

From: Dennis Shaw [mailto:shawdennis@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 8:17 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Cc: Hannele Ruohola-Baker; david baker
Subject: SR520

I-310-001 | Comments on the SR 520 replacement.

Regarding the proposed SR 520 replacement, serious consideration needs to be given to incorporation of rail transit, and less surface area for traffic. Limitations of the I-5 corridor traffic capacity and undesirability of additional single occupancy vehicles as well as the desire and ultimate need to decrease the carbon footprint all support expansion of rail.

Replacement of SR 520 needs to be with anticipation of the next 100 years in mobility, and sustainability, integrating with the technology of the future. Work on what would be the intersecting north-south rail line has already begun.

I-310-002 | Furthermore the impact of greater traffic onto a widened Montlake Blvd [option A] will have a significant negative impact on the adjacent neighborhood. The current 4 lanes of traffic already impacts the walkability and biking experience but is within a width and is with mature trees that keep it livable. Additional lanes and roadway width would turn Montlake Blvd into an 'Aurora Ave' experience; a huge noisy scar. Any additional northwardly directed traffic should be tunneled.

Regards,

Dennis Shaw & Julie Howe

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

From: Walter Oelwein [mailto:walterc1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 1:46 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Walter Oelweins SDEIS comments

Dear WSDOT,

I-311-001 | Please find attached my specific feedback in regards to the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the 520 replacement project.

I have found several issues with the document that I would consider inaccurate, insufficient, problematic, not exploring alternatives, and biased toward the Option A, and against Option K. Many analyses make little sense and call into question the accuracy of the work behind the SDEIS and calling into question whether this document meets the requirements of the SDEIS: To inform the public of the environmental impact of the project. It does not accomplish this basic task, and in fact, appears to attempt to hide the environmental impact of the project.

Amongst my many issues with the document are the following:

I-311-002 | **--The 520 project has no apparent designer.** It instead is default roadway expansion + occasional mitigation. This does not meet the level of "design", so all references to "design" need to be stricken and replaced with a more accurate term: "default roadway expansion". If you have an actual designer or firm who would like to take credit for the default roadway expansion, then this needs to be cited. Please observe how it is more accurate to use "default roadway expansion" instead of "design." Please make indicate in the SDEIS: "We did not enlist any expert design help, instead we just put down a wider road and tried to sell it to people. That is, until they offered ideas to improve it."

I-311-003 | **--Safety apparently is not an issue.** If safety is the main justification for the project, as is repeatedly cited in the executive summary, then you need to take more seriously the "no build" option, and identify options for fixing the existing bridge.

I-311-004 | **--No real improvement, calling into question the whole exercise.** There seems to be no indication of how this project actually improves things. I would expect that an investment at this level would actually improve things significantly. If you can't improve traffic, then at least improve the environment. A tunnel in the Portage Bay/Montlake area would do this, but this idea seems to have been rejected with no justification, although a study done in 2007 shows that it is indeed possible and would indeed make vast improvements in noise, visual quality, recreation, etc. This omission limits any opportunity for actual improvement of the area. There needs to be an argument in the document that actually says that this will improve things. Noise levels should significantly improve, visual quality should significantly improve, recreation should improve, etc. Other than the proposed lids, I see nothing that would indicate that this is a 21st century transportation corridor.

I-311-005 |

I-311-006 | **--Bus transportation seems much worse.** The new bus situation seems very flimsy. It appears that you will just work it out later. This is a major issue with the new freeway default roadway expansion (see – you can say “default roadway expansion” instead of “design” and it makes more sense. Try it!) In addition, you repeatedly cite that it is Montlake residents that made this suggestion to remove the freeway stop in order to narrow the corridor, as if to punish them for trying to identify ways to make the freeway design better. If you want to play that game, you have to cite who made the suggestion to make it a much wider freeway, who made the suggestion to not do the tunnel, who made the suggestion not to add light-rail, who made the suggestion to put a second drawbridge, who made the suggestion to add a 7th lane over the Portage Bay bridge, etc. It indicates that you don’t have a proper designer, and instead are in combat with the constituencies rather than identifying great ways to improve the area. C’mon – you can’t design a way to have a good way for the downtown buses to stop at Montlake?

I-311-007 |

I-311-008 |

I-311-009 | **--Eastbound traffic backed up to I-405? C’mon!** The one area where you say this project will improve traffic significantly is flat out wrong. You cite that your traffic models show that traffic will back up eastbound 520 to I-405 with up to 90 minute delays, and that the new bridge configuration will reduce this significantly. Currently, there are never any back-ups to I-405 on eastbound 520 – ever. Never, ever. This is the one interchange that *doesn’t* get backed up – ever–, yet you are using this scenario (somehow it will manifest) as a main argument for how things are going to improve traffic-wise. This default roadway expansion doesn’t even make sense as expansion.

I-311-010 | **--Visual Impact Study Flawed:** The visual impact study does not seem bourn of reality, and has peculiar pro-Option A bias, when it is clearly the worst design. I have attached my version of the visual impact study from a local resident’s perspective. It also misses a major viewpoint area: E. Shelby Street in the Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Neighborhood.

I-311-011 | **--Do you think it’s time to study the impact of the Montlake Bridge going up?** This has been cited many times by others, but the fact that you haven’t studied Montlake bridge traffic during off-peak times – precisely when the Montlake Bridge has to go up – indicates a faulty, incomplete SDEIS. Very commonly on weekends, traffic is backed up more than a mile, and pedestrians can walk faster than cars can drive. Yet you don’t take this into account. This needs to be documented before you can move forward on the project. This is a major source of contention that demonstrates your anti-Option K and pro-Option A bias.

I-311-012 | **--Foster Island worse-off with Option K? C’mon!** Somehow, Option K, with the land bridge over Foster Island, is repeatedly cited as having the worst environmental impact on the Island, while Option A, which doubles the size of the existing freeway on the island, is cited as having the least impact. This makes no sense and needs to be revised for the document to have any validity.

I-311-013 | **--The impact of tolling is not sufficient:** Your analysis on tolling seems to indicate that this has a limited impact on actual traffic patterns. You need to indicate that this is pure speculation. It seems obvious to me that a \$5 roundtrip toll would have an impact on traffic more than what your analysis indicates, and even without HOV, more people would carpool, making the existing footprint sufficient. This indicates that you have manipulated the results to diminish the impact of tolling to justify the larger default roadway expansion.

I-311-014 | **--Admit and document your mistakes:** I would expect that WSDOT be more humble about the mistakes it has made in the past about 520. It was a tragedy that WSDOT put in a freeway through parkland, neighborhoods and left incomplete ramps for 50 years. This project should have been a concerted effort to re-design this corridor, and instead we get default-roadway expansion. WSDOT, where it has improved the designs, needs to indicate that it was not WSDOT who made the improvement suggestions, but concerned local residents. There needs to be an explicit statement that WSDOT did not make any design improvements until local residents suggested improvements. It also needs to indicate that this indicates that WSDOT has no design capacity and the local residents do. Really – why that dynamic? Didn't WSDOT know that it was a failed corridor already, and why didn't it start out of the gate with, "We want to make a design that makes sense for this space – we have enlisted top designers and here are the best ideas for it." Instead, we get a kicking and screaming WSDOT trying to shoehorn its default roadway expansion.

I-311-015 | **--What's up with your Pacific Street Analysis?** Your analysis of the Pacific Street intersection does not seem bourn of reality. Option K makes provides much more through-put, has no delays due to bridge closures (for freeway traffic) and reduces the total number of stop-lights that a freeway bound car needs to deal with. Yet you seem to think that the Option A configuration is still better.

I-311-016 | **--The second Montlake bridge is awkward and ugly. Admit it.** The second Montlake bridge is just going to look funny and ruin the now-historical views. Admit it.

I-311-017 | **--What about the surface streets that serve as a proxy for 520?** You have no traffic analyses of the major surface streets (Fuhrman/Boyer and Delmar/Lynn) that people use currently as a proxy and cut-through for the freeway. With tolling, increased traffic, you need to indicate the impact of traffic on these streets. Really, I'd like to know!

I-311-018 | **--And many more! (see attached)**

I have provided many specific comments on the SDEIS and accompanying discipline reports. Please review them with care so that the 520 project is one that reflects the values and hopes that an investment of this size would justify, and that a revised document that reflect the realities of the project can emerge.

All comments reference the .pdf page number.

Thank you,

Walter Oelwein
1414 E. Lynn St.
Seattle, WA 98112
206-568-3107

Attachments:

Walter Oelwein's SDEIS Comments for WSDOT.xlsx
Walter Oelwein's Visual Quality Analysis.xlsx

*** eSafe2 scanned this email for malicious content ***

*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***

WashDOT's incorrect assessment

	Existing	A	K	L
Roanoke Vividness	2	2	2	2
Roanoke Intactness	1	2	2	2
Roanoke Unity	3	2	3	1.5
Portage Bay Bridge Vividness	3	3	3	2.5
Portage Bay Bridge Intactness	2	2.5	2.5	3
Portage Bay Bridge Unity	3	3	3	3
Montlake Vividness	3	3	2.5	2.5
Montlake Intactness	1	1.5	1.5	1
Montlake Unity	1	1.5	1	1
West Approach Vividness	3	3	3	3
West Approach Intactness	3	3	2	3
West Approach Unity	3	3	2	3
	28	29.5	27.5	27.5

I have converted WSDOT's visual impact assessment (found on section 97 of part 1 of the Visual Quality discipline report) to numeric values, with 1 being high negative impact, 2 being neutral and 3 being positive impact.

It is absurd that Option A gets the highest score.

WSDOT's assessment is incorrect throughout and needs to be changed for this SDEIS to be correct. Please compare WSDOT's assessment to Walter Oelwein's and you will see the difference.

I have also added an analysis of what a tunnel through Portage Bay/Montlake would do. This was not taken into account and makes the SDEIS incomplete and limits the possibilities for this project.

Now you can see numerically why the local residents think the existing default roadway expansion ideas are so bad, and consideration of the tunnel should be put back on the table.

W. Delwein's (local resident's) assessment

	Existing	A	K	L	Tunnel
Roanoke Vividness	1	1.5	2	2	3
Roanoke Intactness	1	2	2	2	3
Roanoke Unity	1	1.5	2	1.5	3
Portage Bay Bridge Vividness	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	3
Portage Bay Bridge Intactness	1.5	1	1.5	1	3
Portage Bay Bridge Unity	2	1	2	1.5	3
Montlake Vividness	1	1	2	1	3
Montlake Intactness	1	1	2	1.5	3
Montlake Unity	1	1	2	1.5	3
West Approach Vividness	1.5	1	2	1	3
West Approach Intactness	1.5	1	2	1	3
West Approach Unity	1.5	1	2	1	3



Section	.pdf page number	Comment Number	Commentor Name	Comment	Objection
I-311-020 Executive Summary	151 locations	1	Walter Oelwein	The term "desgin" is used 151 times in the SDEIS. However, the term "designer" is used zero times. The term "architect" is used zero times. This means that there was not a designer or an architect. Therefore, the "design" options cannot be called a design. A design requires a designer. A different term such as "default roadway schemes provided by transportation department staffers" should be to be used.	No support
I-311-021 Executive Summary	Overall	2	Walter Oelwein	Anywhere there is a discussion of the safety issues, you should be advocating just tearing down the bridge as an alternative, as has been articulately described by Knute Berger in the www.crosscut.com blog on March 4. After all, if the bridge were to have a collapse, and not exist, we should know what it would look like. A serious analysis is in order. It may be that this would, in fact, be the best situation: The local built and not built environment would improve, public transportation options would improve across I-90, and a sudden de-emphasis on cars would ensue. Employment centers would shift. This SDEIS, since it poses the likely scenario of a bridge failure, must provide this analysis for this document to be complete. Call it the "bridge no more" scenario.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-022 Executive Summary	Overall	3	Walter Oelwein	There is no analysis of how this bridge reflects the values of the state and city. There is discussion on how there are economic and transportation needs, but there is no discussion on why this bridge is the best way to meet these needs and it squares with the image the city and state project. It is my understanding that Washington State and Seattle want to be viewed as enviornmentally friendly, socially forward, economically advanced and technology smart. In what way does this bridge reflect these. It seems to say more, "1950's-style reliance on cars, mitigated by buses for lower income people, no regard to car exhaust or pollution." I believe that a discussion needs to be included to understand why a bridge and not some other set of solutions? The debate is purely on the level of cars, more cars or most cars (and some busses).	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-023 Executive Summary		4	Walter Oelwein	There is no discussion on how a freeway going through a sensitive area is the best way to meet economic and transportation needs. It appears that no analysis was done as to what impact a large roadway has on a local community and parkland, and whether this adds or detracts value. There is an a priori assumption that a large freeway is of economic benefit, when this isn't necessarily the case. Vancouver has no large freeways going through its downtown, yet the city has thrived over the years, in many ways exceeding Seattle. Portland has demonstrated that adding transit and not roads and managing growth has not had a negative impact on economic growth. San Francisco has not cut open large sections of its neighborhoods, and yet still is able to manage transportation and achieve growth. There needs to be analysis as to why a freeway going through parks and residential neighborhoods is actually necessary, and what the alternatives could be.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-024 Executive Summary	Section 1:3	5	Walter Oelwein	Omission: In the "introduction and project overview" section, page 2, it indicates deficiencies with the 520 bridge (vulnerable to earthquakes, aging). It omits other major deficiencies: The aesthetic design was poor. It was an affront to parkland and neighborhoods, is noisy, creates environmental damage, and is considered a failure as an urban freeway.	Omits or ignores important info

I-311-025 Executive Summary	Section 1:4	6	Walter Oelwein	Omission: "The new design options are the result of a public process created to address concerns about the original range of alternatives and design options." The SDEIS omits the actual designers and design process to creating a great freeway design. This statement implies that the mitigation group was the designer. This cannot be correct, since the group provided design criteria for designers to work with in proposing designs.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-026 Executive Summary	Section 1:4	7	Walter Oelwein	Omission: "The Supplemental Draft EIS contains additional detail on construction techniques and on mitigation measures". This omits the design efforts made to meet the requirements agreed by the mediation group. It skips from design requirements from the mediation group to mitigation. Therefore there was no actual design. The options provided cannot be called "designs" and has to use a different word (i.e., default standard roadway) or indicate who the designers are and when and how their design process took place.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-027 Executive Summary	Section 1:4	8	Walter Oelwein	Omission: "Today, the 4-milelong project corridor includes the interchange at Montlake Boulevard and ramps connecting to Lake Washington Boulevard, both in Seattle." This omits that there are several "ramps to nowhere" that have invaded the arboretum (parkland) space and have been ignored by WashDOT. This description is incomplete in that it implies that the ramps are all functional, and not the result of botched efforts by previous efforts by WashDOT.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-028 Executive Summary	Section 1:4	9	Walter Oelwein	Omission: "Narrow shoulders and the lack of an HOV lane mean that a single breakdown can snarl traffic for hours, while buses and carpools creep along with general-purpose traffic in the resulting congestion." This omits another point: There is no high-speed transportation or rail options in this this critical corridor with high demand. This statement implies that the only possible method for crossing the bridge is via car, HOV, or bus, when this is not the only way to get people across the bridge.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-029 Executive Summary	Section 1:4	10	Walter Oelwein	Omission: "In addition, the Portage Bay Bridge and both the west and east approaches to the Evergreen Point Bridge are supported by hollow columns that are especially vulnerable to damage in an earthquake." Whoever designed this made a big mistake. It must be indicated that the same organization who made this mistake will not be making the same mistake. You must include who made the mistake, and what expertise is being employed to make sure it doesn't happen again and how WashDOT has sufficient expertise now to prevent a similar mistake.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-030 Executive Summary	Section 1:4	11	Walter Oelwein	Omission: Neighborhoods and the region as a whole must be better served by reliable infrastructure, yet the built and natural environment must be protected as much as possible from the potential effects of a major transportation corridor." This is not correct. This implies that the project is doing as much as possible to protect the natural and built environment. The members of the mediation group identified ways that this is not applicable, and several ideas that would expand and improve the natural and built environment were rejected without study (such as a tunnel/tube) by WashDOT. A more apt statement would be, "The WashDOT staffers will consider the natural and built environment, but are placing a higher priority to expand the transportation corridor, and will be sacrificing the natural and built environment, as this reflects the priorities of WashDOT. You could also add, "WashDOT is uniquely qualified to lay down roads, but is not qualified to protect the natural and built environment." This is a more accurate statement.	Error or Incorrect

I-311-031	Executive Summary	Section 1:4	12	Walter Oelwein	Omission. Two reasons are cited for why the project is needed now. You should add a third: New opportunities in high-speed rail transit (namely Sound Transit at Montlake) have emerged since the original project was conceived, and we need to maximize the effectiveness of this opportunity with this project. You should add a fourth: New technologies that have been used in other parts of the world allow for integrating transportation corridors with environmentally sensitive and valuable locations, and this project afford to take care of this. You should add a fifth: It is time to rectify the 50 year old poor design that has created noise, pollution, poor aesthetics that have detracted from the historical character and parkland of the space, and has been an overall negative for the Seattle area in terms of prestige and quality of life.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-032	Executive Summary	Section 1:4	13	Walter Oelwein	Omission: There is no mention as to why NOT to do the project now. For example: We do not have a design that meets the project needs. We have not tried to find a design that meets the project needs. The nearby residents do not believe that WashDOT has sufficiently considered options that meet the design needs. The interchanges being proposed do not solve the problems outlined. The project has not considered how to integrate or expand Sound Transit's light rail line. These are good reasons NOT to do the project, and needs to be stated if you are stating reasons to do the project.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-033	Executive Summary	Section 1:6	14	Walter Oelwein	Omission: It makes it clear that the bridge can be rehabilitated to withstand greater wind speed. However, it is not stated why the entire bridge needs to be re-built. It is not stated why replacement is needed instead of doing another rehabilitation to get to the design standard. This would certainly be less expensive and faster to accomplish (thus safer).	Omits or ignores important info; Confusion over long term and short term
I-311-034	Executive Summary	Section 1:7	15	Walter Oelwein	Omission: By saying columns are vulnerable to earthquakes, this indicates that columns are a bad design to begin with. This section implies that columns are the only option to replace the bridge, when a tube or tunnel (potentially less vulnerable to earthquakes) are an option. The omission: With all of our proposed designs, we are repeating the same bad designs (high columns) that created this crisis.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-035	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	16	Walter Oelwein	Omission: "This makes it imperative that commuters be provided with travel choices that allow them to avoid driving alone, and that the proposed project be built to support increased use of transit and HOVs." It needs to be stated that WashDOT has made no effort to identify the best transit for the project, and has assumed HOV and Buses as the only options. This failure has caused delays to the project.	Omits or ignores important info; Confusion over long term and short term
I-311-036	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	17	Walter Oelwein	"Congestion generates pollutants from idling vehicles, which are much less efficient than vehicles operating at higher speeds." This implies that cars are the primary and encouraged mode of transportation, versus other options. This is not necessarily true. No car would cause less pollution than a car. This section needs to explain that WashDOT has assumed that cars are the preferred method of transport, and is discouraging less polluting options (such as rail) in the design process. In doing this, WashDOT has assumed in increased pollution via cars over the next 50 years. A better discussion would be to say, this bridge replacement has the opportunity to reflect our values going forward, and not in the past." Or, it could say, "WashDOT sees cars as the only viable transportation options."	Omits or ignores important info; Confusion over long term and short term

