Comment by User: paulgar

Submitted on: 10/30/2006 11:05:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98105

Comment:

Thank you for allowing comments on the draft EIS.

Having read the draft EIS, I have four main comments. They are all related to my belief that as it stands the EIS contains insufficient analysis to enable our elected officials to make truly informed decisions about which of the options to proceed with, and that it would be a grave mistake to proceed without this being addressed.

In particular, the analysis of the Pacific Interchange Option to the six lane alternative is insufficient. I believe the EIS analysis fails to adequately consider a number of key factors, and others seem to have been entirely overlooked, which for me calls into question the credibility of its favorable treatment of the Pacific Interchange Option, and makes me question whether it would have a sufficiently positive impact on the city to make it worthwhile.

I believe that, for the following reasons, the Pacific Interchange Option is unlikely to achieve many of the cited benefits, and at the same time would be highly detrimental to the local environment of Union Bay and Laurelhurst, as well as to North East Capitol Hill, Eastern Montlake, the Arboretum, the sections of the University facing Union Bay, the Montlake cut and Portage Bay, with additional negative impacts on neighborhoods further to the North and East.

These are the main issues with the current EIS that lead me to question its conclusions:

1. Continued traffic impacts from the existing Montlake Bridge make the Pacific Interchange Option ineffective for improving traffic flows.
The biggest issue with the EIS is the lack of sufficient analysis of traffic flows for the Pacific Interchange Option. In particular it completely overlooks the impact of opening the Montlake Bridge. Traffic from both Eastbound and Westbound 520 that is heading to Montlake and North and East Capitol Hill will come down from the new bridge next to the Husky Stadium and turn left towards Southbound 23rd/24th Avenue to cross the existing Montlake Bridge, in addition to traffic heading that way from the North, 25th Ave, University Village, and Sandpoint Way. The opening of the Montlake bridge, which is only a hundred yards or so from the proposed Pacific St intersection, will cause traffic to back up into the intersection very quickly, blocking all traffic from the 520, Pacific Street and North Montlake every time. The resulting regular gridlocks may largely negate the traffic flow benefits of building the Pacific Interchange Option and so waste the additional money spent and the additional environmental impacts suffered.
2. Underestimated traffic impacts to neighborhoods around the Pacific Interchange.
The traffic analysis in the EIS for the Pacific Interchange Option focuses on improvements to the movement of vehicles along Montlake and Pacific Street and at the same time concludes

I-0781-001 | that there will be limited increase in the traffic approaching the area through the intersections on 25th Ave, 35th Ave, Sandpoint way and into the neighborhoods. These conclusions stretch credulity as common sense would indicate that if the new interchange does manage to improve traffic flows then the decreased travel time will draw significantly more drivers to use that route and therefore the approach roads from NE Seattle.

I-0781-002 | 3. Weak noise impact analysis.
The EIS restricts its detailed analysis of changes to noise levels to those approaching or above federal noise mitigation levels. Significant quality-of-life issues for local residents appear well below these levels and yet no quantitative account is being taken of the population affected by changes below those levels that may occur. How can baseline noise studies that the analysis is based be sufficient to be credible, when for instance, measurements were taken at the end of Webster point for a total of 48 hours, with no consideration of variations in wind strength and direction? The EIS needs to consider changes to noise at lower levels and make more accurate and credible baseline measurements in order to be sufficiently informative.

I-0781-003 | 4. No night-time lighting impact analysis.
The EIS contains no consideration of night-time lighting of the various options. The impact of night-time light pollution would likely be greatest with the Pacific Interchange Option as the high level intersection over SR520 would need to be brightly lit by freeway intersection quality street lighting high above an intersection that is itself high in the air. No account is taken of the effect of the resulting significant increases in night-time light pollution on the neighborhoods both to the north and south that face the bridge, nor on the wildlife in the university/arboretum wetlands.

Thank you for listening

Comment Category: Transportation and Traffic

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Comment:

I-0781-004 | Continued traffic impacts from the existing Montlake Bridge make the Pacific Interchange Option ineffective for improving traffic flows.
The biggest issue with the EIS is the lack of sufficient analysis of traffic flows for the Pacific Interchange Option. In particular it completely overlooks the impact of opening the Montlake Bridge. Traffic from both Eastbound and Westbound 520 that is heading to Montlake and North and East Capitol Hill will come down from the new bridge next to the Husky Stadium and turn left towards Southbound 23rd/24th Avenue to cross the existing Montlake Bridge, in addition to traffic heading that way from the North, 25th Ave, University Village, and Sandpoint Way. The opening of the Montlake bridge, which is only a hundred yards or so from the proposed Pacific St intersection, will cause traffic to back up into the intersection very quickly, blocking all traffic from the 520, Pacific Street and North Montlake every time. The resulting regular gridlocks may largely negate the traffic flow benefits of building the Pacific Interchange Option and so waste the additional money spent and the additional environmental impacts suffered.