I-311-037	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	18	Walter Oelwein	This section misrepresents the accomplishments. It states that these are accomplishments, but only lists the features. An accomplishment is a measurable change in a key metric. So "designed to current wind standards" should change to "Move the bridge from wind 77mph wind standard to 92 wind standard." (or whatever the new metric the bridge would be) -- it's unknown since it's vague and not listed.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-038	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	19	Walter Oelwein	This section misrepresents the accomplishments. It states that these are accomplishments, but only lists the features. An accomplishment is a measurable change in a key metric. So "New Portage Bay and west and east approach bridges designed to current seismic standards." should change to "Change the ability to withstand a 6.0 earthquake to a 6.8 earthquake." (or whatever the new metric the bridge would be) -- it's unknown since it's vague and not listed.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-039	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	20	Walter Oelwein	This section misrepresents information. It states the accomplishments, but only lists the features. An accomplishment is a measurable change in a key metric. So "Four general-purpose lanes and two HOV lanes, providing increased mobility and reliability for transit and carpools as well as for general-purpose vehicles." should change to "Current throughput of x cars and y busses to a cars and b busses. (or whatever the new metric the bridge would be) -- it's unknown since it's vague and not listed.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-040	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	21	Walter Oelwein	This section misrepresents the accomplishments. It states that these are accomplishments, but only lists the features. An accomplishment is a measurable change in a key metric. So "Four general-purpose lanes and two HOV lanes, providing increased mobility and reliability for transit and carpools as well as for general-purpose vehicles." should change to "Current throughput of x cars and y busses to a cars and b busses. (or whatever the new metric the bridge would be) -- it's unknown since it's vague and not listed.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-041	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	22	Walter Oelwein	This section misrepresents the accomplishments. It states that these are accomplishments, but only lists the features. An accomplishment is a measurable change in a key metric. So "Landscaped lids over sections of the highway to reconnect neighborhoods." should change to "Create X acerages of parkland where there are currently freeway crevasses (or whatever the new metric the bridge would be) -- it's unknown since it's vague and not listed.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-042	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	23	Walter Oelwein	This section misrepresents the accomplishments. It states that these are accomplishments, but only lists the features. An accomplishment is a measurable change in a key metric. So "A regional bicycle/pedestrian path across Lake Washington with connections to existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities." should change to "Create 2 miles of bike lanes where there are currently no bike lanes creating an estimated x bike commuters across the lake" -- it's unknown since it's vague and not listed.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-043	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	24	Walter Oelwein	This section misrepresents the accomplishments. It states that these are accomplishments, but only lists the features. An accomplishment is a measurable change in a key metric. So "Stormwater treatment to improve the quality of runoff from SR 520, which is currently not treated." should change to "Reduce runoff of x polluted gallons per year" -- it's unknown since it's vague and not listed.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-044	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	25	Walter Oelwein	This section misrepresents the accomplishments. It states that these are accomplishments, but only lists the features. An accomplishment is a measurable change in a key metric. So "Noise reduction features, which could include noise walls and/or quieter, rubberized asphalt pavement" should change to "Reduce noise in the surrounding neighborhoods by x %" -- it's unknown since it's vague and not listed.	Error or Incorrect

I-311-045 Executive Summary	Section 1:8	26	Walter Oelwein	In this section, it lists the accomplishments, but what does the project not accomplish? This omission needs to be included: Does not restore the arboretum from the land-grab of the 60's. Does not maximize the historic character of the neighborhoods. Does not interconnect the Sound Transit station. There are many things that this project design fails to do, and they need to be listed.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-046 Executive Summary	Section 1:8	27	Walter Oelwein	In this section, it lists the accomplishments, but it does not list the metrics that it makes worse: It introduces more cars in to the neighborhoods and the arboretum, it increases the amount of break dust into the air, it increases the carbon footprint that the bridge brings, it introduces an ugly bridge to a historic vista, it creates greater shadows and footprint on sensitive lands. These need to be included in the executive summary, with metrics.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-047 Executive Summary	Section 1:8	28	Walter Oelwein	You need to include the "good" things that could happen by not building: "Can identify ways to further reduce the carbon footprint of freeways." "Can adopt more modern designs, such as tube and tunnels, that reclaim Arboretum parkland, improve views and increase flow in interchanges." "Can better integrate with Sound Transit." "Keep a narrower footprint on portage bay, Arboretum, and Montlake." These are all valid reasons not to build, or further improve the designs, but are omitted.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-048 Executive Summary	Section 1:9	29	Walter Oelwein	"The SR 520 Pontoon Construction Project would construct new pontoons that would be used to restore the existing traffic capacity of the Evergreen Point Bridge in the event of a catastrophic failure." This implies that pontoons are the only option for a revision. In fact, it makes it required that it be pontoons that would replace the bridge, rather than a tube or tunnel. Why not create a tube or tunnel in the case of catastrophic failure. By doing this project, you have solidified an inferior design option as the only design option, and without a public comment period. This makes this Supplemental Draft EIS invalid.	ERROR or Incorrect; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-049 Executive Summary	Section 1:9	30	Walter Oelwein	"This project is part of the Lake Washington Urban Partnership, a collaborative effort between WSDOT, King County, the Puget Sound Regional Council, and FHWA to explore innovative ways to help manage congestion on SR 520." This is the first mention of "innovative" management of congestion. This idea is very incomplete and needs to be explored more. In the sections prior, there is no mention of the impact that tolling could have on congestion. It implies that cars can cross for free at any time in the future, when there have been no experiments on whether tolling will discourage trips on their own. This SDEIS is thus inconsistent, in that it implies that larger freeways (4 + 2) is the way to go, when you can work on tolling to mediate traffic, congestion, carbon footprint, impact to neighborhoods.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-050 Executive Summary	Section 1:9	30	Walter Oelwein	"Innovative management of congestion." By mentioning tolling as the only "innovative management of congestion", this reveals that innovative elements about the design have not been made. This is another reason why "not" to do the project (also omitted). WashDOT has not made any effort to identify innovative ways to reduce traffic, congestion, pollution, noise, carbon footprint, or pursued innovative efforts to restore parkland (in fact, this SDEIS later tries to make the argument that the option that improves parkland has the worst environmental impact), improve the historic character of the neighborhood, better integrate and expand mass transit. This needs to be called out in the SDEIS.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

I-311-051	Executive Summary	Section 1:10	32	Walter Oelwein	It mentions Option A. However, Option A+ is not mentioned at all. This is the option that representatives of WashDOT were advocating prior to the release of the SDEIS. So which is it, Option A or Option A+, and what is A+? This needs to be fully integrated into the SDEIS or else the SDEIS is incorrect.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-052	Executive Summary	Section 1:10	33	Walter Oelwein	"6-Lane Alternative with the following design options that were developed in 2008 through a mediation process". This reveals that these "designs" were not designed at all. They were negotiated. This means that the word "design" should be replaced with "Negotiated roadway placement". To use the word design implies that there were designers who made a conscious effort to create something that meets the various needs of the project. No designers are listed, and the resulting roadway placements reflect an uninspired, unmindful project. It is an error to call these designs. It's like customers "negotiating" what a car looks like with the manufacturer. The car manufacturer cannot claim that it was "designed."	Error or Incorrect; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-053	Executive Summary	Section 1:10	34	Walter Oelwein	"For these reasons, the No Build Alternative is inconsistent with WSDOT's standards for safety and reliability." This implies that WashDOT has standards for safety and reliability. What about other standards: Impact to the local community, aesthetics, encouraging alternate forms of transportation. The SDEIS needs to include all standards that a highway should have and whether the current design meets these.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-054	Executive Summary	Section 1:11	35	Walter Oelwein	The two diagrams (1-4 and 1-5) are direct comparisons, yet they are not to scale. This makes it difficult to understand the difference. It appears that the diagram 1-5 is a much smaller scale, yet it is still significantly wider. This needs to be shown in full scale so that the reader can actually see what the environmental impact is.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-055	Executive Summary	Section 1:12	36	Walter Oelwein	The lids are mentioned as being developed "through mediation." Again, these are not by design, but through negotiation. This means that WashDOT did not do any design work to make this a quality, designed freeway. It proposed default roadway placement, and waited for people to complain about the bad job they did. WashDOT needs to acknowledge in the SDEIS that it did not make any effort to create a "well designed freeway/bridge" that elevates the community and transportation situation. It started with the bare minimum, and begrudgingly added features. This is why it does not earn the right to be called "Designed." All references to "design" need to be restated as "default roadway placements by WashDOT staffers."	Error or Incorrect; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-056	Executive Summary	Section 1:12	37	Walter Oelwein	"as they do along much of the SR 520 corridor and as they would continue to do under all alternatives without mitigation." This omits that a designer (not default roadway placer) would have identified technologies and placements that eliminate noise altogether (such as a tube/tunnel) so that mitigation wouldn't be necessary. The SDEIS needs to be corrected to say, "WashDOT did not invest in identifying ways to eliminate noise altogether, and assumed that mitigation was the only way to go."	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-057	Executive Summary	Section 1:12	38	Walter Oelwein	"Option A was defined as including noise walls and/or quieter, rubberized asphalt pavement." This is vague-- which is it and or or? The answer would have an environmental impact, making this document incomplete.	Omits or ignores important info;

<p>I-311-058</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>Section 1:12</p>	<p>39</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Option K was defined as including only quieter, rubberized asphalt pavement for noise reduction." It is not clear why Option A would have noise walls, but Option K would not. Perhaps it is because the noise walls would be so exceedingly ugly that it is unfathomable that anyone would put such a monstrous bridge in a population center, and that neighbors through the mediation process proposed and identified better ways to reduce the monstrosity of a noise-walled super-bridge, which the WashDOT default roadway placers put in. Either state this as the reason for why Option A has noise walls and other options do not.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-059</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>Section 1:12</p>	<p>40</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"they do not affect FHWA's and WSDOT's responsibility to identify and consider effective noise abatement measures under existing laws." While WashDOT may not have responsibility under the law, it has responsibility to make the project as effective as possible. This statement needs to be clarified, "WashDOT has not made an effort to design in significant noise reduction and is interested only in doing the minimum that the law requires. WashDOT has not made an effort to thoroughly investigate ways to avoid creating massive amounts of noise altogether."</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-060</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>Section 1:12</p>	<p>41</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Noise modeling done for the project indicates that noise walls would meet all FHWA and WSDOT requirements for avoidance and minimization of negative effects." This makes it seem that noise is the only consideration in noise walls. It needs to also state that noise walls have the detrimental effect of being egggeriously ugly, unpopular on a free-standing bridge, and something that will be met with resistance. It also needs to be stated that given that mitigation efforts create bigger problems than they solve, more creative expertise needs to be invested in order to find ways to achieve all objectives, such as creating a tube or tunnel.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-061</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>Section 1:12</p>	<p>42</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Quieter pavement has not been demonstrated to meet these requirements in tests performed in Washington state, and therefore cannot be considered as noise mitigation." This leaves an incomplete story. What did the tests reveal? Did they reveal that they do have some impact? That they would make a better experience for the residents in some way? The way this is written implies an anti-quieter pavement bias by WashDOT, and needs to be corrected to show a willingness to use every technology imaginable to make this bridge replacement an improvement over the failures of the existing bridge.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>

<p>I-311-062</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>Section 1:10</p>	<p>43</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"WSDOT and FHWA will work with the affected property owners after a design option is selected to make a final determination of reasonable and feasible mitigation measures for project-related noise effects." This is a vague statement. It implies that mitigation efforts are the only option, when good design is not covered. i.e., design a freeway that does not create noise in the first place. This is imaginable in the case of a tube-tunnel. The SDEIS is incomplete in that it implies that "default roadway placement with mitigation" is what is being evaluated for environmental impact, when other alternatives -- with good design, could be included.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-063</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>Section 1:13</p>	<p>44</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"What are the 6-Lane Alternative design options A, K, and L?" Again, using the word "design" implies that there was a conscious designer. It needs to be revealed who made these default roadway placement. It is my understanding that "option A" was proposed as a default roadway placement by WashDOT. Other options came from concerned residents about the deficiency and uncreativity of the default roadway placement, and offered new "designs." In all cases, it appears that WashDOT did not make a concerted effort to create a great design, and instead defaulted from the previous, unsuccessful, damaging roadway placement and negotiated with concerned citizens for improvements. This process needs to be made more explicit, since it needs to be understood why these are considered the best options and worth the investment in a SDEIS or billions of dollars of construction.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-064</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>Section 1:14</p>	<p>45</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"All options place an emphasis on multimodal transportation by decreasing reliance on single-occupant vehicle travel and facilitating transit connections." This cannot possibly be true. Each "option" has 66% lanes + increased size of breakdown lanes for single-occupant vehicles. This creates a greater emphasis on the SOV, not less. If designs were proposed that started with rail transit, reduction of cars through tolling, etc., then you could claim this. Instead I would revise this sentence to "All options place an emphasis on SOV cars, with the increased shoulder and the effort to encourage greater throughput of cars in the coming years."</p>	<p>Error or Incorrect</p>
<p>I-311-065</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>Section 1:14</p>	<p>46</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The project features for each design option are described under the geographic area headings". Again, this implies that these options were designed. They were not, they were first default roadway placement (Option A), and then new options were suggested by creative and concerned neighbors. This is not design.</p>	<p>Error or Incorrect</p>
<p>I-311-066</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>Section 1:14</p>	<p>47</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>Nowhere in this section is the connectivity to the Montlake Sound Transit station mentioned. What are the benefits and impacts of each default roadway placement on this? This reveals that the impact of the Montlake Sound Transit station was not even considered in this SDEIS, and needs to be included.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-067</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>Section 1:15</p>	<p>48</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>In the Option A drawing (page 14), it mentions a "7th lane." This is not mentioned in the description of the various alternatives and needs to be removed. Using the term "6-lane" alternative becomes incorrect. The SDEIS needs to remove this 7th lane from the bridge on option A, or else the term "6-lane" alternative needs to be revised to "WashDOT insertion of extra lanes without regard to mediation."</p>	<p>Error or Incorrect</p>

I-311-068	Executive Summary	Section 1:18	49	Walter Oelwein	"Should a decision be made to pursue any new design variations with significantly greater environmental effects than Options A, K, or L, they would need to be evaluated in another supplemental environmental document, which would change the project schedule." What about design options that significantly less environmental effects (such as a tube/tunnel)? Would they need to be evaluated, or could they be adopted.	Error or Incorrect; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-069	Executive Summary	Section 1:18	50	Walter Oelwein	Table 1-2 says that it is "6 lanes". This can't be true, since the drawings explicitly says 7 lanes. The summary is hiding something -- if it can add an extra lane in this section, can it add more lanes elsewhere?	Error or Incorrect
I-311-070	Executive Summary	Section 1:19	51	Walter Oelwein	This section implies that only option A is affordable. However, it does not state how option A also exceeds the 4.65 billion cap set by the legislature, when you count the costs of the bonds. All alternatives are too expensive, and this needs to be stated outright	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info
I-311-071	Executive Summary	Section 1:19	52	Walter Oelwein	"As discussed previously" This was not discussed previously	Error or incorrect
I-311-072	Executive Summary	Section 1:19	53	Walter Oelwein	Is discussion of the budget supposed to be part of the environmental impact? It actually seems out of scope from the purpose of the project. The scope should be to discuss the environmental impacts of the project, and this section detracts from this, and implies the best option is the cheapest one. The "environmental impact statement" should have the focus be on the environmental impact, not the budget impact.	Error or incorrect
I-311-073	Executive Summary	Section 1:19	54	Walter Oelwein	"However, the funding for the full corridor program falls over \$2.65 billion short of the \$4.65 billion total. WSDOT and the legislative workgroup are working to identify additional funding sources, including federal stimulus funding under the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act." The charts earlier imply that Option A is the only one that is affordable. But this statement demonstrates that all options are not funded. Therefore, it needs to be clearly stated at this point, "No options are fully funded."	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-074	Executive Summary	Section 1:20	55	Walter Oelwein	"To address the potential for phased project implementation, the Supplemental Draft EIS evaluates the vulnerable structures separately as a subset of the "full build" analysis. This subset is referred to in the Supplemental Draft EIS as the Phased Implementation scenario." This needs to be clearer: If the different phases are not funded, will the project proceed? Will portions of the projects (such as lids) be removed? If so, then the SDEIS needs to address the environmental impacts of this.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-075	Executive Summary	Section 1:21	56	Walter Oelwein	"WSDOT is leading the highway design efforts". This is the first reference to who designed it, but it is not a designer, it is a department. This explains why the initial designs advocated by WashDOT are so uninspired. This section can be improved by describing how WashDOT decided to go about the initial design-- did they hire someone experienced in urban freeways?	Omits or ignores important info

I-311-076 Executive Summary	Section 1:23	57	Walter Oelwein	"In 2005, after the 6-Lane Alternative had been developed and discussed with project stakeholders neighborhoods adjacent to the highway expressed concern that the 6-Lane Alternative, as then configured, was too wide in the Montlake interchange area." This needs to be taken out of the passive voice. Who was it who developed the 6-lane alternative? Why did it assume that the wide footprint would somehow be acceptable? What expertise went into this decision, other than existing assumptions that it would be a larger bridge? This appears to be a key design decision flaw that needs to be better articulated. Why did WashDOT think that the neighborhoods would think that the proposed "designs" would be acceptable? This seems very naive. Why didn't WashDOT propose creative designs rather than wait for the neighborhoods to come up with their own?	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-077 Executive Summary	Section 1:23	58	Walter Oelwein	"The impacted communities on the west end of the project need to determine what design from Union Bay and westward to I-5 will best serve the neighborhoods, the University of Washington, and parks and natural resources. City and community leaders and residents need to come together and develop a common vision on the best solution that fits the character and needs of the local communities. I have asked WSDOT to provide support when requested for such a process." Obviously Option K should be the only option considered, because this is the option that was supported by the community leaders and residents that reflected the common vision. Additionally, why didn't WashDOT create a great design that would attempt--in advance--to achieve this goal, rather than force the residents to negotiate in any positive features?	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-078 Executive Summary	Section 1:25	59	Walter Oelwein	Again, nowhere in this section does it state what WashDOT did to bring to the table designs that would be considered positive by the stakeholders. This implies that it did not have sufficient experience, bring in consultants with deep knowledge of how to create urban freeways. Instead, it relied on hearing concerns from stakeholders, and then doing mitigation. It would have been better if WashDOT got the expectations/concerns from the stakeholders, brought in top expertise to design creative ways to achieve the design, and exceed the expectations of the stakeholders with great design (such as a tube/tunnel). Instead, it relied on the mediation process to integrate and scratch and claw for improved design.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-079 Executive Summary	Section 1:26	60	Walter Oelwein	"The workgroup received extensive input from mediation participants about ideas for modifying the design options. These ideas were intended to reduce costs and/or better achieve project objectives." Again, this is backwards design methodology. WashDOT's poor ability to understand the stakeholder needs and design in great options rather than provide poor options and let people fight for mitigation has made this a poor process. This needs to be called out in the SDEIS	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-080 Executive Summary	Section 1:26	61	Walter Oelwein	"The workgroup also solicited advice from resource agencies, local jurisdictions, the Seattle Parks Department, the Coast Guard, and other stakeholders." Again, no mention of identifying an expert in urban bridge and freeway design. This needs to be called out, since it is an obvious flaw in the design process.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-081 Executive Summary	Section 1:26	62	Walter Oelwein	The call out should indicate geographically (using a map) where these people reside. This will show where the interests are, and whether they adequately represent the stakeholders	Omits or ignores important info

I-311-082	Executive Summary	Section 1:27	63	Walter Oelwein	"At each meeting, people expressed support for a variety of choices, including Option M, Option A+ with and without the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps, a transit-optimized 4-Lane Alternative, and retrofitting the seismically vulnerable bridges to allow more time to develop a long-term solution." This mischaracterizes the feedback. The neighborhoods most closely impacted by the project were overwhelmingly in favor of Option M, and opposed to Option A+. This needs to be included in the SDEIS for it to be correct.	Error or incorrect
I-311-083	Executive Summary	Section 1:27	64	Walter Oelwein	"On December 8, 2009, the legislative workgroup reconvened and confirmed their earlier recommendation that Option A+ should be the preferred design option for the 6-Lane Alternative." Again, this needs to be improved to be correct. The sentence, "This went against the overwhelming support for Option M provided by the close-in neighborhoods. It also went against the deep opposition by the adjacent neighborhoods to Option A+ "	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-084	Executive Summary	Section 1:27	65	Walter Oelwein	"Option M is similar to Option K; however, the proposed method of tunnel construction has substantially different impacts than those described in the Supplemental Draft EIS, and would require additional environmental evaluation—likely in the form of another Supplemental Draft EIS—if the legislature chose to pursue further study of it." By definition, this makes the SDEIS incomplete. Option M needs to be included in this report as much as Option A+ in order for it to be given the appropriate weight.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-085	Executive Summary	Section 1:29	66	Walter Oelwein	The "transportation" row needs to include a statement that the options do not adequately integrate or allow for mass transit expansion of Sound Transit, and the analysis of this is incomplete	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-086	Executive Summary	Section 1:29	67	Walter Oelwein	"The greatest effect on traffic volumes would occur in the Montlake Boulevard interchange area." Earlier in the document you mention the increased usage of the bridge in general in the coming years. However, there is no mention on how this increased capacity of the bridge is going to affect the local neighborhoods (Montlake, Portage Bay, Roanoke Park, etc.). It is easy to imagine that more people will cut through the area to access the (non-integrated) transit or the freeway. This makes this summary incomplete to intimate that local traffic is only a "Montlake Cut" issue.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-087	Executive Summary	Section 1:30	68	Walter Oelwein	"This increase reflects the effect of tolling on mode choice, the reversible connection to the I-5 express lanes and other corridor improvements." In the Transit row, there is no mention that tolling may reduce demand overall, whereas earlier in the document, it says that demand is going to increase. This is contradictory.	Error or incorrect
I-311-088	Executive Summary	Section 1:30	69	Walter Oelwein	"Under Option A, traffic volumes north and south of the Montlake Cut would be similar to the No Build Alternative, except on Lake Washington Boulevard south of the SR 520/Arboretum ramps." This is incorrect. It should say, "Traffic capacity" would be similar, but volumes will increase. That means more delays and congestion. This is an omission that needs to be corrected and called out, since this is a major reason for having the other alternatives -- to improve flow in the Montlake area. Earlier in the document you make the argument that congestion adds pollution, yet you ignore this argument here, exactly where there is the most population.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info
I-311-089	Executive Summary	Section 1:30	70	Walter Oelwein	"Under Options K and L, traffic volumes north and south of the Montlake Cut would increase when compared to the No Build Alternative and Option A." Similar to the line item for Option A, this is an incorrect statement. It should state, "Traffic capacity" will improve, allowing for less congestion and pollution. This needs to be called out as a major difference between Options A and K,L, since people will be wondering about the price tag difference.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info

I-311-090	Executive Summary	Section 1:31	71	Walter Oelwein	<p>"All options would remove the Montlake Freeway Transit Station and replace its function at other nearby transit stops. Loss of the transit station would require passengers to change their current travel routes and these changes could include using light rail, additional bus transfers, and finding alternate bus routes to get to the same destination." This contradicts the row above. It says that transit is improved, but then in this row it says that passengers have to change travel routes. This section seems intentionally vague, since it is conter-intuitive that removing one of the most popular stops where there is a new Sound Transit station, and multiple downtown to Eastside freeway routes can somehow improve transit options. You need to be explicit that you have no plan outlined for how the Montlake Freeway Station's functionality will be replace. This appears to be a major flaw in the "design", and is another indicator that this is not actually a "design", but a default roadway placement.</p>	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info
I-311-091	Executive Summary	Section 1:31	72	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Option A would require the least amount of new right-of-way (11.1 acres). This option would result in seven full parcel acquisitions, and would remove two additional residences, the Montlake 76 gas station, and nine of the 11 buildings on the south campus of NOAA's Northwest Fisheries Science Center" This is written to imply that Option A has the least impact, when it appears that it has the most. It should be written to state that it has the least amount of acerage, but the most amount of business and building closures (this evaluative piece is left out, showing an apparent bias toward Option A).</p>	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info
I-311-092	Executive Summary	Section 1:31	73	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Option K would require the most new right-of-way (15.7 acres). This option would result in six full parcel acquisitions, and the University of Washington's Waterfront Activities Center (WAC) would be relocated for a multiple-year period." Just as the comment about Option A having the "Least acerage", but omitting that Option A has the most business and building impact, this comment on Option K implies that it has the "most acerage" while omitting the fact that it has the least business and building impact. The acerage it requires to obtain is not buisness and buildings, but parking lot. This reveals bias against Option K</p>	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info
I-311-093	Executive Summary	Section 1:31	74	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Estimated property tax effects would be similar across all options, and result in a less than 0.01 percent decrease in tax revenue." This is an incomplete statement, as it assesses the loss in tax revenue of only the loss of the parcels purchased for the right of way. But what about the tax revenue of creating a ugly second Montlake bridge? Or a doubling of size of a freeway that shouldn't even be going through a residential neighborhood? This section implies that this is the only impact of the tax revenue. This is incorrect and implies that increasing the size of the freeway has no impact on the tax base in the neighborhood, which cannot possibly be true.</p>	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info
I-311-094	Executive Summary	Section 1:31	75	Walter Oelwein	<p>"All 6-Lane Alternative options include lids that would benefi t community cohesion by reconnecting neighborhoods originally bisected by SR 520 and I-5, providing linkages between adjacent and nearby parks, improving views toward the highway from nearby residences, and providing safe passage across I-5 and SR 520." This is an incomplete statement. Residents for years have stated that having a freeway go through the residential neighborhoods has been a blight on the city and the social impacts. The additions of lids is nice, but you fail to mention that you are doubling the size of a freeway in dense, sensitive neighborhoods, as though this is an acceptable action and has no social impact. It has amazing social impact: It reflects a city and state that puts a bias of cars over people, is unable to design transporations systems for the future, and likes to build things on the cheap. The impacts are lower quality of life, lower tax base, and stunted economic growth.</p>	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info

<p>I-311-095</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>Section 1:31</p>	<p>76</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Low-income populations would experience disproportionately high and adverse effects as a result of tolling. The most affected low-income populations would be those that are car-dependent and populations living in areas with limited transit service." You fail to mention that the bridge fails to provide improved access to low-cost transition options, such as Light Rail, and this omission in design is just as egregious to the low income population as it is adding tolls.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info</p>
<p>I-311-096</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>1:31</p>	<p>77</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Loss of parkland would occur for right-of-way acquisition of all or part of up to five recreational properties (depending on the option). The largest acquisitions would occur at McCurdy and East Montlake Parks. There could be negative effects related to visual quality and aesthetics where widening of the roadway would bring the project footprint closer to parks." This statement implies that parkland is purely an experiential element, and not an economic element. I find this document incomplete, since there is an economic value to adding parkland, and an economic destruction to having encroaching freeways in parkland. It should be stated outright that WashDOT has proposed only options that destroy parkland, rather than proposing options that correct the encroachment of freeways onto urban parkland. This makes the document incomplete. A better designer would have started with the idea to recover ALL of the parkland, and propose project ideas that would submerge the bridge entirely, and restore the parks and habitats, while allowing throughput (and possibly increasing safety). Omitting this idea makes this document incomplete, and reveals a bias for destroying habitat and parkland.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-097</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>1:31</p>	<p>78</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Trails across these lids would further improve connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians." You should mention what you are planning to do to improve Delmar Drive, which is an unsafe speedway for cars, pedestrians and bicyclists. With the lid, you are improving one area, but not the immediate approach to it.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info</p>
<p>I-311-098</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>1:31</p>	<p>79</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"And, there is no feasible and prudent alternative that would avoid the use of all Section 4(f) properties." In either the Draft EIS or SDEIS, I have yet to see an adequate analysis for why a tube/tunnel wouldn't be feasible and prudent. This glosses over an obvious design improvement, and makes this document incomplete.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-099</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>1:31</p>	<p>80</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Foster Island, located in the Washington Park Arboretum, would be affected by all options and is considered a Traditional Cultural Property eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)." This glosses over that only option K makes an effort to improve Foster Island, while the other options further destroy Foster Island. This needs to be added.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>

I-311-100 Executive Summary	1:32	81	Walter Oelwein	"At differing capacities all options would temporarily occupy Interlaken Park, Montlake Playfield, and the Bill Dawson Trail." This appears to be an incomplete thought. What does this mean, "temporarily occupy?" I interpret this to mean that construction and the final bridge will occupy these parklands. So we can't use these during and after construction? This is the first mention of these spaces in the analysis, so it is hard to follow.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-101 Executive Summary	Section 1:32	82	Walter Oelwein	"The Section 6(f) Evaluation assesses parks and other recreation facilities acquired and/or developed using funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, which are protected from conversion to non-recreational uses." This section is incomplete. I don't understand what it is trying to say. It appears to say that the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 disallows conversion of parkland to non-recreational uses (and appears to be a response to the bad freeway design of the original 520 bridge), yet WashDOT is proposing a new bridge that doubles in size, and precisely converts parkland to non-residential uses. So this section needs to be rewritten to be more clear about why WashDOT feels comfortable proposing only options that encroach on parkland, and has not even bothered to pursue options that restore parkland. This is one of the big mysteries surrounding this project.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-102 Executive Summary	Section 1:32	83	Walter Oelwein	"Visual Quality": This section is entirely inadequate. It mentions the lids as improving visual quality, but it does not mention the visual quality of a bridge more than twice the size in a narrow corridor. The bridge is substantially higher, and with noise walls, would look even more visually unappealing. A specific statement about the quality of the bridge aesthetics needs to be made here. Additionally, a justification for why there is no designer of the bridge, just default roadway placement needs to be included. This section seems to say, "We're adding a \$5 billion bridge here, but we are making no effort to make the bridge an architectural achievement, as the area is not worthy of this investment." Obviously, with the highly populated area, the UW, the parklands, etc, this is precisely where WashDOT needs to enlist architectural and design expertise, rather than just rely on staffers to place roadway dimensions in a corridor. The only mention is the columns difference.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-103 Executive Summary	Section 1:33	84	Walter Oelwein	"All options would result in changes to the visual character and quality in the Montlake area." This is a misleading opening statement. Only Option K would preserve the historic views and character of the Montlake Cut. The other options would fundamentally change this forever.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-104 Executive Summary	Section 1:33	85	Walter Oelwein	"However, Option K and L would include additional structures in the McCurdy Park and East Montlake Park areas that would be most visible to motorists and park users. These structures would dominate views much more than the existing ramps and mainline." This must be an error. It seems to say that adding parkland would be worse than looking at ramps. A bit more explanation that the local residents are tired of the neighborhood being used as a freeway ramp is in order, rather than implying that the "mitigation" somehow makes the views worse.	Error or Incorrect;

<p>I-311-105</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>Section 1:33</p>	<p>86</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>The box for visual quality for Option A is blank. However, Option A is where a second drawbridge is going to be built. Why ignore this fact here? This by definition, has massive visual impact over the historical views of the local area, both when the bridge is down and up. This appears to be an omission that reveals the author's bias against the other options, as the other options specifically call out some minor columns, but Option A doesn't call out a second bridge.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-106</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>Section 1:33</p>	<p>87</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>In the Option K visual summary, there is no mention about how Option K preserves the current views of Montlake Cut, and no other options provide this. This appears to reveal a bias against citing the virtues of Option K, as the only thing mentioned are the additional columns and walls of Option K.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-107</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>Section 1:33</p>	<p>88</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Under Option K, the land bridge at Foster Island would remove naturalized woodlands on both sides of SR 520." This does not characterize the visual impact correctly. Currently, an unobstructed freeway cuts through parkland. With the new design, this freeway is hidden from view and adds parkland where it had been taken away. The way this reads, it appears that the Foster Island land bridge is a visual blight. This appears to be written as a bias against Option K.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-108</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>Section 1:34</p>	<p>89</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>The Cultural Resources section needs to be presented as a grid separating the options, similar to the previous sections. As it is presented now, it appears that they are all equal in some capacity, this shows an anti-Option K bias, since Option K is the one that best preserves the Cultural Resources, but this is hard to discern in this presentation.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>

I-311-109	Executive Summary	Section 1:34	90	Walter Oelwein	"Foster Island presumed Traditional Cultural Property – experiences potential adverse effect under Option K" It is not clear to me why the author keeps calling out Option K as having an adverse affect on Foster Island, when Option K is the only option that tries to do something to preserve the character of Foster Island. The other options double the size and increase the height of the exposed freeway through Foster Island, yet the SDEIS keeps saying that Option K creates advers effects. This appears to be an anti-Option K bias revealed here. At least call out that Option K tries to cover the freeway, improving Foster Island, while the other options further erode Foster Island.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-110	Executive Summary	Section 1:34	91	Walter Oelwein	"Residences Exceeding the Noise Abatement Criteria" In this section, it shows that many residences exceed the NAC. Why is this acceptable that WashDOT propose options like this? Why didn't WashDOT propose three designs that eliminate noise, or reduce the noise criteria. This shows a bias for cars over that of the local enviornment, rather than proposing a design that corrects the wrongs of the past. A statement needs to be included, "WashDOT does not have the capacity to design a freeway that improves the local noise situation. We have not invested adequately in identeifying deisgn and engineering resources that can do this. Instead, we are simply repeating the same mistakes of the past." This would more accurately described the enviornmental impact of this project.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-111	Executive Summary	Section 1:34	92	Walter Oelwein	Residences Exceeding the Noise Abatement Criteria: This section shows an anti-Option K bias. How can Option A, with 7 lanes and not 6, have less noise. And how can having a second drawbridge reduce noise compared to a tunnel. This makes no sense, and does not seem to be justified in the document.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-112	Executive Summary	Section 1:34	93	Walter Oelwein	"All options would meet air quality standards. The modeled concentrations of air pollutants are well below the 1-hour and 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for all design options." This omits an important other option: How much would a tube or tunnel decreased air pollution in a highly populated area? This needs to be stated explicitly, as this should be an important consideration for any project going into the 21st century. The way this is written reveals that it is somehow acceptable to have a freeway going through neighborhoods. This is not reflective of the local area's values.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-113	Executive Summary	1:35	94	Walter Oelwein	"Adding the suboptions to Option A would result in a slight increase in carbon monoxide concentrations at the Montlake Boulevard/Pacific Street intersection." This should be rewritten to state the following: Option A is the only option that increases air pollution. Instead, it is written to appear to minimize the impact of Option A compared to the other options. This reveals a bias against the other options.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-114	Executive Summary	1:35	95	Walter Oelwein	Air Quality (continued): It does not make sense that you would fail to mention that Option K, with its tunnel and lower congestion in the Montlake area (due to cars not idling waiting for the draw briedge) would not be somehow reduced, or a better option than the other options. Failing to mention this in the executive summary seems to show a bias against Option K.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-115	Executive Summary	1:35	96	Walter Oelwein	"Energy and Greenhouse Gases" This section seems incomplete. It should indicate which option has the MOST greenhouse gasses. I'm guessing that Option A would have the most greenhouse gasses, since it will create cars idling for the TWO Montake bridges every day, increasing congestion and pollution. The fact that this is not called out appears to be a bias against Option K.	Omits or ignores important info

<p>I-311-116</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>1:35</p>	<p>97</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Energy and Greenhouse Gases" This section fails to mention the improved improvement of greenhouse gasses by further lowering the bridge into a tunnel and tube and the technologies that could be used to capture and recycle CO2. Instead, it operates on the model that it is OK to continue using combustion engines to send greenhouse gasses into the atmosphere 100% of the time. This set of designs appears to be a failed opportunity to be innovative in finding ways to further reduce greenhouse gasses.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-117</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>1:35</p>	<p>98</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Energy and Greenhouse Gases" : This section also fails to mention what the impact on greenhouse gasses improved linkage to the Sound Transit Light Rail station would have. The current designs ignore that this important link has been created, and the opportunities it provides for improving the transportation corridor. What if Light Rail were added to 520 -- how much would this further decrease greenhouse gasses? This needs to be added to the analysis, or else it is incomplete, and misses a big opportunity to make this a positive project, rather than a damaging project.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-118</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>1:35</p>	<p>99</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"All options would increase the amount of land covered by pollutant-generating impervious surfaces in the project area (Option A – 35 percent increase, Option K – 45 percent increase, and Option L – 44 percent increase)." This is written in an unclear manner. I'm not sure if increases of "land covered by pollutant-generating impervious servaces in the project area" is a good thing or a bad thing. This needs to be clarified. It if is a bad thing, it needs to be more clear about what the impact is -- Option K is the only option that restores parkland on Foster Island -- is this why it increases "pollutant-generating impervious surfaces"? This appears to be another section where a good thing is being presented as a bad thing in the analysis.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info;</p>
<p>I-311-119</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>1:35</p>	<p>100</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>Ecosystems: This section needs to be broken out into separate commentary like previous sections, otherwise it makes all Options appear equal. Clearly Option K is the superior choice when it comes to Ecosystem, so this needs to be called out in the Option K column.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info;</p>
<p>I-311-120</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>1:35</p>	<p>101</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Option K would result in the overall greatest loss of fish habitat due to the filling for the depressed SPU1." This needs to be quantified better, since it implies that Option K is a big destroyer of Fish Habitat versus the other options. That is the way it is written. What is the percentage difference? The way this is written implies anti-Option K bias.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info;</p>
<p>I-311-121</p> <p>Executive Summary</p>	<p>1:35</p>	<p>102</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Option K would result in the greatest loss of wildlife habitat." This is a consistent theme in this SDEIS: By adding parkland, it destroys things. By creating a twice as large exposed bridge, it doesn't. This doesn't make any sense. It is written as though the one option that is designed to best preserve Foster Island is also the design that most ruins Foster Island, when the other designs (A, L), show no regard to the habitat of Foster Island and in fact further cut into it. Please re-write the analysis to demonstrate that only Option K attempts to best preserve the character and habitat of Foster Island, or else this analysis is disingenuous.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>

I-311-122 Executive Summary	1:35	103	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would fill 1.8 acres of wetland and 5.4 acres of wetland buffer." Again, this appears to reveal anti-Option K. Suddenly, when Option K looks the worst, you break out the analysis into the three options. However, you do not indicate what it is about Option K that fills in the most acres of wetland wetland buffer. Is it the fact that it actually restores parkland on Foster Island, while the other options allow for a doubling of size of the freeway through the park and habitat? This section continues to reveal anti-Option K bias.	Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-123 Executive Summary	1:35	104	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would be below the high-water elevation east of the Montlake shoreline, and much lower than the other options through Union Bay and east of Foster Island. It would result in filling approximately 2.7 acres of aquatic habitat and 10.3 acres of shading in the Montlake and west approach areas." This section is hard to understand. I'm not sure what this is trying to say in comparison to the other options. It specifically calls out the lower profile, yet this isn't mentioned as a benefit in the visual impact section (at least in a quantified manner).	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-124 Executive Summary	1:35	105	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would remove 19.5 acres of mostly the Urban Matrix cover type, with most in the Montlake area." Again, this seems to be a contradiction. Option K is the one that best recovers parkland, yet it is called out as removing the most amount of wildlife habitat. This analysis is incomplete or needs to be clarified.	Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-125 Executive Summary	Section 1:35	106	Walter Oelwein	"The risk of damage to the below-water facilities for Option K would be greater than if the interchange were constructed above water." I object to this specific call-out of Option K. In the introduction you state that the bridge is going to collapse because it is a poorly designed bridge. Yet here you are saying that the bridge has the least possibility of collapse. This shows an anti-tunnel bias, and reveals that WashDOT is actually not very comfortable with the Tunnel prospect, when this is precisely how you not repeat the mistakes that have made the existing 520 bridge so unsuccessful. This comment appears completely unjustified.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-126 Executive Summary	Section 1:37	107	Walter Oelwein	"Under Option K, operational restrictions on hazardous materials transport through the tunnel may be employed to minimize fire and explosion risk." Again, this comment reveals that the authors of this SDEIS and WashDOT are not familiar or comfortable with Tube/Tunnel technology, which reveals that they are not capable of fully analyzing and documenting the project impact. I would expect a call-out on how the tube/tunnel of Option K would decrease the likelihood of spills and discharge into the ecosystem, since it's in a tunnel, not exposed to the world and able to spill directly into the water. Issues like this apparently were not considered in analyzing the tube/tunnel option in the first place, calling into question the qualifications of the default roadways placement staffers.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-127 Executive Summary	Section 1:37	108	Walter Oelwein	Navigation: There is no call out here that Option K would require the opening of only one bridge instead of two. This seems to be a major qualitative difference for boat navigation, as you would have to rely on the both bridges to open, and not just one. The fact that this isn't called out seems to minimize the benefits of Option K, while minimizing the impact of Options A and L.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