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-1

Comment:

The EIS contains no consideration of night time lighting of the various options. The impact of night time light pollution would likely be greatest with the Pacific Interchange Option as the high level intersection over SR520 would need to be brightly lit by freeway intersection quality street lighting high above an intersection that is itself high in the air. No account is taken of the effect of the resulting significant increases in night time light pollution on the neighborhoods both to the north and south that face the bridge, nor on the wildlife in the university/arboretum wetlands.

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-14

Comment:

I think this underestimates / avoids traffic impacts to neighborhoods around the Pacific Interchange. The traffic analysis in for the Pacific Interchange Option focuses on improvements to the movement of vehicles along Montlake and Pacific Street and at the same time concludes that there will be limited increase in the traffic approaching the area through the intersections on 25th Ave, 35th Ave, Sandpoint way and into the neighborhoods. To me these conclusions stretch credulity, as common sense would indicate that if the new interchange does manage to improve traffic flows then the decreased travel time will draw significantly more drivers to use that route and therefore the approach roads from NE Seattle.

Comment Category: Noise

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-19

Comment:

The EIS restricts its detailed analysis of changes to noise levels to those approaching or above federal noise mitigation levels. Significant quality-of-life issues for local residents appear well below these levels and yet no quantitative account is being taken of the population affected by changes below those levels that may occur. How can baseline noise studies that the analysis is based be sufficient to be credible, when for instance, measurements were taken at the end of Webster point for a total of 48 hours, with no consideration of variations in wind strength and direction? The EIS needs to consider changes to noise at lower levels and make more accurate and credible baseline measurements in order to be sufficiently informative.

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-9

Comment:

How is it that in these artists impression of the Pacific Interchange Option is significantly lighter and airier with much reduced shadows even though the roadway is 20 feet wider than the 6 lane option. It's even lighter and less shadowed than the artists impression of the four lane option. It's unfortunate, but this kind of thing, really throws doubt on the credibility of the conclusions surrounding the Pacific Interchange Option.

I-0781-004

I-0781-005

Online Comment by User: paullippert

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 3:57:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-12

Address: 522 31st Ave E, Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

I-0782-001 | I favor the alternatives that provide the most capacity for multi-occupant vehicles, i.e. buses and carpools. With only 4 lanes, bus and carpool traffic has little if any advantage over single-occupant cars, and congestion will only get worse for all.

The six-lane options seem absolutely necessary to address not just current but future congestion.

I-0782-002 | The graphics about current congestion do not include congestion on southbound I-5 in the afternoons caused by people entering I-5 at 45th or 50th and then crossing all lanes of traffic to get to the 520 westbound. Several of the design alternatives, especially Pacific St, address this source of chronic congestion.

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-49

Comment:

I-0782-003 | I walk almost every day in the Arboretum. Traffic noise in the Arboretum is already so loud, mostly from Lake Washington Blvd running through the park but also from the current 520 traffic, that I believe all of the design alternatives will likely have little impact on noise levels, or may even reduce noise somewhat for pedestrians and visitors.

Noise abatement for the new 520 will likely help make the northernmost part of the Arboretum a bit more quiet, but I think the only way to significantly reduce overall traffic noise in the Arboretum is to change the road material of Lk Wash Blvd, or to significantly restrict traffic. How about one weekend day closed (like Rock Creek Parkway in Washington, DC) as a beginning?

Online Comment by User: pbereano

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 1:51:00 PM**Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative****Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-2****Address: , , 98144****Comment:**

The 6-lane alternative should NOT be built. The last thing we want to do is make it easier for more cars to come into the city. Eastsiders should get used to taking mass transit; after all, even the rich do in cities like New York, Boston, DC. It is time to move away from such a heavy reliance on the auto culture, and from the symbiosis between construction companies and unions on the one side and public officials on the other.

Only consider the 4-lane alternative and more mass transit.

Philip L. Bereano

I-0783-001

Online Comment by User: pd4

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 7:37:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-11, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

I-0784-001 | Why are we spending so much money on moving cars instead of other transportation alternatives? By increasing the lanes on the bridge you will give more incentive for people to drive instead of taking other forms of transportation.

Comment Category: Ecosystems

Comment Location: Chapter-11, Page-1

Comment:

I-0784-002 | The arboretum is unique to Seattle and is a very important ecosystem. We need to protect these spaces for the animals as well as people. The impact on the arboretum is not worth it. If anything we should look to remove the bridge as far as possible from this beautiful area.

Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-11, Page-1

Comment:

I-0784-003 | The 4 lane is the best alternative. If at all. We need to place more emphasis on alternative forms of transportation.