I-311-128	Executive Summary	Section 1:38	109	Walter Oelwein	Parks effects (acres): It is not clear if this means that it increases or decreases parks. This needs to be revised for this SDEIS to be correct.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-129	Executive Summary	Section 1:38	110	Walter Oelwein	Visual Quality: Not attempting to quantify the visual quality of the various options reveals an anti-Option K bias. Here's a go: Montlake Bridge Visual Quality: A: Bad K: Good L: Bad. Additionally, it would be nice to see what the visual quality would be with the tube/tunnel of the project. The fact that this has not been analyzed reveals that WashDOT is leaving options on the floor.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-130	Executive Summary	Section 1:38	111	Walter Oelwein	Noise: I object to this analysis. It is incorrect, since Option A has more lanes through Portage Bay, how can it possibly be fewer residences.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-131	Executive Summary	Section 1:38	112	Walter Oelwein	Energy and Greenhouse Gases: This analysis is incomplete. It needs to reveal what the greenhouse gas increases would be as traffic idles for the TWO Montlake bridges as they wait to get on and off the freeway. I believe that this poor analysis reveals and anti-Option K bias	ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce
I-311-132	Executive Summary	Section 1:38	113	Walter Oelwein	Water Resources: This section is non-sensical to me, since Option A is the option that most intrudes on our parkland, and does the least to mitigate, yet somehow it comes out in the analysis as the "best" in this area. How this is arrived at is not explained well at all, and reveals a bias for Option A.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-133	Executive Summary	Section 1:39	114	Walter Oelwein	Ecosystems: This analysis again seems corrupted. Option K is the one that the residents most support as being best for the local environment, yet your analysis attempts to show that it is the worst for the environment, probably because Option K is the one option that attempts to reduce the impact of having a giant freeway go through a park. Yet you support analyses that somehow imply that this is generally the best way to go. I find this document to be disingenous and incorrect.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-134	Executive Summary	Section 1:40	115	Walter Oelwein	"Options K and L would close NE Pacific Street for 9 to 12 months." Again, anti-Option K bias is revealed here. Somehow you are going to build a second Montlake bridge and not have an impact on Pacific street? But building a Pacific street tunnel/onramp requires closing Pacific street? This seems absurd and needs to be rewritten.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-135	Executive Summary	Section 1:40	116	Walter Oelwein	"Options K and L would use E. Shelby Street and E. Hamlin Street as haul routes during construction. During peak construction periods there could be as many as 5 to 20 trucks per hour, depending on which option is selected." Again, Anti-Option K bias is revealed here. It is as though the writers want to pursue Option A as the only alternative. I cannot believe that ONLY option K and L would use E. Shelby Street and E. Hamlin Street as haul routes during construction. This seems like a completely unjustified statement.	Error or Incorrect;

I-311-136 Executive Summary	Section 1:41	117	Walter Oelwein	"The scale and intensity of construction-related effects within these areas would be greatest with Option K." Again, this calls out Option K unjustifiably. Option K is designed to best improve the experience in the local area, and is supported by the residents as such. The way this is written implies that Option K was designed to be the worst and most disruptive. This reflects the anti-tunnel building bias more than it does a good analysis of the impacts of construction.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-137 Executive Summary	Section 1:41	118	Walter Oelwein	"Effects on the University District and Montlake neighborhoods would be similar for Options K and L." The specific call-out about Option K and L seems unjustified and implies that Option A has no social impacts. This can't possibly be true. This section further reveals anti-Option K bias, and is written in a way to persuade people to think that it is a bad option. In fact, this reveals that limited effort has been made to make option K a viable alternative, study construction plans. Constructing a tunnel will take place underground, so intuitively, other than removing of dirt, there should be actually less impact with the tunnel construction. This whole section needs to be reviewed and corrected.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-138 Executive Summary	Section 1:42	119	Walter Oelwein	"Closure of NE Pacific Street associated with Options K and L could affect response times and emergency accesses to UW Medical Center." Again, I cannot abide with the concept that Pacific Street is not affected by Option A, but Options K and L are suddenly causing Medical response problems. This is a dangerous statement and needs to be revised such that Option A is adequately called out as a damage to emergency response.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-139 Executive Summary	Section 1:42	120	Walter Oelwein	"Overwater and in-water construction would affect tribal fishing opportunities and fish habitat, although the risk of harming fish is lower for Options A and L compared to Option K." Again, somehow it is OK to put high shade-creating bridges and cutting freeways through parks, but somehow Option K, which reduces the damage the most is identified as the worst. This analysis is incorrect and needs to be changed.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-140 Executive Summary	Section 1:42	121	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would result in 7.0 acres of construction effects on area parks. This option would temporarily close over 80 percent of East Montlake Park. Construction effects are likely to last for 54 to 60 months." These numbers look trumped up to make it appear that Option K is an onerous option. It actually reveals that WashDOT has not done enough due diligence on how to design and manage this project. The SDEIS needs to be re-written such that Option K construction is better managed.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-141 Executive Summary	Section 1:46	122	Walter Oelwein	"Option K has the highest greenhouse gas emissions potential at roughly double that of Option A." Here you quantify greenhouse gasses precisely, yet the overall impact of having cars exposed, and idling for the Montlake Bridges to go up and down is not discussed. This makes the analysis deficient.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

I-311-142	Executive Summary	Section 1:46	123	Walter Oelwein	It appears that the greatest construction impact is on Option K. This also implies that it will have the best long-term benefit for Visual, Cultural, Economic, etc. This really isn't mentioned anywhere in the document, and demonstrates an anti-Option K bias.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-143	Executive Summary	Section 1:52	124	Walter Oelwein	"Another project element that has helped WSDOT avoid and minimize effects has been to engage the public in project planning and identifying community resources, values, and preferences. These activities include formal public scoping processes; public meetings and hearings; community briefings; community, city-sponsored and project newsletters; a project Web site; and a project hotline" This seems to imply that WashDOT has sufficiently addressed neighborhood concerns. The consistent Anti-Option K bias in the analysis reveals that WashDOT wants to implement the option most damaging to the local area, and hide the fact that significant pro-K support exists in the local area. The analysis implies the opposite, and needs to change.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-144	Executive Summary	Section 1:52	125	Walter Oelwein	"Another project element that has helped WSDOT avoid and minimize effects has been to engage the public in project planning and identifying community resources, values, and preferences." There is no commentary in this section that shows that the community values NOT having an overland bridge cutting through their neighborhood. It shows that WashDOT has not sufficiently explored or offered designs that reflect the community values, and the subsequent "designs" are the result of negotiations to improve the poor design and find ways to make it better. Please change any wording that implies that WashDOT has tried to reflect the values of the local area and instead say, "WashDOT has ignored the values of the local area in proposing designs, and has had to negotiate compromises".	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-145	Executive Summary	Section 1:53	126	Walter Oelwein	"Mitigation measures identified for effects during project operation" I object to the premise of this section. It should have a section: "How WashDOT designed a great construction from the start." It can't have this section because instead of using a design process, it replaced existing default roadway placement and then mitigated. This is terrible urban development, and should have been done differently. WashDOT can instead start with a better set of design principles and expertise and create a great design, knowing the values of the area.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

I-311-146	Executive Summary	Section 1:59	127	Walter Oelwein	"With the build alternatives, SR 520 would be considerably wider throughout the corridor and somewhat higher across the Washington Park Arboretum (except under Option K)." This is the first time I see any indication that Option K has a less impact due to bridge size. Why is this? In reading the rest of the document, the metrics presented seem to imply that Option K has the most impact. Please fix the rest of the document to sufficiently support this statement.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-147	Executive Summary	Section 1:61	128	Walter Oelwein	"However, broad public and political consensus has not been reached in support of this recommendation." This needs to state more explicitly: Eastside interests like Option A, and Westside Interests like Option K. I find it controversial that interests outside of the areas have such a say.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-148	Executive Summary	Section 1:61	129	Walter Oelwein	This section misses some other controversies: The notion that putting an elevated feeway through a wetland is acceptable in the 21st century. The limited thought on how mass transit integrates (especially with the Sound Transit station). The idea of adding a second Montlake bridge that essentially doubles the congestion and back-up. The lack of integrated initial design, and the preference to suggesting a bad design, and then mitigating; the fact that there is no identifiable designer, urban planner or architect that can holistically apply expertise and holistic design and benefits is a massive missed opportunity for this project. The lack of expertise in urban design, and instead the reliance on replicating existing bad design. The fact that WashDOT lied to the City Council at the hearing in December, saying that Option A+ had broad-based support, when everyone in the room was in support of Option M. The fact that it has been revealed that WashDOT has not studied the impact of cars waiting for the second draw bridge, and assumes in all traffic throughput models that the drawbridges don't go up. WashDOT should be aware of these controversies, and needs to acknowledge these in this section.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-149	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Overall	130	Walter Oelwein	This report reflects a bridge with 6 lanes, plus 10 ft shoulders, as depicted in Exhibit 3. However, WashDOT has requested bids for 6 lanes, 10 ft shoulders, and two mor lanes for light rail. That makes this SDEIS incomplete. It needs to describe the visual quality of what it would look like to have a bridge that size. It also needs to explain somewhere in the SDEIS that this is an option, and where it came from, as the other options are provided. This is a serious omission that needs to be reconciled before any construction can begin, since all information is based on the "6 lane" option, when WashDOT is not operating as such.	Omits or ignores important info; other options not considered

I-311-150	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 4	131	Walter Oelwein	This shows what it looks like for Option A's second bascule bridge from above. However, there are no images in the other exhibits of what it looks like from street level. This is a serious omission, because it does not appear that the Montlake corridor could handle a second bascule bridge with more lanes. This needs to be addressed here in the Visual Quality report (what would it look like to have more lanes in Montlake?). This does not seem to be discussed anywhere in the SDEIS, and is a significant part of the project. Other intersections, L and K, are examined as having visual impact, but for some reason Option A's second bascule bridge is not.	Omits and ignores important info.
I-311-151	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 4	132	Walter Oelwein	It appears that only Option K has an reasonable integration with the Sound Transit station. How is the visual impact of the pedestrians discussed in this document? Option A appears to be very ugly for the pedestrians at the Montlake level.	Omits and ignores important info.
I-311-152	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 9	133	Walter Oelwein	"effects related to aesthetics and visual quality are given due weight in project decision-making". I don't believe that due weight has been made, as options that would significantly improve the visual quality, such as the tube and tunnel, were not considered as viable.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-153	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 9	134	Walter Oelwein	"To ensure that potential changes to visual quality and aesthetics resulting from a transportation project are adequately and objectively considered during the NEPA process, it is critical that an accepted, systematic assessment process be used." There should also be a mention of the resources used to create the aesthetics to begin with. I have yet to see any information about what expertise, design or otherwise, was used to make sure this is the best design possible. In other major projects, an architecture firm, a contest, or a famous architect is used. Why wasn't one used here? It appears to be WashDOT staffers, not someone who would be qualified to make aesthetic improvements. So it needs to be called out that a) WashDOT did not enlist aesthetic assistance. and b) there is no aesthetic expertise involved in creating the designs. This indicates that "due weight" has not been made in decision making. If this was the case, then option A would be removed immediately, as it is easily the poorest in aesthetic quality.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-154	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 10	135	Walter Oelwein	"Construction effects in the I-5, Portage Bay Bridge, and Lake Washington geographic areas would be the same for Options A, K, and L and for the Phased Implementation scenario." This cannot possibly be true, as Option K is a tunnel, and at least some of the construction effects would be underground. By definition, this is better aesthetically.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-155	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 10	136	Walter Oelwein	"Construction effects in the Montlake and west approach areas would vary among Options A, K, and L. Option A would result in the lowest number of visual changes. Option K would have substantial (high-level) effects on visual quality due to the presence of boring equipment for the Montlake Cut tunnel, removal and hauling of excavation materials, the presence of barges for construction of the land bridge at Foster Island, and the removal of swaths of vegetation for the tunnel, particularly along the shoreline. Option L would have effects on visual quality comparable to those of Option K. These effects would be due to the presence of construction barges for the proposed new bascule bridge (drawbridge) across the Montlake Cut." I don't agree with this assessment. This seems to say that creating a second draw bridge across what is currently a famous vista has the least impact, while the barges associated with building the tunnel, has much more impact? This appears to be anti-Option K bias, and is unjustified in this report.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info;

I-311-156	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 10	137	Walter Oelwein	"Under Option A, a new drawbridge parallel to the existing historic bridge would alter the setting of the historic bridge and change the visual quality of views along the canal when the established vegetation is removed." In prior sections you specifically call out Option K as being worse aesthetically, but here you say Option A is going to change the historic bridge setting, but fail to call out specifically that Option K was DESIGNED SPECIFICALLY to avoid this. It must be called out here, or else this appears to be anti-Option K bias.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-157	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 10	138	Walter Oelwein	"Under Option A, the bridge over Foster Island would be higher than the existing bridge and the bridge proposed for Option L." Again, you fail to mention that Option K is specifically designed to improve the visual character of Foster Island. Instead you compare Option A to the existing bridge and Option L. The fact that you fail to compare this to Option K indicates severe bias against Option K. Option K is designed to be the best visually, and this needs to be called out in your aesthetic impact report.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-158	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 10	139	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would result in substantial effects on visual character and quality in the Montlake area." Why the neutral language -- "effects". Why not use the term "substantial improvements"? This is what Option K was designed to do. The default roadway placement of the old and Option A interchanges were aesthetic nightmares, so to treat them as somehow acceptable or neutral is not correct.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-159	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 11	140	Walter Oelwein	"These structures would dominate views much more than the existing ramps and mainline because the layers of tree buffers would be gone, with limited ability to replace the trees." I cannot abide by this assessment. The option K interchange was specifically designed to improve the views and impacts. This is written as though exposed freeway ramps and interchanges are better than lids and hiding the interchanges. This does not make any sense and needs to be revised to reflect that Option K was designed to have the most pleasing impact. Why else would the local community support Option K and not Option A?	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-160	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 11	141	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would result in substantial effects on visual character and quality in the southeast campus of the University of Washington. The new Pacific Street/Montlake Boulevard intersection and a partial lid would create a complex, multi-layered visual field." So you're saying that a landscape architect couldn't create a visual field better than a wide freeway, onramps, high bridge, etc.? This is not believable and calls into question this discipline report.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-161	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 11	142	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would result in the greatest effects on visual quality and character on Foster Island because of the removal of naturalized woodlands on both sides of SR 520 for the creation of the land bridge." This makes no sense again, and calls into question this entire report. You're trying to say that the creation of a land bridge that effectively hides a massive freeway is WORSE than a massive freeway soaring through a treasured park? You're saying that increasing and connecting the parkland is WORSE than a huge freeway? Why is it that the local residents support having such a lid. The aesthetic impact analysis is very poor, and needs to be re-done. It is not credible.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-162	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 11	143	Walter Oelwein	"Option L would result in substantial effects on visual character and quality in the southeast campus of the University of Washington." This section is written to be similar to that of Option K's "substantial impacts." Nowhere in the comparison to you mention that Option K goes underground, and makes for a better visual impact in comparison to Option L's intrusion on the WAC.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info;

I-311-163	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 11	144	Walter Oelwein	"The addition of sound walls under any of the options, if desired by the neighborhoods, would make the roadway look thicker at the locations approved for sound walls." What if the neighborhood putting the entire roadway underground. What impact would that have on visual quality? This is not assessed in the report, and this is a faulty report because you are offering only poor choices for visual impact.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-164	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 11	145	Walter Oelwein	"The apparent extra thickness". This does not indicate who has would actually design noise walls. This is not an aesthetic concept: "noise walls", so it should be called out that by proposing noise walls that reduce visual quality but improve sound quality, shows that this is not designed. A good designer would identify options and solutions that both are aesthetically improved and reduce noise (like a tube/tunnel). The report shows little creativity or capability of designing an aesthetically pleasing freeway in a dense neighborhood.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-165	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 10	146	Walter Oelwein	"What are the key points of this report?" This section does not mention the fact that the freeway is substantially larger than the existing freeway, which is going to be a major aesthetic detriment. It mentions later in this section "defining character of driving across 520" for drivers. What is the "defining character" that this bridge brings to residents who are near it all of the time? This needs to be called out: The aesthetics of a bridge trippled in size from the existing span has a major negative impact on the local area. Why is this not discussed? This is the main complaint be local residents: that WashDOT is proposing to expand an already ugly, intrusive structure. This needs to be articulated in the Aesthetics Discipline report. If you do, it then obliges you to further consider alternatives that would actually REDUCE the visual (and noise) blight in the local area.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-166	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 10	147	Walter Oelwein	"Exhibit 3. 6-Lane Alternative Cross Section" This scematic seems to show a bridge that is twice the size of the existing bridge. You need to call out here, and everywhere in the report that this is an unacceptable intrusion on the visual quality and character of the local area, and does not fit to the scale of the area, and that this is a failure of deisgn, and other alternatives should be considered.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-167	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 15	148	Walter Oelwein	"Exhibit 3. 6-Lane Alternative Cross Section" Why is it so crucial that the shoulders be a full 10 feet? This seems to create a dramatically larger profile than the existing footprint. If a car breaks down, does it need the full 10 feet? This does not make any sense. An alternative that significantly slims down this profile needs to be considered in all sections of the SDEIS, including this one, because there is no justification I've seen for having such wide shoulders. I imagine that if there was an actual designer working on this, not a default roadway placer, this would have been modeled and proposed.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

<p>I-311-168</p> <p>Visual Quality Vol. 1</p>	<p>Section 18</p>	<p>149</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"However, because quieter pavement has not been demonstrated to meet all FHWA and WSDOT avoidance and minimization requirements in tests performed in Washington State, it cannot be considered as noise mitigation under WSDOT and FHWA criteria. As a result, sound walls could be included in Option K." This section reveals that WashDOT is not providing acceptable mitigation and is not working in good faith with the results of the negotiation. WashDOT should instead offer better designs that reduce noise, improve aesthetics, rather than keep saying, "Noise walls are ugly, but can be added, and quieter pavement doesn't work." You're not providing any options for a negotiated option, so this indicates anti-Option K bias, and that you are not trying to make this option work, even though this is the preferred alternative of the local residents.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-169</p> <p>Visual Quality Vol. 1</p>	<p>Section 18</p>	<p>150</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"However, because quieter pavement has not been demonstrated to meet all FHWA and WSDOT avoidance and minimization requirements in tests performed in Washington State, it cannot be considered as noise mitigation under WSDOT and FHWA criteria. As a result, sound walls could be included in Option K." This section also neglects that Option A and L have similar contractictions and problems, but for some reason you neglect to call this out in the report. The report says that noise walls will be ugly and quiter pavement doesn't work. Doesn't this mean that the project is not fulfilling its goals of being respectful of the local area and assuring visual quality? In this case, WashDOT is required to provide adequate designs, not inadequate designs only. You are blaming the residents for not being able to design a freeway, and this is not appropriate. What would be appropriate is the acknowledgement that WashDOT has not been able to offer solutions that reflect needs of the project, aesthetically, noise-wise, and is proposing something that makes it go from bad (big freeway) to worse (bigger louder freeway).</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-170 I</p> <p>Visual Quality Vol. 1</p>	<p>Section 27</p>	<p>151</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>The concepts of intactness and utility are not used consistently in the summary in section 10. The summary needs to reflect the framework of the aesthetic assessment.</p>	<p>Error</p>
<p>I-311-171</p> <p>Visual Quality Vol. 1</p>	<p>Section 29</p>	<p>152</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"WSDOT visited the project corridor several times to develop qualitative assessments and descriptions of existing landscape conditions." I feel like this introduces a conflict of interest. It seems to me that WashDOT is mostly concerned about putting in roads and increasing throughput. This is at odds with the act of qualitative assessments of landscape conditions, and would necessarily put a bias against doing a thorough or accurate job in this area. WashDOT needs to acknowledge this bias and general lack of skill set, and hire an independent body not influenced by WashDOTs goals of creating throughput, so that this assessment could be accurate. It seems impossible to me that a body doing a visual assessment would arrive at a blight like Option A as a viable option, and the fact that WashDOT even proposes such a poor default roadway placement reflects this.</p>	<p>Error; Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-172</p> <p>Visual Quality Vol. 1</p>	<p>Section 29</p>	<p>153</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"community input". This is vague. At the beginning of the sentence it says that WashDOT made site visits, but then it introduces the concept of "community input." This is not described as to where this input came from, and could mean anything. In a detailed report like this, an omission like this reveals that WashDOT did not perform due dilligence in understanding the community's values regarding the aesthetics of the impacted area.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info</p>

I-311-173	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 29	154	Walter Oelwein	"project analysts". Were these WashDOT representatives or an independent body? I believe that there is a conflict of interest here in that WashDOT's interests are not improving or understanding the visual character of the affected area, but in placing default roadways through a right of way, as the proposed options from WashDOT consistently represent.	Error; Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-174	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 31	155	Walter Oelwein	This analysis is incomplete. There is a new public park "south portage bay" that doesn't seem to have an assessed viewpoint. Also, it seems stranget that there are no viewpoints assessed for most of the corridor of South Portage Bay toward the impacted area.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-175	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Sectin 31	156	Walter Oelwein	The analysis is incomplete. There should be a viewable area from the south side of Foster Island, as well as the north side.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-176	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 31	157	Walter Oelwein	The analysis is incomplete. For some reason very few views from the Arboretum toward the freeway area (between 16 and 17 on the map) are provided (especially from the south side). Similarly, how come the views from Marsh Island (and the footbridge) are not assesed either?	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-177	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 31	158	Walter Oelwein	You totally missed an important view to assess. It is from E. Shelby Street in the Roanoke Park neighborhood (up and down the entire street). It looks directly toward Montlake Cut and directly at Montlake bridge. Since Options A and L are proposing creating a massive second structure across Montlake Cut, this is something with significant visual impact. However, Option K was specifically designed to make sure this view was managed. Strangely, this assessment was avoided, indicating an anti-Option K bias. This is a glaring omission that makes this assessment incomplete. This clearly indicates why Option K is called out in the summary as being not as attractive, when you have systemically avoided the precise viewpoint(s) that Option K is designed to improve.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-178	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 35	159	Walter Oelwein	At the end of this page you have the opportunity to note that in none of these landscape units is it appropriate to have a large scale freeway cutting through it. This is an omission that is not acknowledged in this discipline report. There is nothing about the landscape that makes a large freeway appropriate for it. The freeway is an intrusion to the visual character of the area, and this should not acceptable.	Omits or ignores imporant info
I-311-179	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 36	160	Walter Oelwein	"have identified specific views and viewpoints as important" This is another opportunity to acknowledge that WashDOT put a freeway into these views 45 years ago, and has made these views worse this entire time. These views would be significantly better were it not for the eggregious harm of bad freeway design that neglected issues such as aesthetics the first time they were built. I'm astonished that this is not acknowledged in this discipline report, as this is the most fundamental complaint of those who are in the local area: Someone put a massive freeway in the area and thinks that this is OK? The area is a treasure and an important tax base. It has stunning views, yet the transportation department has chosen to destroy this, and proposes to destroy it further. It is from this perspective that this discipline should be written.	Error; Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

I-311-180	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 37	161	Walter Oelwein	Again, you fail to mention that the viewable area includes the Montlake Bridge, with the potential addition of a second bascule bridge under Options A and L. The fact that this is missed calls into question the integrity and thoroughness of the report.	Error; Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-181	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 40	162	Walter Oelwein	"I-5 is generally not visible from homes north of East Roanoke Street because of recently installed sound walls." It should be noted that the Department of Transportation made an error in installing the sound walls, and they are much shorter than the design. There is no mention of this, and if you are going to credit yourself for improving the visual character of the area, you need to admit to the failures.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-182	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 40	163	Walter Oelwein	"Surface streets are in a grid pattern and densely lined with mature trees that form a near continuous matrix of canopy." It isn't noted that residents have invested heavily in protecting these trees (specifically the elms surrounding Roanoke Park) from disease to preserve the historic character of the local area; this should be noted so that reviewers understand that these trees aren't here by accident.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-183	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 40	164	Walter Oelwein	The Portage Bay landscape unit includes the bay, the shorelines around, and hillsides overlooking Portage Bay." This sentence omits that someone put a giant freeway through this area in the 60s, which has been reviled as poor freeway design.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-184	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 41	165	Walter Oelwein	"The Portage Bay Bridge is an important character-defining structure in the landscape unit." This needs to be elaborated to describe what kind of character it defines. Here are some suggestions: "It reflects the values of the 60s that felt comfortable altering the landscape significantly and negatively with a large freeway in a residential area." (Note: Why is it assumed that these are still the values?)	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-185	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 41	166	Walter Oelwein	"Other vegetation includes the marshes, wetlands, and tree and shrub buffer around the Montlake shoreline as well as the untended, overgrown area under the westernmost part of the bridge." This is incomplete. You need to add that the South Portage Bay park has recently been restored by the residents, and they have removed significant vegetation along the southern part of the Montlake Playfield area.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-186	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 41	167	Walter Oelwein	"The roofed docks of the Queen City Yacht Club at Boyer Avenue interfere with ground-level views." Why the specific call-out on the Queen City Yacht club, but not mention the massive, poorly designed bridge that dominates the views (and adds significant noise).	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-187	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 42	168	Walter Oelwein	"Husky Stadium is the dominant and iconic structure and a memorable part of most views inside and outside of the area." You fail to mention that this area -- the Montlake Cut is NOT affected by the current 520 footprint, and that it remains with the same views of the prior 100 years. This is significant, because Options A and L (but not option K) will dramatically affect the Montlake Landscape unit. (This is why the residents of Montlake support option K) Yet, you say in the summary that option K has the most impact. This needs to be revised to be correct.	Omits or ignores important info

I-311-188	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 43	169	Walter Oelwein	"a popular rock-climbing structure" Why does the rock climbing structure get adjectival treatment of "popular." Can we add popular to other things, then? How about the "popular historic Montlake bridge" or the "popular views from Shelby street of the Montlake bridge". I request that you put "popular" in front of all vista areas in which the 520 bridge has an impact.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-189	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 43	170	Walter Oelwein	"The visual character of this landscape unit is defined primarily by the bay itself and secondarily by the open spaces that ring the bay." Again, I can't understand how you can omit that there is a giant network of freeways and onramps that dominate and ruin the visual character of the space. Please add that this space has been ruined visually by soaring freeways and onramps, some of which have been abandoned and ignored by WashDOT for 40+ years.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-190	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 43	171	Walter Oelwein	"These structures are relatively small in scale compared to the expanse of Union Bay and while they contrast with the surrounding ornamental and native vegetation, they provide a textural and geometric counterpoint to water, sky, and vegetation." However, there is a massive freeway cutting through this area that is out of scale to the small scale structures and pristine environment.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-191	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 45	172	Walter Oelwein	"The Evergreen Point Bridge is the dominant man-made structure in the Lake Washington landscape unit." Here you mention that there is a massive freeway in the landscape unit, but you don't mention it elsewhere. You need to be consistent for this SDEIS to make sense, and understand why the residents on the West Side advocate for improved design from the OLD, Cheap design.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-192	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 46	173	Walter Oelwein	"The dark gray of the pontoons and road deck helps to soften the visual presence of the structure as seen from distant locations." You mention the visual quality of the bridge here, but you fail to mention that the bridge is not known for its visual quality, only its size. It was designed poorly and cheaply originally, and has no distinctive architectural qualities, and is never cited as an attractive structure, despite being in such a dense, highly populated corridor. This needs to be called out that as design goes, the 520 bridge was a failure.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-193	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 49	174	Walter Oelwein	"The pleasant landscape at Roanoke Park" It should be added that this landscape is maintained and developed by local residents caring for the park.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-194	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 49	175	Walter Oelwein	Please note that the vistas from Shelby Street in the Roanoke Park neighborhood have high utility, intactness and vividness, all because this view of the Montlake Cut has not been destroyed by a giant freeway put in by WashDOT but will be if Options A or L are instituted. This is neglected because Shelby Street in Roanoke Park was not included in the visual study, making this SDEIS incomplete.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-195	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 52	176	Walter Oelwein	"In general, however, this is a vehicle-oriented environment and the aesthetic experience of pedestrians here is diminished by traffic, in particular at the Montlake Boulevard-Pacific Street intersection, the Montlake Boulevard overcrossing, and the Montlake transit stop under the Montlake overcrossing". . . You need to add, "due to the poorly planned original design that funnels all north-of-the-cut traffic across a two lane draw bridge that opens frequently, increasing congestion. Note that Options A and L repeat this same mistake, but Option K does not. This omission indicates an anti-Option K bias.	Omits or ignores important info

I-311-196	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 53	177	Walter Oelwein	"In the Arboretum itself, the bridge and west approach are only visible from the Foster Island shoreline and the boardwalk between Foster Island and Marsh Island." This seems to miss the fact that there is a large freeway bisecting Foster Island, and that you must go underneath a freeway in order to get to the commonly used part of Foster Island. This addition of a freeway through a park ruins many visual experiences.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-197	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 54	178	Walter Oelwein	"Because of the age of the west approach structure, vegetation and shorelines have settled into a visual balance with the bridge." I don't think it's a fair statement that anything in the Arboretum natural area has "balance" with a bridge, which is actually a massive freeway paying homage to cars. This needs to be restated to say, "vegetation and shorelines are still ruined by the massive unbalance that the bridge brings."	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-198	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 54	179	Walter Oelwein	I'm disappointed with this section because it operates under the premise that it is somehow acceptable to have a large freeway going through marshlands, parklands, residential areas, boating areas, etc. This assumption makes no effort to acknowledge the mistakes of the past and assumes that this is the acceptable baseline. When embarking upon an expensive massive project, the acceptable baseline should be a structure that is in harmony with the area, not an intrusion. The SDEIS needs to be improved so that it makes it clear what an acceptable visual impact would be for such an area. Instead, it frequently ignores the impact that a massive freeway structure has on an otherwise vibrant, intact, and useful visual space.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-199	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 57	180	Walter Oelwein	"The "before" and "after" visual character were compared in order to determine the degree and type of potential effect, as defined by the criteria shown in Exhibit 13, adapted from FHWA guidelines (FHWA 1989)." This concept misses the point behind the opportunity of this project. By using the existing, failed structure as the before, it makes it somehow acceptable, or status quo. This project, especially at its price tag, needs to enhance the local area rather than accept failed design as the existing level of acceptability.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-200	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 57	181	Walter Oelwein	Your first bullet point should be, "The ongoing idea that a massive structure that puts a preference to cars in a sensitive area is being reinforced and accepted as the status quo." The point is that the visual impact study is avoiding the possibilities of a design that doesn't make this assumption.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-201	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 60	182	Walter Oelwein	There is no mention in the Portage Bay Land Unit the impact of creating new bridges across the Montlake Cut. These are significant architectural features that need to be cited, or else the SDEIS is incomplete.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-202	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 62	183	Walter Oelwein	"Widening Montlake Boulevard north of the Montlake Cut would remove a portion of the UW Open Space, including many specimen conifers that now act as an informal gateway to the University of Washington campus and as the ground-level terminus of Rainier Vista." This isn't mentioned in the summary, the widening of Montlake Boulevard and the significance behind this. It appears that the impact of this is far understated.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-203	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 62	184	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would not affect the Montlake bascule drawbridge area, and visual effects in the NOAA campus area could be less than those of Option A" This is not mentioned in the summary. In the summary it repeats over and over that Option K has the worst visual impacts of the three options, yet in the actual analysis, it reads that Option K has less impact.	Error
I-311-204	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 62	185	Walter Oelwein	"The east end of the Portage Bay Bridge would be 11 to 12 feet narrower for Option K than for Option A, which might lessen the visual effects of demolition and construction." 11 to 12 feet is significant, yet it might lessen the visual effects of demolition? This can't be correct, unless you state more clearly that Option K will indeed lessen the visual effects of demolition.	Error

I-311-205	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 63	186	Walter Oelwein	"Excavation of the tunnels under the Montlake Cut would not be visible but the freezing operation and mining machinery would be visible for several months." In the summary it is repeated that tunnel excavation has a significant impact, and even made it into the summary and the executive summar. Yet here, it says that excavation will not be visible. This is contradictory information, and this section, as well as the executive summary needs to be changed.	Error
I-311-206	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 63	187	Walter Oelwein	"The loss of tree buffers, the extreme change in landform, and the construction of ventilation towers for the tunnels and pump houses for stormwater would dramatically change the park-like character of this area." This implies that there is no design to make it as park-like as possible. How can this be, when the whole intent of this part of the plan is to preserve the historic character of the Montlake area. It implies that there has been no real design work for this, so the report writer needed to just say it would be bad. This implies that the design is incomplete. The design needs to be finished (by actual designers) and then the SDEIS can be written without speculation as is found here.	Error
I-311-207	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 64	188	Walter Oelwein	"but would add large above-ground bridge structures." This sentence is buried in the middle of the paragraph and at the end of a sentence. This should be the first point made. Option L creates a huge bridge.	Error
I-311-208	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 64	189	Walter Oelwein	Because you didn't do a study from Shelby St. in Roanoke Park, you are omitting important info. The creation of a large bridge where there is only the historic Montlake bridge has a huge impact on this view. This SDEIS is incomplete	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-209	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 65	190	Walter Oelwein	There is no mention that Option A doubles the size of the freeway in Foster Island. Won't this be doubly visible? (The later section of Option K mentions the creation of the land bridge, but this section does not mention the creation of a doubled-size freeway	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-210	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 69	191	Walter Oelwein	"The noticeably wider roadway". This omits that it would be taller and the noise walls, undesigned, have to be assumed to be of poor aesthetics.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-211	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 70	192	Walter Oelwein	"The new reversible HOV fly-over ramp" -- I believe that this is only an Option A feature, it needs to be called out as such.	Error
I-311-212	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 70	193	Walter Oelwein	"Visual quality would not change here because the new ramp would be consistent with the visual quality and character of the existing interchange." Again, this is insufficient. How is having a flyover exchange next to an elementary school acceptable? It was controversial at the time I-5 was installed, and it is still controversial. The freeway designers should not be allowed to rely on existing bad design as acceptable.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-213	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 70	194	Walter Oelwein	Again, you fail to comment on the view from E. Shelby to the cut, where the new draw bridges will be with Options A and L. This is a serious omission and needs to be added to the SDEIS for it to be valid or to further consider Option A or L.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-214	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 70	195	Walter Oelwein	"The character and quality of the new Portage Bay Bridge Wider spaces between columns and a wider road deck Landscaping under the Portage Bay Bridge west of Boyer Avenue" These three bullet points suppose that there is actual design to the bridge. I have not seen any evidence of a bridge designer associated with this project, only default roadway placements. From the content of the SDEIS, the actual look of the portage bay bridge is simply a guess of what it may look like, and not something that visual quality SDEIS writers can comment on. This makes it an incomplete SDEIS.	Omits or ignores important info

I-311-215	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 70	196	Walter Oelwein	<p>"•The character and quality of the new Portage Bay Bridge •Wider spaces between columns and a wider road deck •Landscaping under the Portage Bay Bridge west of Boyer Avenue" This section does not mention and diminishes the impact of having a bridge that is more than twice the width size of the original bridge. Also, there is no mention of the water capture elements, and what they look like. Finally, there is no mention as to what noise walls will look like and the impact a noise-wall-look would have of the views. This is a major complaint of the nearby residents, so it is strange that it is not mentioned in the SDEIS. It needs to be added in order for this SDEIS to be complete.</p>	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-216	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 71	197	Walter Oelwein	<p>"This would not change visual quality because the bridge is already the dominant structure in the views in this area (Exhibit 2-4, Attachment 2)." This is simply not correct and needs to be changed. It cannot stand to reason that a bridge with twice the width does not have an impact on the quality of structure. Having a bridge twice the size of the original will have a significant impact on views. Secondly, it implies that an out of scale, out of place bridge is somehow acceptable in this natural and built environment, and seems to be making the argument that this is an acceptable thing to have here. An out of scale building replacing a different out of scale building is still out of scale. I have not seen any statement in this SDEIS that says that this freeway going through several neighborhoods and parklands is a problematic issue from visual quality.</p>	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-217	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 71	198	Walter Oelwein	<p>"These changes would not change the overall visual quality ratings, but much depends on the design of the new bridge. If the design of the Portage Bay Bridge is noteworthy and architecturally appropriate in terms of style and scale for the setting, vividness and unity would remain high, and intactness could increase. On the other hand, a design that does not consider style or scale may adversely affect visual quality." This is a very appropriate statement to have in this SDEIS, and it is quite revealing. This states that the design of the bridge has not yet be completed, which means that this Visual Quality report, and other aspects of the SDEIS needs to be called into question. How can a visual impact assessment be made without having an actual design to review this. WashDOT needs to have proper designers create a design, and then you should create an SDEIS that assesses the impact. By admitting that you don't have a design, you have stated that this SDEIS is not valid. There have been no mention that I have seen that WashDOT plans to hire an architect that would make it "architecturally appropriate", so we have to assume that this bridge will be ugly like the last one.</p>	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-218	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 71	199	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Option K would result in effects identical to those of Option A, except that Option K does not have the Option A auxiliary ramp, making the eastern half of the bridge 35 feet narrower than under Option A (Exhibit 2-1, Attachment 2). The decrease in width would noticeably decrease the effects on the NOAA campus (Exhibit 2-7, Attachment 2), but may not be discernible from most viewpoints (Exhibit 2-6, Attachment 2)." It appears that you are minimizing the impact of something specifically designed to maximize the impact. Option K is the best effort to design in a slimmer profile of the bridge. Then to say that it has no impact ("not discernible") needs to be revised.</p>	Error

I-311-219	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 71	200	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would result in effects identical to those of Option A, except that Option K does not have the Option A auxiliary ramp, making the eastern half of the bridge 35 feet narrower than under Option A (Exhibit 2-1, Attachment 2)." This misses a significant issue: The fact that Options A and L have an additional Montlake Bridge is not mentioned here at all. The Montlake Bridge is highly visible from Portage Bay (as is the 520 bridge). The fact that Options A and L are not assessed on their visual impact on the Montake Bridge vista is a significant omission in this SDEIS. (By the way-- Options A and L would have significant negative impact on the visual quality of the Montlake Cut. Hence Option K exists, but you wouldn't know it from the way this SDEIS is written).	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-220	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Overall	201	Walter Oelwein	There are very few arguments as to why this multi-billion dollar bridge will actually improve views. The lids are the main feature, and mysterious "architectural treatments", but beyond that there isn't much to say in favor of the visual quality of the project. This calls into question the default roadway placement, and makes the argument to have real designers work on this project, not engineers.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-221	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Overall	202	Walter Oelwein	"Option L would result in effects similar to those of Option K, except that the presence of sound walls at approved locations would make the roadway appear more massive when seen from outside of the roadway." First, you need to use the term "more massive" for many areas of this report, since that is what it will have on visual impact. Second, this sentence hides the fact that WashDOT has no ideas other than soundwalls to reduce noise. It makes every excuse not to use quiet pavement, or seek out information for making it work. It lacks credibility that noise walls is the only idea that WashDOT has to solve the noise problem. WashDOT needs to change from trying to railroad stale and bad ideas and move toward identifying cutting edge solutions that work elsewhere in the world.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-222	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 71	203	Walter Oelwein	"resulting in an overall reduction in the quality of views of experienced while driving across or looking at the Portage Bay Bridge." This statement is true, and it is also stated in the report that the architecture of the bridge has not been designed yet. Therefore, this SDEIS is premature and needs to be rewritten after the bridge has actually been designed, because this would have a big impact on the report -- actually knowing what the bridge would look like, and whether it would be an architectural achievement or a default roadway slab, as the SDEIS seems to assume it is.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-223	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 72	204	Walter Oelwein	"Presence of a new bascule bridge parallel to the historic Montlake Bridge" This is omitted in the Portage Bay Landscape Unit. It needs to be assessed for the Portage Bay Landscape Unit, or else this SDEIS is incomplete.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-224	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 72	205	Walter Oelwein	"However, if the stormwater treatment wetland were designed to blend naturalistically with the surroundings it could be a positive change." This is a consistent problem with this report. The various Options are not actual designs, but concepts created by WashDOT staffers and concerned citizens and no actual design has been created by qualified professionals. This makes this entire SDEIS suspect, and in need of revision after actual designs have been created. When there is no design, it ends up being all bad design, and thus this visual quality report is inaccurate.	Error or incorrect

I-311-225	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 73	206	Walter Oelwein	"In the southeast campus area of the University of Washington, Option A would have effects on overall visual quality comparable to Options K and L but on different resources." This minimizes the differences on something that is significant. This section does not emphasize at all that a second draw bridge is out of scale for the area, and would look strange. The same goes for Option L, with an askew bridge in the same viewing area. Only option K maintains the look and character of the existing set up. I don't see this articulated in the report, when this is the spirit behind the different options.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-226	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Sectin 73	207	Walter Oelwein	"Vividness would remain high in the Montlake Cut area if the new bascule bridge is an appropriate architectural companion to the existing historic bridge." Once again, this SDEIS reveals that there is no actual design for the bridges. This makes the visual quality report incomplete and needs to be re-done once bridges are designed. I find it amazing that WashDOT feels comfortable discussing the visual quality of something that hasn't actually been designed. If it is an on-the-cheap default bridge, then it will look totally out of character. As there is no indicator of who is actually doing the designs, we have to assume that it is the least-designed option that will prevail. We cannot accept this SDEIS because it fails to understand the impact. This is a concern of the residents, and this SDEIS does nothing to illuminate the issues and only exacerbates them with the admission that there are no actual designs on the table.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-227	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 73	208	Walter Oelwein	"Even though the SR 520 roadway would be wider, intactness and unity for residential views in the Montlake area could potentially increase because they would be of landscaping and not the highway." This appears to be wishful thinking, and needs to be supported with something that indicates that WashDOT has actual urban planners and landscape architects and designs that support this. It should be noted "If there is landscaping" instead of assuming that there will be.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-228	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 73	209	Walter Oelwein	"Presence of tall retaining walls, columns for the mainline, and more road surfaces around the interchange". On previous pages, you mention "f the new bascule bridge is an appropriate architectural companion", which clearly states that there is no guarantee of this happening, and that the bridge has not yet been designed. However, when you get to Option K, you suddenly know the height of the walls and columns and the visual impact of this. It is easy to imagine that elisting architects and designers, much as you seem to assure will happen for the second Montlake bridge, would create an option K tunnel entrance that is low profile, fits with the surrounding area, and would be a net improvement over the existing space, due to urban design resources being devoted to it. How come you don't mention this opportunity for improved architecture for Option K, when you do for Option A? This shows an anti-Option K bias. The design alternative that is not being considered is the idea that you can hire a designer.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-229	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 73	210	Walter Oelwein	"more road surfaces around the interchange" By the way-- wouldn't there be "more road surface" for Option A? This is not mentioned in the option A section -- when it is creating 4 more lanes. This appears to be a signifiant omission.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-230	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 74	211		"The tunnel could change the character of the east mouth of the Montlake Cut." This statement is made for the tunnel, but not for a second bascule bridge?" It is clear that there is little understanding or expertise or design behind the tunnel entrance, and the default renderings are assuming the worst. This appears to have some serious anti-Option K bias compared the the repeated use of minimal impact with Options A and L, even though they create soaring double-wide bridges while Option K does what the rest of the project should be -- minimizing the emphasis on roads (and hiding them) and maximizing the emphasis on the natural area.	Omits or ignores important info

<p>I-311-231</p> <p>Visual Quality Vol. 1</p>	<p>Section 74</p>	<p>212</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"At SR 520, the SPUI and tunnel configuration would create a walled canyon for motorists." This has too much value-judgement associated with it. Motorists would be able to cross the Montlake Cut and not have to look at a second bridge (this is not mentioned, for some reason). Secondly, moving into a tunnel and re-emerging on the bridge would be an overall pleasant experience for a driver, especially if you avoid having to sit and wait for the bridge to go up. Walled canyon seems to be overstating an entrance to a tunnel, and I'm sure the designers-- if you had them-- would make it so that it doesn't have this feel.</p>	<p>Error.</p>
<p>I-311-232</p> <p>Visual Quality Vol. 1</p>	<p>Overall</p>	<p>213</p>		<p>There is no mention on the aesthetics and visual quality of what it will look like when two bridges go up in Options A and L. This makes this SDEIS seem significantly incomplete. Two bridges going up at the same time will certainly increase congestion (especially as traffic rates increase over time), and motorists and pedestrians will not like the visual quality of sitting and looking at traffic. Having to draw bridges go up at the same time would also have a silly, bloated look to it. Also, do they go up at the same time, or do they do it in sequence? This, too, would look kind of askew and make views worse, not better. I'm surprised that this isn't addressed at all. Of course, this is highly visible from all throughout the Portage Bay neighborhood, so this is an important aesthetic consideration for the residents.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-233</p> <p>Visual Quality Vol. 1</p>	<p>Section 74</p>	<p>214</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"These structures would dominate near views much more than the existing ramps and mainline do because of the walls in the water for the SPUI ramps, and because the tree buffers would be gone (Exhibit 2-21, Attachment 2). These structures would be visible to motorists and park users, with the highest level of visual effects on views from the Arboretum Waterfront Trail at Marsh Island." There's a lot of negative discussion about the entrance to the tunnel, but no discussion of what it looks like when thousands of cars sit idle waiting for two draw bridges go up and down, and what a second draw bridge does from the view from Marsh Island. I (and proponents of Option K) think that it would look bloated and weird to see two draw bridges, especially since this changes a historic Montlake cut. But this impact not mentioned, reflecting anti-Option K bias.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info;</p>
<p>I-311-234</p> <p>Visual Quality Vol. 1</p>	<p>Section 74</p>	<p>215</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The tunnel could change the character of the east mouth of the Montlake Cut. Even though the structure itself would not be visible, the tunnel entrance would change the landform at the former MOHAI parking lot and require ventilation towers and stormwater pump stations in East Montlake Park. The taller structures could also be visible from some residences on both sides of the interchange." This section seems to underestimate what a good landscape architect could do here. It implicitly states that there is no actual design ("could also be visible" instead of "will also be visible"). This is a lot of negative text talking about an opportunity area for a former parking lot (and a not very attractive one at that).</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info;</p>
<p>I-311-235</p> <p>Visual Quality Vol. 1</p>	<p>Section 75</p>	<p>216</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"This new configuration would create a complex, multi-layered channel that would block views to the University of Washington and Rainier Vista from the viewpoints of the motorist and transit rider." This section has revealed that there area no actual designs of the bridge architecture, but there isn't much discussion on how there are no actual designs of the "complex, multi-layered channel." Why the negative verbiage surrounding the channel, when it hasn't actually be designed yet? It should have a more neutral or optimistic text (as you have in describing the second Montlake Bridge), "architectural complement to the area" rather than denegrating it as a complex, multi-layered channel.</p>	<p>Error or incorrect</p>

<p>I-311-236</p> <p>Visual Quality Vol. 1</p>	<p>Section 75</p>	<p>217</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Intactness and unity would decrease in the Montlake residential area because the massive, depressed SPUI is not in balance or consistent with the residential scale and the natural character of the parks and shorelines around it." It appears that only option K gets the "negative" score for the SPUI as "not in balance with the residential scale." I have several issues with this. First, You fail to mention in this report that having a giant freeway that goes through parkland and residential areas is out of scale and balance. This needs to be stated in the report repeatedly and explicitly, if you are going to be comfortable discussing the SPUI. Second, the second Montlake Bridge is not in scale and part of the natural character, yet this is not mentioned. Third, as has been revealed in many sections of this document, there have not actually been designs of the bridge(s), and we can extend this understanding to the SPUI. Calling it out of scale and out of balance rings false, when a proper designer would be able to work on this, and this SDEIS is incomplete until you actually do have someone do this. Fourth, the second bascule bridge, additional lanes, and onramps in Option A would have the same ridiculous out of scale and out of balance issues. In fact, the existing interchange at Montlake has that as well. The fact that this is called out for Option K, but not Option A shows some serious anti-Option K bias. This bias in the detailed report is amplified in the report summary and in the executive report and needs to be revised to be more accurate about the visual problems of Option A (of which there are plenty) and the visual benefits of Option K.</p>	<p>Error or incorrect</p>
<p>I-311-237</p> <p>Visual Quality Vol. 1</p>	<p>Section 75</p>	<p>218</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The SPUI over the mainline and the new bridge through East Montlake Park would be a dramatic change in visual character and visual quality in this area (Exhibits 2-14 and 2-15, Attachment 2)." Agreed. How come you don't mention the second bascule bridge as being "dramatic" with Option A? This clearly shows pro-Option A bias. Please understand that Option A opponents see having a second bascule bridge over Montlake as an unsightly, out of scale, out of balance addition to a historic landscape.</p>	<p>Error or incorrect</p>
<p>I-311-238</p> <p>Visual Quality Vol. 1</p>	<p>Section 75</p>	<p>219</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Option L would result in very high levels of change to visual character and quality in the Montlake area." I did not see a similar statement in relation to Option A, when adding a second draw bridge would surely have a similar impact.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info;</p>
<p>I-311-239</p> <p>Visual Quality Vol. 1</p>	<p>Section 75</p>	<p>220</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The new bridge could be noticeable from a number of viewpoints in the Montlake neighborhood, Foster Island, and Laurelhurst." Again, you forget about Portage Bay area. Most residences and many streets and street-end parks in Montlake have amazing views of the Montlake Cut. Adding a soaring bridge in Option A and L would have a big impact. This is an omission that makes this SDEIS significantly insufficient.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info;</p>
<p>I-311-240</p> <p>Visual Quality Vol. 1</p>	<p>Section 77</p>	<p>221</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The lid will be designed to respond to the existing landscape and this may ameliorate the enclosing effect of the sound walls by creating new connections and viewpoints." Again, the concept of design is introduced as something that is to take place later, yet this SDEIS is commenting on the aesthetic impact of. . ."designs". This undermines the concept of the document, and it is by definition incomplete, since we don't actually know the designs, so it impossible to comment of the impact of the designs. Also, this reminds us that the actual options developed were not from designers, but from default roadway placement and helpful suggestions from concerned citizens. Please have proper designers design the concepts from the start, rather than throw something together and expect us to understand the visual quality of them.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info;</p>

I-311-241	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 77	222	Walter Oelwein	"The surface lid could create a less cluttered pedestrian environment that is also compatible with the urban character of the Pacific Street area and complement the University Link Light Rail station. The depressed intersection could also create a less cluttered situation for motorists but longer distance, orienting views and street landscapes would not be available." This was worded less positively in the Option K section. There wasn't a mention of a complement to the University Link Light Rail station, and the surface lid was not described as a "less cluttered pedestrian environment." This reveals anti-Option K bias in this section.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-242	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 78	223	Walter Oelwein	"The permanent removal of the Aurora Borealis sculptures at the entrance to Union Bay near Madison Park would not have an effect on visual quality, but the marking of a threshold or gateway would be lost." This hides a story. The gateway quality of the sculptures exists because of the narrow roadway that currently exists. The much wider roadway destroys the scale, making it impossible to have a "gateway" or "threshold". The scale of the freeway is in essence too large of a scale to make it inviting to Seattle. This omission reveals a commentary that needs to be included -- the freeway is much bigger than before (higher, bulkier and wider), creating scale problems.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-243	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 78	224	Walter Oelwein	"The primary effect on visual quality and character from operation of the facility would be due to the noticeably greater width and somewhat noticeable greater height of the west approach." This point seemed to be diminished or avoided in the Portage Bay section. Why?	Error or Incorrect
I-311-244	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 78	225	Walter Oelwein	"The new path under the bridge could be a more comfortable and pleasant experience than going through the tunnel as it does today because of the complete openness." This makes the new path seem too rosy. The path is by definition twice as long, and it is still under a massive freeway. Using the words "pleasant" and "comfortable" are pushing it. Instead you should say, "somewhat less odious if the designers take care in this path, but if they took the same care as they did in the 60s, it will be twice as worse." I notice that whenever it is Option A, you try to make it sound acceptable, while Option K emphasizes the downsides.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-245	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 78	226	Walter Oelwein	"The Arboretum and Foster Island in general will not be affected by the presence of the new bridge." I couldn't disagree more. Why would local residents propose a landbridge over the freeway and a lower profile of the freeway if they didn't consider the presence of the bridge completely odious? Then to say that a bridge double the size does not affect the Arboretum and Foster Island? This is an incorrect assessment and cannot possibly be true. Additionally, the current bridge affects the Arboretum and Foster island significantly, so it cannot be true that the "new bridge" does not affect the Arboretum and Foster Island. This assessment surfaces in the executive summary, and needs to be stricken and revised for this SDEIS to be correct.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-246	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 78	227	Walter Oelwein	"Of the three options, Option K would result in the highest level of change to the visual quality and character of Foster Island." This surfaces in the executive summary as a negative. Only Option K specifically makes an effort to significantly improve the visual experience on Foster Island, yet the SDEIS says that it has the "highest level of change", with all supporting statements describing how it makes it worse, yet the other options are treating a large freeway through a public open space as benign. This is not correct and needs to be changed for this SDEIS to be correct.	Error or Incorrect

I-311-247	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 79	228	Walter Oelwein	"The four corners of the land bridge would likely always be somewhat visible from parts of Lake Washington, Union Bay, and Husky Stadium because the marsh and wetland vegetation might not be tall enough to completely screen the walls." It is admitted that the design is not complete for other aspects of the project (such as Option A's second bascule bridge), yet here it is assumed that the design is complete of Option K's lid -- and it affects visual quality. Why wouldn't a well designed landbridge enhance the area rather than affect it negatively? Why not call out that it hasn't yet been designed? This section is pure speculation, and indicates that Option K's impact is worse rather than better without any supporting evidence.	Error or Incorrect; No support
I-311-248	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 79	229	Walter Oelwein	"From the park user's perspective, the north portion of Foster Island would be a somewhat more formalized recreation area depending on the design of the picnic and swimming area". Again, it hasn't been designed yet, so you cannot speculate the degree to which it is formalized. And how is it acceptable to not call out the level of formalization for the other options, which have a large, car/transportation-centric structure soaring through it. Is this not formalized? And formalized declaration of lack of respect for the natural environment and parkland? This needs to be called out more explicitly. Consistently in this SDEIS you call out the negative aspects of the efforts to improve the area and make it better despite a freeway going through it, yet ignore the negative aspects of having a massive freeway go through natural spaces.	Error or Incorrect; No support
I-311-249	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 79	230	Walter Oelwein	"The south portion of Foster Island would retain most of its woodland character and the new path to the lid could be more comfortable and pleasant than going through the tunnel." Why the softness of "could be more pleasant than going through the tunnel"? This must be an error. Of course that going to and over the lid will be better than walking through a creepy 100+ foot tunnel. Also, it doesn't mention the experience of walking over the lid versus walking through a tunnel. Shouldn't this be a consideration of the visual impact? This is another egregious anti-Option K statement that needs to be corrected to: The lid will significantly enhance the experience, yet it is presented here as either a neutral or negative.	Error or Incorrect; No support
I-311-250	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 79	231	Walter Oelwein	"access roads would be installed for vehicle access to the stormwater pump stations near the land bridge and this will give the south island a more developed quality." This is another example highlighting the negatives of the Option K Foster Island lid and a minimization of the negative impacts of a huge freeway going through the parkspace. How is it that something with minimally used access roads that covers up a massive freeway is "more developed" than a actual massive freeway with hundreds and thousands of speeding cars, trucks and busses?	Error or Incorrect; No support
	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 79	232	Walter Oelwein	"Intactness and unity when seen from the viewpoints near or on Foster Island could be diminished to low or moderate because the paved roads and land bridge structure are not consistent or harmonious with the island's existing undeveloped woodlands." Again, you call out this landbridge as being a negative to the island, when the other options have a (twice as large) large freeway zooming through it without any effort to be "harmonious with undeveloped woodlands" This characterization of the option is consistently incorrect and doesn't adequately express the effort to improve the situation on Foster Island. The other options make a bad situation worse on the island, yet this SDEIS does not articulate it.	Error or Incorrect; No support
I-311-251	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 80	233	Walter Oelwein	"The Foster Island trail may have to pass under SR 520 in a tunnel as it does today if the bridge height does not provide a minimum of 10 feet clearance for vehicles and pedestrians." There's a lot of discussion about the landbridge of Option K and it's impact, but no discussion of what it is like to have a freeway twice the width going through Foster Island. This section is incomplete and does not reflect the impact of Option A or L.	Omits or ignores important info

I-311-252	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 83	234	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Increases in the amount of ambient and direct light in the corridor may occur because of additional and/or brighter sources along the highway and access ramps." A special call-out for Option K's tunnel should be made here. As it is the only tunnel, it by definition, would reduce the ambient light compared to what adding four lanes on Option A and L. Why is this not mentioned? In the following paragraph you talk about the differences between options, and this section needs to articulate this.</p>	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-253	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 83	235	Walter Oelwein	<p>"he Option L bascule bridge over East Montlake Park would cast wide, dense shade in the park compared to the current dappled, softer shade from vegetation. Both Options A and L would increase shadowing over the Montlake Cut." This is correct, but I find it peculiar that you find many opportunities to talk about the "high retaining walls" and "deep canyons" of Option K (which I disagree with), yet you fail to mention that Option K specifically prevents this increased shading and ambient light. This indicates a bias against Option K.</p>	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-254	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 85	236	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Avoidance and Mitigation" This section implies that these are the only good options -- avoidance and mitigation -- and reveals a core problem of the project. A third option is to identify designs that actually improve the area, that positively create a better environment (a positive approach) vs. avoidance and mitigation (a negative approach). You are preferring the "lipstick on a pig" model. Why wouldn't you first make an effort to design something great, and then tout its positive attributes? This is how most great architecture is done -- a design or architecture firm creates a design that meets the needs of all stakeholders. Where there are tradeoffs, explanations can be made. Through great design, you can make something better than its base components. The Seattle Library is an example of this. If it was a default building with mitigation, then you'd have something that no one cares about (or uses). Instead, it had the approach of being creative, exciting, exuberant and built in exciting features that met the needs of all users, and inspired through a great look and design mere passers-by. It is on the list of great architectural achievements and is an example of how a great design can make anotherwise simple plot of land significant. You have this opportunity here, you have taken the approach of "put a roadway down and mitigate". This makes the project, by definition, a failure from the start, and invites angry protests from most stakeholders. This section should provide a clear explanation for the design process chosen, or else it is incomplete. A SDEIS needs to articulate why this is the best possible design. Instead, it assumes a bad design and describes the way it apologizes for it.</p>	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-255	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 85	237	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Community input during the early stages of the I-5 to Medina project helped identify important visual quality and character features that were of concern." The reason the community had concerns was because you placed default roadway placement rather than proposed designs that would actually make the community happy. If you had said, "We have enlisted a top-design firm, and they have identified a way to remove this freeway from your views and eliminate noise altogether, while designing in increased throughput and mass-transit" -- how much "community input" would you need at that point other than -- "How soon" can we get rid of this awful existing freeway that destroys the local area?" You could have done this if you proposed a tube or tunnel right from the start. You could have received the support of the local area, rather than resistance.</p>	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

I-311-256	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 85	238	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Mitigation options focused on the addition of landscaped lids to reconnect neighborhoods and augment open space; the use of sensitively designed architectural elements and details, e.g., sound walls, ATM signage, and maintenance facilities to be integrated with, complement, or otherwise enhance existing and/or new features; the application of "green over gray"1 wherever possible in the corridor; a sustainable, functional, and aesthetic landscape design; and the increased spacing between bridge columns to open up views under bridge structures." Very little discussion of the "green over gray" principles are found outside of this, in the visual quality section. Why not? This is the first I've seen of it this late in the report. I would have expected to see many instances where "green over gray" implementations would have a positive impact on the project. This indicates that such principles have not been infused sufficiently in the project so-called "designs."</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
I-311-257	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 85	239	Walter Oelwein	<p>"The design of sound walls must be carefully considered, given that they tend to create a confined, or hard-edged, visual character or reduce visual quality for motorists by cutting off views of visual resources. In addition, for viewers to the roadway these sound walls potentially block views and create an unpleasant concrete barrier." I believe that this is an incomplete discussion. The local residents agree that sound walls are very ugly, and have consistently been researching ways to slim down the profile of the bridge. The best ideas include using quieter pavement. However, WashDOT has consistently shown resistance to using technology it is unfamiliar with, so instead prefers to proposed ugly, unsatisfactory solutions that don't work. WashDOT had the opportunity to propose a tube/tunnel in the corridor that would, in effect avoid all of these issues, yet did not explore this opportunity. There is also no mention of what the best practices around the globe are for minimizing the impact of an urban freeway, just a repetition of the impact of noise walls and some ongoing denegration of quieter pavement. A project of this scare requires greater thinking than this.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
I-311-258	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 85	240	Walter Oelwein	<p>"the use of sensitively designed architectural elements and details" It has been admitted in multiple locations that such architectural elements have yet to have been designed. Therefore, this SDEIS is incomplete, since this is cited as something that has an impact on the visual quality of the project. This is one reason WashDOT has struggled to get this project going -- there really are no ideas for making this an improvement rather than a worsening of an already bad thing (a massive freeway going through a valuable natural and built environment).</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
I-311-259	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 85	241	Walter Oelwein	<p>"The design of sound walls must be carefully considered, given that they tend to create a confined, or hard-edged, visual character or reduce visual quality for motorists by cutting off views of visual resources" Again, it is difficult for someone to make an assessment on the visual quality of sound walls without some actual designs of soundwalls, and how they would look with this bridge. The SDEIS is incomplete without some actual proposed designs (a problem throughout this document).</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>

I-311-260	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 85	242	Walter Oelwein	<p>"However, with a sensitive design that considers color palette, texture, top-of-wall treatment, and landscape, sound walls may in some cases serve as additional visual mitigation." This SDEIS can't just claim that sound walls could be "additional visual mitigation" without showing what some examples of "good" sound walls are. Sound walls are usually applied in land-based freeway corridors, not "basin" like the Portage Bay area. Are there examples of these successfully being applied in a similar context? The fact that this is such a slight discussion point makes this document incomplete.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
I-311-261	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 86	243	Walter Oelwein	<p>"including the process for selection and location of any art in cooperation with municipal and county jurisdictions and art organizations." Perhaps the actual structure could be made artistically -- so that it, to is public art, rather than putting public art on an admittedly ugly structure?</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
I-311-262	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 86	244	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Construct sound walls that will visually screen the roadway from sensitive viewers, particularly in residential areas. The walls could be designed to ensure a unified visual appearance as viewed from within the roadway corridor." This seems a bit optimistic, since I'm not familiar with applications of sound walls on bridges, so it needs to be supported with examples where this has successfully been done in similar contexts for this statement to be valid. Otherwise, it is simply carting a tired, ineffective idea that hides other options (such as a submerged road -- very common in other cities).</p>	<p>No support, Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
I-311-263	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 87	245	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Establish guidelines to ensure the design of structures are aesthetically compatible with the surrounding land and waterscapes in scale and architectural style, and unified in appearance." Shouldn't this have been done from the start? By admitting that these guidelines have not been set indicates that this project is doing things in the wrong order. You can't have a discipline report on Visual Quality if you are discussing the possible need to establish guidelines to ensure the design of structures that are aesthetically compatible with the surrounding land and waterscapes. An in this section you need to provide examples where this has successfully been done in the globe. Instead, all I have seen in this report and elsewhere, is default roadway placement that in no way is aesthetically compatible with the surrounding land and waterscapes. The SDEIS needs to have some actual designs in place in order to comment on them. And it needs to consider designs that actually restore the land and waterscapes.</p>	<p>No support, Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>

I-311-264	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 88	246	Walter Oelwein	"Foster Island would require extensive restoration for Option K, including shoreline and buffer restoration and roadside planting. This site is protected under Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. As such, development of revegetation plans would require coordination with City of Seattle (Seattle Parks and Recreation Department), University of Washington, Department of Natural Resources, and the National Park Service." Again, you call out Option K as the only problematic option for Foster Island, when Options A and L do nothing to improve upon the fact that a massive freeway is going through this natural environment, and the doubling in size makes Foster Island significantly worse rather than better. Every time you mention the work needed to make Option K work, you need to cite how Options A and L make a significantly worse mark on the island.	Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-265	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	247	Walter Oelwein	Portage Bay row Ignores that Option A and L have a second Montlake Bascule Bridge, which would severely alter the existing views. It also doesn't consider the intactness of watching two bridges go up at different times, and what it would look like to have double the lanes of traffic across the cut. This is a major omission and needs to be reassessed for this SDEIS to be valid. For "Unity and Intactness", the impact should be switched to low once you consider this.	Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-266	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	248	Walter Oelwein	The Portage Bay row makes incoherent comment on the fact that Option K is the slimmest profile. It says that the Option K section is narrower by "xx" feet. Given that this was discussed in mitigation, and is very important to the residents, it should have an impact on this visual assessment.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-267	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	249	Walter Oelwein	In the Montlake row, "elevated SPUI visible; lowered intersection at SE campus enhances circulation;" there is commentary on the "enhanced circulation. So this implies that circulation has an impact on visual quality. Well, there is no discussion on the impact of 8 lanes of cars waiting for the two Montlake Bascule bridges going up and down several times a day, and the impact this stalled, congested traffic would have. Why? This seems to be a serious omission. Currently, visual quality of a traffic jam on both sides of the cut is severely diminished every time the bridge goes up. It wouldn't be so bad if it was just the local cars (like is found on the University Bridge), but with the Montlake freeway exchange, it makes for an instant traffic jam. Only Option K removes this visual clutter, and it needs to be cited in this analysis.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-268	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	250	Walter Oelwein	"OPTION A low to moderate: removal of unused ramps; augmented onramps reduce NOAA campus; landscaped stormwater pond at MOHAI" The unity of Montlake is going to be severely affected by a second Montlake bridge. It will look odd. This needs to be cited here.	Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-269	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	251	Walter Oelwein	"OPTION K low: addition of venting towers, stormwater pump station in East Montlake Park; depressed SPUI not in balance with parks, shoreline" I would think that this analysis shold show "high", since the freeway traffic being diverted into a tunnel, not waiting for an opened draw bridge, the pedestrian connection of buses to Sound Transit, and the opportunity to landscape the surrounding area would provide a significant improvements to the current low unity. This is poor analysis and doesn't demonstrate the benefits of Option K.	Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-270	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	252	Walter Oelwein	"OPTION A high: if second bascule bridge design complements existing historic bridge" This is a bad analysis. I would put it as low. A second bridge across the Montlake cut would be totally out of scale. It adds four lanes, will have two bridges going up and down, and basically is an ongoing homage to more car traffic. This does not make a quality visual experience, and needs to be changed to "low." Shame on you for trying to pass off a second Montlake bridge as "complementary" rather than "tacked on."	Error

I-311-271	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	253	Walter Oelwein	"OPTION L moderate to high: if second bascule bridge design complements existing historic bridge and doesn't block east view" Similarly to Option A, the second draw bridge will be an ongoing homage to traffic and will emphasize this as what is important to the local area. Rather than what the natural beauty is. Option L needs to be moved to Low, just as Option A does.	Error
I-311-272	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	254	Walter Oelwein	"OPTION A high: wider spacing of columns could open water level views; design of bridge could enhance vividness" This needs to be moved to Low. The addition of noise walls is called into question throughout the document, and thus needs to be cited as an issue on vividness. Also, this admits that there is no actual design being proposed, other than default roadway placement, so it is speculative that the vividness of the views could be "enhanced." This statement simply is speculative and not correct.	Error
I-311-273	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	255	Walter Oelwein	"OPTION K high: same as Option A" This simply cannot be true. Option K has the best chance to be listed as "high" because of its slimmer profile and its efforts to avoid using noise walls (different from the other options). Options A and L need to be lowered to "Low".	Error
I-311-274	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	256	Walter Oelwein	"OPTION A moderate to high: depending on bridge design and landscape under bridge west of Boyer, intactness could increase" This fails to note that the bridge is twice as wide as before, and higher and with noise walls. This better be one excellent bridge design, and given that this SDEIS had the opportunity to present one, but didn't, and is still using terms like "depending on the bridge design", indicates that this analysis is a priori incorrect and speculative. Then to claim that intactness is high is an overly optimistic claim, given the general sentiment that a large freeway going through this natural and built environment is a blight on the general area.	Error; Not supported
I-311-275	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	257	Walter Oelwein	"OPTION A high: depending on bridge design; column spacing could increase views through bridge" This is in the Unity Colum. You cannot possibly say that having a bridge twice as wide and higher has "high" unity. It will break up the views more than current, and the fact that you are still citing "depending on the bridge design" indicates that you have no idea. This SDEIS is incomplete.	Error; Not supported
I-311-276	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	258	Walter Oelwein	Error: In Portage Bay unit, Unity, it shows Option A as having Moderate Unity, and Option K as having High Unity. Yet it says that Option K is the "same" as Option A. However, Option A has a flyover HOV ramp, so it can't be the same.	Error

I-311-277	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	259	Walter Oelwein	Here is the quantification of the anti-Option K bias found in this document: If you give 1 point for "Low", 2 points for "Medium" and 3 points for "High" in each landscape unit (Roanoke Park, Montlake, Portage Bay, and West Approach) for vividness, intactness and unity, you get 28 points for the existing structure, 29.5 points for option A, and 27.5 points each for options K and L. So under this analysis, only option A is net improvement over the existing structure and options K and L are a net loss. So you're telling me the following: Only option A improves on the existing conditions (with no mitigation over Foster Island, a second Montlake bridge, no designs for either the second Montlake Bridge or Portage Bay span, no changes to the interchanges in Montlake, and freeway that is twice as large). While Option K, with a submerged roadway, lids, a narrower bridge profile, lowered SPUI, mitigation over Foster Island, a way not to have ugly noise walls on the Portage Bay span, and keeping the Montlake cut views intact, is a net loss in visual quality. This is not credible. First, all three options, with this investment, should have significant improvements in visual quality in at least some areas. Second, Option K is overwhelmingly supported by the local residents, precisely because it makes an effort to improve the visual quality of the existing structure, and is significant positive improvement over WashDOT's proposed Option A. Yet WashDOT says Option K is worse than their Option A design (contradicting the sentiments of the residents) and in fact makes things worse. This lacks credibility.	Error; Not supported
I-311-278	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	260	Walter Oelwein	In doing my own assessment on the options, I get a much different score. I put Existing as 16 points. Option A as 15.5 points. Option K as 23 points, and Option L as 16.5 points. Compared with your assessment this is -12.5 for Existing, -15.5 for Option A, -4.5 for Option K, and -11 for Option L. You may disagree with my assessment, but my assessment is fairly representational of a local resident's sentiment toward the existing structure and what benefits the different options are. This is why local residents like Option K -- it is clearly the best choice, and this is the numeric justification for it using your system of evaluation. The fact that the SDEIS does not reflect this sentiment demonstrates the degree of disagreement that is had between the residents and WashDOT.	Error; Not supported
I-311-279	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	261	Walter Oelwein	Many of my comments discuss the missed opportunity of the Tube/Tunnel option, and the fact that it was dismissed so early reflects poor design processes. In my assessment, a tube-tunnel option would have scored a perfect score 36 (compared to the existing bridge's score of 16 and Option A's 16.5), since it would remove a large freeway in Portage Bay, use Option K interchanges underground and underwater, and would eliminate a big freeway going through the Arboretum and Foster Island.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-280	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 9	262	Walter Oelwein	This is the first mention of a design competition and it is in an attachment. Why hasn't it happened yet? Wouldn't we have come up with some awesome interchange and tunnel ideas? Would this have not made the SDEIS process simpler? Is this actually going to happen, or is it going to be default roadway placement and pressures to speed through this process will skip the design competition. What if someone designs something that submerges the freeway to eliminate the visual blight? Would that have the chance to win?	No support.
I-311-281	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 9	263	Walter Oelwein	Why is the design competition mentioned only with Option A? This seems to indicate in advance, that only Option A merits a design competition. In other sections, it says for Option A "bridge design to be determined", yet Options K and L have a determined bridge design. This is inconsistent and not supported anywhere in the text.	Error; Not supported

I-311-282	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 13	264	Walter Oelwein	Needless to say, these options are very ugly. They really do have a negative impact on the landscape. Why is this acceptable? Please include a view of no freeway.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-283	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 19	265	Walter Oelwein	(Exhibit 2.8) This visualization deemphasizes the impact of having eight lanes devoted to managing traffic on surface streets on Montlake and the freeway exchange. Isn't this why people don't like Option A? It appears that you are hiding something.	No support; Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-284	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 22	266	Walter Oelwein	(Exhibit 2.10) You speak disparagingly about the retaining walls for the Option K tunnel, yet they are not visible here. This is where you said it would have the most impact. Instead, the largest feature is the pleasing Sound Transit station. Also, Option A doesn't have the Sound Transit Tunnel.	No support; Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-285	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 23	267	Walter Oelwein	(Exhibit 2.11) You say that the Option K and L lids have a poor effect on visual quality, yet these exhibit show no discernable difference. The analysis you provide discusses the terrible retaining walls and "walled canyons", but these depictions show no difference.	No support; Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-286	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 31	268	Walter Oelwein	(Exhibit 2.14) The image of Option A seems to deemphasize that there are somehow 8 lanes of traffic crossing Montlake here. I don't think that the reflects accurately what it will be like, especially in comparison to the other images for K and L that emphasize traffic. Don't try to pass off that there is no traffic for Option A.	No support; Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-287	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 33	269	Walter Oelwein	(Exhibit 2.15) This viewpoint selection shows some significant bias. When on Foster Island, there is a massive freeway that is disruptive and ugly. However, in this viewpoint, you express that there is no such freeway, until Option K comes along. This is unacceptable bias against K. Why don't you show the creepy tunnels you'd have to walk through to get to this point in existing, A, and L?	No support; Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-288	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 44	270	Walter Oelwein	(Exhibit 2.22) This is a terrible view. Option A is clearly a bad choice -- it adds so much visual blight, yet this is not described in the executive summary or discussed much in the SDEIS, and the analysis seems to think that this is OK, while saying many disparaging remarks about the tunnel's "high walls". Look at this Option A bridge, and it is totally out of scale and balance for the area. Not to mention the additional traffic that it encourages across this choke point. Also, it should show what it looks like up. As that has a significant visual impact. The Option K rendering keeps the visual intact AND lets cars get on the freeway without having to wait for boaters (thus less congestion). This benefit is not reflected in the analysis. The Option L view is also problematic, since the second bridge, especially up, would be curious looking and out of scale. People would say, "Why the second bridge? That looks odd?"	Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-289	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 46	271	Walter Oelwein	Again, the second Montlake bridge looks odd, out of balance and out of scale, yet it doesn't come out in the analysis	Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-290	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Overall	272	Walter Oelwein	The lack of views from Portage Bay at Shelby Street misses a significant vista, and should be rendered.	Omits or ignores significant info.

I-311-291	Visual quality	Section 24	273	Walter Oelwein	"To address the potential for phased project implementation, the SDEIS evaluates the Phased Implementation scenario separately as a subset of the "full build" analysis. The evaluation focuses on how the effects of phased implementation would differ from those of full build and on how constructing the project in phases might have different effects from constructing it all at one time. Impact calculations for the physical effects of phased implementation (for example, acres of wetlands and parks affected) are presented alongside those for full build where applicable." I have not found any discussion of visual impact were it not to be a "full build." This means that there is no option other than doing a full build. Otherwise, this document does not take into account phased implementation, and therefore such an implementation that is not complete would not have been evaluated for environmental impact.	Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-292	Transportation Discipline Report part 1	Exhibit 1-4 (section 24)	274	Walter Oelwein	The images are inconsistent than what is found in the Visual Quality discipline report. Option A shows no second bascule bridge. This is a serious omission that makes this report incomplete and faulty. It would lead one to believe that only option A has no impact to the local area, when this is clearly not true.	Omits or ignores significant info. Error.
I-311-293	Transportation Discipline Report part 1	Exhibit 1-3 (section 22)	275	Walter Oelwein	This image shows 6 lanes plus 10 ft. shoulders. Yet WashDOT has submitted RFPs asking for 6 lanes, 2 light rail lanes, and 10 ft shoulders, making this image incorrect. How can one assess the impact with inconsistent default roadway placements? This larger profile being discussed in the bidding process needs to be included in the SDEIS for it to be a valid SDEIS. All instances where exhibit 1-3 appears to be incorrect.	Omits or ignores significant info. Error.
I-311-294	Transportation Discipline Report part 1	Exhibit 1-3 (section 22)	276	Walter Oelwein	Why is 10 ft shoulders so important? Couldn't they be 6 feet or less, and still essentially serve the purpose of the breakdown lane? This is not discussed anywhere in the document for why the breakdown lane has to be as large as a regular lane.	Omits or ignores significant info. Options not considered
I-311-295	Transportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 17	277	Walter Oelwein	One of the questions not asked is, "What is the minimum footprint that the transportation system can have and still meet the needs? What are the best designs for achieving throughput? The questions posed all assume that default roadway placement equals transportation. Not true. Good, creative design (such as placing roads underground or underwater) can have a positive impact on transportation; Also, how does the transportation system improve the area, rather than diminish it? Roads are an integral part of the environment, but the transportation questions posed do not even mention that the transportation system has to integrate with the environment and is suitable for the environment. This is an important consideration.	Omits or ignores significant info. Options not considered
I-311-296	Transportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 20	278	Walter Oelwein	"evaluate a new set of community-based designs for the Montlake area in Seattle." This is an important statement. This means that the community has had to take the burden of creating designs that meet the transportation and environmental needs. Why didn't WashDOT create designs that did this? This means that WashDOT did not do due diligence, and the term "design" cannot be used. It is a project that was conducted without the community in mind. WashDOT would be better served by taking community input, and creating designs that work for all aspects of the project. Instead, WashDOT did default larger roadway placement, and waited for the community to object to egregious aspects of it, and make modifications. WashDOT should enlist a proper design firm who can make the case of the best design given the various design needs and constraints of the project.	Error.

I-311-297	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 21	279	Walter Oelwein	"For the transportation analysis included in this report, it was assumed that traffic in the No Build Alternative would not be tolled." This is a faulty assumption. What would be the impact of tolling the 4-lane current structure? This seems to be an important data point, because elsewhere in the SDEIS you mention how traffic volumes will increase. But will they really increase with tolling? With tolling, could a 4 lane (with small shoulders) bridge actually be able to meet demand? This is an important question, because if you can manage traffic volume via tolling, then additional lanes is not important, and other, less expensive ways of completing the project could be considered, such as retrofitting the existing bridge. In order for this SDEIS to be complete, you need to remove this assumption and discuss how well you could manage increasing traffic demand via tolling.	Omits or ignores significant info. Options not considered
I-311-298	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 21	280	Walter Oelwein	"The 6-Lane Alternative would complete the regional HOV connection (3+ HOV occupancy) across SR 520 and implement tolling." Again, this seems to mix data points, and makes the environmental/transportation impact more confusing. You need to have the baseline of current state and the demanding, then the current 4 lanes plus tolling (with HOV's being toll-free), and finally, tolling plus HOV. It seems like a glaring omission not to consider the intermediary step of the impact on tolling without having to re-build the entire bridge, because this makes for a low-cost solution compared to the alternatives. Why was this not examined? What happens when political pressure changes this to a 2+ lane?	Omits or ignores significant info. Options not considered
I-311-299	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 21	281	Walter Oelwein	Why only 3+ carpools? Other carpool lanes in the state are 2 people, and there will be a political push to make 2 people vehicles qualify for HOV, especially with tolling. This seems to be a big assumption, and the reasons for only considering 3+ carpools is not provided in this document.	Omits or ignores significant info. Options not considered
I-311-300	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 22	282	Walter Oelwein	"The proposed width of the roadway would be approximately 18 feet narrower than the one described in the Draft EIS, reflecting public comment from local communities and the City ofSeattle." In order for this SDEIS to hold and to make this project legal, this statement has to hold. Please indicate why WashDOT has put out bid requests describing a larger profile, undermining the project, and probably causing delays.	Omits or ignores significant info. Options not considered
I-311-301	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 22	283	Walter Oelwein	"The project would include landscaped lids across SR 520 at I-5, 10th Avenue East, and Delmar Drive East, and in the Montlake area" In order for this SDEIS to be correct, these lids have to be built. Since there is no discussion of the environmental impact of not building these lids, it is a requirement that these bids be built, or else the project violates the law.	Reminder to keep promises.
I-311-302	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 24	284	Walter Oelwein	Imagery shows Option A as not having a second bascule bridge and new freeway interchange. This gives the impression that Option A is not a big change, when it is a dramatic change.	Error
I-311-303	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 25	285	Walter Oelwein	"Citizen recommendations made during the mediation process redefined this option to include quieter pavement for noise abatement instead of sound walls included in the 2006 Draft EIS." Why didn't WashDOT offer this itself? Why isn't WashDOT actively suggesting better mitigations, and waiting for citizens to conduct better freeway designs? This statement indicates that WashDOT has not sufficiently researched options for this project, and needs to do so in order for the project to meet the design needs.	Omits important info

<p>I-311-304</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 25</p>	<p>286</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"However, because quieter pavement has not been demonstrated to meet all FHWA and WSDOT avoidance and minimization requirements in tests performed in Washington State, it cannot be considered as noise mitigation under WSDOT and FHWA criteria. As a result, sound walls could be included in Option K. The decision to build sound walls depends on neighborhood interest, the findings of the Noise Discipline Report (WSDOT 2009b), and WSDOT's reasonability and feasibility determinations." This statement is confusing and error-prone. First, does quieter pavement meet some criteria for improving the noise situation? It is presented as all or nothing, when clearly quieter pavement, as the name implies, does something to reduce noise. Second, why is this being considered only for Option K, and not the other options? Citizen input has been focused on option K because it is the only viable option, and citizens have been focused on creating the best design. Options A and L could benefit from quieter pavement, but because there is citizen opposition to these options, WashDOT will not consider quieter pavement? This does not make sense. The SDEIS needs to consider the impact of quieter pavement for all options. It also needs to make explicit that there is citizen opposition to Options A and L, and this is why quieter pavement is not discussed for these options -- citizens will be against these options with or without quieter pavement. This needs to be surfaced for this statement to make sense. Finally, what other options does WashDOT have other than noise walls? Is that it? This seems to be a very limited set of options for such a large project. How about a lower speed limit? That would reduce noise.</p>	<p>Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-305</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 26</p>	<p>287</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Noise mitigation identified for this option would include sound walls as defined in the Draft EIS." Why not add quieter pavement too? What's the issue of making it even better?</p>	<p>Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-306</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 31</p>	<p>288</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Exhibit 1-8 shows the vulnerable portions of the project that would be prioritized, as well as the portions that would be constructed later." The term prioritization implies that parts of this project could be dropped off. So the priority 3 parts -- such as the new lids and intersections, could conceivably be not completed. However, if you do this, this changes the environmental impact, making the document invalid, and if you don't complete all parts of the project, then the project is illegal, since it didn't take into account the environmental impact if priority 2 and 3 options are not complete. So priority is the incorrect word. You can just say "Phase 1, Phase 2, based on safety concerns", but you can't say priority, because that implies that it does not need to be compelled as much, but in order for the SDEIS to be legal, it does.</p>	<p>Error. Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-307</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 31</p>	<p>289</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"the regional bicycle/pedestrian path, but lids would be deferred until a subsequent phase" This makes it appear that building the lids is optional, but you are not considering the environmental impact of not constructing the lids. So this needs to be re-written not to imply that the lids are optional. How about, "The lids will be an integral part to complete this project, and if they are not, then this document is invalid and WashDOT has not completed the necessary regulatory steps to proceed on this project."</p>	<p>Error. Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-308</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 31</p>	<p>290</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"WSDOT would develop and implement all mitigation needed to satisfy regulatory requirements." This is written to imply that mitigation is different from lids. It needs to be more explicit, such as "WSDOT will develop and implement the project as described in this document" so that alternative mitigation that is not discussed in the SDEIS is implemented without study or public comment.</p>	<p>Error. Omits important info</p>

<p>I-311-309</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section3 1</p>	<p>291</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The evaluation focuses on how the effects of phased implementation would differ from those of full build and on how constructing the project in phases might have different effects from constructing it all at one time. Impact calculations for the physical effects of phased implementation (for example, acres of wetlands and parks affected) are presented alongside those for full build where applicable." This is the only reference to the "full build" in the Transporation Discipline report, which means to say that this SDEIS only considers full build, and not partial build scenarios. This means that WashDOT is obliged to build all aspects, including lids, or else it is a project that has not cleared regulatory standards.</p>	<p>Error. Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-310</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 31</p>	<p>292</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"What are the key findings for freeway traffic?" This section describes the experience for freeway traffic, but not mass transit options. It is incomplete, because it does not describe the general experience for busses (which need to deal with the same traffic) and it does not mention that there is no mass transit option that is not affected by traffic (trains). Similarly, the bicycle and pedestrian situation is not mentioned. This is an incomplete assessment of the current state. It needs to describe the general mass transit experience if this wants to be the "transportation" discipline report. Transportation isn't just cars, but the way it is written, it implies that it is. This makes the SDEIS incomplete and incorrect, as in the introduction all kinds of transportation is discussed at the beginning chapter about the need for a transportation discipline report, but not when it comes to the actual content.</p>	<p>Error. Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-311</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 34</p>	<p>293</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"With this growth, traffic volumes and congestion will be affected as described below:" Again, this assumes only traffic. What are the mass transit needs (i.e., people without cars? How many more busses? How many trains? This omission makes the findings imply that the only solution is increased roadway. This is an omission that needs to be corrected for this SDEIS to be correct.</p>	<p>Error. Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-312</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 34</p>	<p>294</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Daily traffic demand across Lake Washington would increase by 17 percent on SR 520," This doesn't seem like a whole lot. The increase in the number of lanes is 33%. It also seems as though quality mass transit could easily absorb that 17 percent, and tolling would discourage 17% driving. So the project does not seem to justify adding more lanes under this assumption.</p>	<p>Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-313</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 34</p>	<p>295</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"On SR 520, morning peak period demand would increase 10 percent and afternoon peak period demand would increase 16 percent compared to today. Peak period congestion would be worse than today." Again, this statement really doesn't seem much worse than today, not justifying a 33% increase in car lanes and the wide shoulders. It appears that some tolling that would reduce demand, increased busses, or a light rail line could easily handle this growth, especially with the sound transit line coming through the corridor. Because tolling on the "no build" alternative is assumed out, this design option is omitted, when it could significantly reduce costs and impact of the project.</p>	<p>Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>

<p>I-311-314</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 34</p>	<p>296</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Westbound general-purpose travel times will increase approximately 20 to 30 minutes compared to today. Eastbound general-purpose travel times will increase up to 1 hour." What would happen if there was a toll (and \$5 toll at that)? Wouldn't this reduce demand significantly, encourage HOV and bus travel? This is not considered, when it should be, because it is something that the legislature has actually signed into law -- early tolling. The estimates for the "no build" option are fiction, because we know that there will be tolling prior to building a new bridge, yet the impact of this on the "no build" option isn't considered. This is a strange omission and implies that WashDOT is not interested in identifying the best option for moving people and preserving the environment, but is interested in increasing the roadway footprint.</p>	<p>Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-315</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 34</p>	<p>297</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"With the 6-Lane Alternative, the SR 520 corridor would be tolled, which would cause some drivers to change their travel mode (bus or carpool), time of day for travel, or their route." The abrupt introduction of tolling with 6 lanes (but not considering it with 4 lanes -- even though this will happen because of state law) doesn't make sense. The SDEIS has to consider the impact of tolling on the "no build" alternative for this to be a valid SDEIS. It cannot state how congesting things will be without discussing the impact on tolls.</p>	<p>Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-316</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 34</p>	<p>298</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The 6-Lane Alternative options would not generate more regional traffic, but would change traffic circulation patterns to and from SR 520." This statement is difficult to understand. How does a roadway "generate" traffic. Earlier it says that regional growth and employment generates traffic. Here it says that the roadway generates traffic. This is a contradiction. This statement is written to imply that the 6 lane alternative will not be responsible in more traffic, just the shifting around in traffic. This implies that the additional lanes are actually not necessary (since there isn't "more" traffic), and that an improvement in the interchanges are all that are needed.</p>	<p>Error or incomplete info.</p>
<p>I-311-317</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 35</p>	<p>299</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The 6-Lane Alternative HOV system and design improvements would substantially reduce congestion at two of the most congested locations on SR 520 compared to the No Build Alternative: □ Approaching the SR 520 bridge in Medina (westbound), □ Approaching the SR 520 bridge in Seattle (eastbound)" Again, as this is the summary, there is no mention of the impact on mass transit options, it is purely a car-centric statement. The SDEIS needs to describe the impact on Mass Transit as well.</p>	<p>Error or incomplete info.</p>
<p>I-311-318</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 35</p>	<p>300</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Tolling and the completion of the HOV lane with the 6-Lane Alternative would reduce daily vehicle volumes across SR 520 by up to 4,700 vehicles (or 3 percent) compared to the No Build Alternative. Some people would choose to take other modes of travel (such as transit, carpools, vanpools, and bike), change time of travel, or select a different route." What about with the 4 lane alternative and increased busses?</p>	<p>Error or incomplete info.</p>
<p>I-311-319</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 35</p>	<p>301</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>This section describes only the amount of car traffic, and vehicle traffic time. What is the mass transit traffic time change? What is the amount of mass transit trips that the bridge can handle? This report is focused only on vehicular transportation, and paints no picture of the mass transit situation and improvement oppportunities. This makes the SDEIS incomplete.</p>	<p>Error or incomplete info.</p>
<p>I-311-320</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 35</p>	<p>302</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>It is not mentioned that the "Montlake Flyer" bus stop is being removed, so this would change non-car travel times in some way. This is not mentioned, even though this is a major source of traffic across the bridge, and I'm very interested in knowing what the change would be.</p>	<p>Error or incomplete info.</p>
<p>I-311-321</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 35</p>	<p>303</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"HOV vehicles approximately 40 minutes." Are you including busses in the mix of HOV vehicles? If so, it needs to be more explicit. At the same time, the busses will not be stopping at Montlake, so that has an impact on travel time. It is not mentioned here, making this document incomplete.</p>	<p>Error or incomplete info.</p>

<p>I-311-322</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 35</p>	<p>304</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"General-purpose vehicle trips would decrease by up to 10,000 vehicles per day and general-purpose person trips would decrease by up to 13,500 persons per day." Then why make the freeway bigger? This implies that the traffic demand is managable, and tolling and mass transit could manage traffic through 2030 without increasing the bridge profile.</p>	<p>Error or incomplete info. Options not considered.</p>
<p>I-311-323</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 35</p>	<p>305</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The 6-Lane Alternative would allow SR 520 to serve more traffic than the No Build Alternative during the peak period: up to approximately 700 more vph and 2,100 more people per hour." This "key finding" is written as though it is a good thing (more vehicular traffic is better). But let's consider this a bad thing: It implies that we are encouraging more general purpose traffic when we are in an era when we are trying to reduce vehicular trips. This implies that this is the main goal of the project, rather than finding the best transportation corridor that reflects our values. This statement is embelmatic of how WashDOT is not considering the interests and values, and is considering only increased throughput.</p>	<p>Error or incomplete info. Options not considered.</p>
<p>I-311-324</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 36</p>	<p>306</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"This diversion would increase traffic in the Harvard/Roanoke neighborhood and increase traffic along the NE 45th Street corridor. The diversion would also decrease traffic volumes north of the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection compared to the No Build Alternative." What is the impact on Delmar Dr. E? This needs to be mentioned for the SDEIS to be complete.</p>	<p>Error or incomplete info.</p>
<p>I-311-325</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 36</p>	<p>307</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"With Suboption A (with Lake Washington Boulevard ramps), access to SR 520 (and therefore traffic volumes) would be similar to the No Build Alternative." This cannot possibly be true, since above it is stated that all 6 lane alternatives would handle more cars and people than no-build, but none of these cars are going thorough Lake Washington Blvd? This is impossible. The analysis is incorrect.</p>	<p>Error or incomplete info.</p>
<p>I-311-326</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 36</p>	<p>308</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"With Options K and L, traffic volumes at the SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke and I-5/NE 45th Street interchanges would be similar to the No Build Alternative." Again, this seems impossible. Throughout the introduction, you mention the explosive increased growth of population, employment, and vehicular traffic. Then you mention the increased throughput that the 6-lane alternatives would bring, but when it comes to the impact at interchanges, you say, "No different than no-build." It must be that more cars will get on and off at these interchanges, because there will be more cars, as stated earlier.</p>	<p>Error or incomplete info</p>
<p>I-311-327</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 37</p>	<p>309</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"In the Montlake area:" There is no mention of the impact of the bascule bridges on traffic. These bridges go up frequently during the day, and create lots of congestion. With Options A and L, you are creating more capacity, and at the same time stalling traffic the same amount of time, creating more congestion. This needs to be analyzed and mentioned in the SDIES for it to be complete.</p>	<p>Error or incomplete info</p>
<p>I-311-328</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 37</p>	<p>310</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Option K or L would decrease traffic volumes on SR 520 between Montlake and I-5 compared to the No Build Alternative because drivers would shift their travel routes to the new interchange and its associated increase in capacity in the Montlake area." This key finding needs to be stated in the "Montlake" section. I could not identify a key finding that Option K and L would increase capacity in the Montlake area. This needs to be addressed in the Montlake section, because it seems like a pretty important differentiation between Options K and L.</p>	<p>Omission</p>

<p>I-311-329</p> <p>Transportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 37</p>	<p>311</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Even though SR 520 traffic volumes would decrease between Montlake and I-5, some westbound congestion would remain because neither Option K nor L includes the westbound auxiliary lane." This needs to be quantified for it to be valid. "Some congestion would remain" is vague and unsupported, but designed to make Option A look good and Options K and L look bad. It also implies that with Option A, "some congestion would <i>not</i> remain", that is, Option A relieves all congestion. This cannot be true, and needs to be stricken from the SDEIS for the document to be valid.</p>	<p>Not supported, Error</p>
<p>I-311-330</p> <p>Transportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 37</p>	<p>312</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"With Option K or L, congestion on SR 520 would also affect ramp traffic at the new interchange, spilling back onto the local system." OK, this is clearly an anti-L and -K statement. How can it be that Option K/L "spills back" and Option A doesn't? First, "Spills back" is a value-laden term that implies that Option K is the worst design, when in fact it does the most to channel traffic quickly to and from the freeway with no "spilling back." Second as Options A and L have bascule bridges that shut down traffic several times a day, this would surely "spill back" traffic into the local system. However, the fact that the draw bridges would stop traffic for extended periods is ignored in the SDEIS.</p>	<p>Error, not supported, omission</p>
<p>Transportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 38</p>	<p>313</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The NE 45th Street/7th Avenue NE intersection would worsen from LOS D with the No Build Alternative to LOS E during the afternoon peak hour with Option A." This statement again shows Anti-K bias. It says that Option A is worse, but it does not say that Option K makes things better (since cars can more easily get north of the cut). Why not call out K when it is the best option?</p>	<p>Omission</p>
<p>I-311-331</p> <p>Transportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 38</p>	<p>314</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Roanoke Street Interchange Area" This section describes only worsening of the intersections. However, what is WashDOT doing to make it so that these cars can be transitioned to mass-transit? By definition, these are people in close-in neighborhoods, so an improved mass-transit arrangement would make it possible to actually reduce traffic. But this report only discusses cars, so we don't know what the impact of improved mass transit will be. This is where the one-dimensional analysis of cars and growth = more cars is faulty. With more growth you can get more mass transit -- which means fewer cars but more people trips. This SDEIS doesn't seem to take into account the opportunities for improved people transportation, and only quantifies cars. This calls into question the basic concept of the project, where moving people in dense corridors is the top priority (not necessarily cars).</p>	<p>Omission; other options not considered</p>
<p>I-311-332</p> <p>Transportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 38</p>	<p>315</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Montlake Interchange Area" This section needs to be more clearly written for it to make sense. This is where the greatest differential between Options A, L and K are, and the differences are difficult to follow. Secondly, there is no mention on the impact that the additional bascule bridges (options A, L) have vs. no additional bascule bridges for Option K. This is a huge difference, because traffic to and from the freeway will not be subject to boat traffic, as is common today. the fact that it is not mentioned makes this analysis glaringly incomplete, and leads one to believe that there is anti-Option K bias.</p>	<p>Omission; other options not considered</p>
<p>I-311-333</p> <p>Transportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 38</p>	<p>316</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection would improve from LOS F with the No Build Alternative to LOS E during the afternoon peak hour with Option A and its suboption." What would be the difference with Option L and K? This is an important difference between the two options, and it would seem that Option K would be much better, since traffic does not have to go across the Montlake bridges and can more directly access the freeway.</p>	<p>Omission; other options not considered</p>

I-311-334	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 38	317	Walter Oelwein	"The Montlake Boulevard NE/East Shelby Street intersection would improve from LOS F with the No Build Alternative to LOS A during the afternoon peak hour with all of the 6-Lane Alternative options". This seems implausible, since two of the three alternatives have a bascule bridge, so there will be a difference non-peak at least. Second, with the additional lanes, this is going to be a much bigger intersection with Option A, so it is hard to imagine that it will be so much better with A, and especially in comparison to K. This is anti-K bias.	Omission; other options not considered
I-311-335	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 38	318	Walter Oelwein	Not once does it mention "off-peak" traffic. Normally, I could see this not being a big deal, but with the Montlake Cut, and the boating right of way, this is a major omission in the findings. During peak hours, the bridges don't go up, but at other times, the boating right of way causes the bridge (and potentially bridges) go up a lot. During the summer, A LOT. This makes non-peak traffic come to a halt for extended periods of time as boats go through. It is a common experience to be sitting in a stand-still in Montlake at any time of day, making non-peak traffic as much an issue as peak traffic. With Option A and L having bascule bridges, it stands to reason that this would extend and exacerbate the problem. And Option K would alleviate the problem, since SR520 traffic would not be subject to the whims of the boating right-of-way, and the back-ups waiting for the bridges would be limited to the cars who don't want to get on the freeway. That's a huge difference, and the fact that this is not discussed or considered in the discipline report is a major omission, and something that the public needs to be aware of. It also reflects Anti-K bias, since the design for Option K was to stop the madness of the Montlake bridge being a gateway for freeway (and transit) on-off traffic. This is a major benefit of the design, and needs to be analyzed and discussed.	Omission; other options not considered; Error
I-311-336	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 38	319	Walter Oelwein	I provided this feedback in the Draft EIS, but it does not seem to be addressed in the SDES: The main corridors of Furman/Boyer and Delmar Drive are not addressed in this section analysis. Given that these are two major arterials that are directly related to cars making short-cuts on-and-off the freeway, there is a great amount of interest in these streets, and how a new freeway would impact traffic on them. The intersection where they meet (Boyer and E. Lynn) gets heavy traffic in the morning and evening, and much of it is "cut-through" traffic -- people avoiding the freeway to get on to the bridge closer to the bridge deck. How would the new freeway road placements improve this kind of "negative impact" traffic to the neighborhood?	Omission;
I-311-337	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 39	320	Walter Oelwein	"Existing Conditions": This section has an incomplete discussion on the existing conditions of mass transit, it just says that it is commonly used for transit. What is it like to walk down to the freeway station and wait on the side of a freeway for a bus stuck in traffic? How do people get to the Montlake area via bus to get on 520? This is not discussed. It focuses only on the driver experience. How people experience this roadway via mass transit needs to be discussed, or else this SDEIS is woefully incomplete; in it's current state, it reflects the "only cars are important" concept commonly found in this SDEIS, and paints an incomplete picture of how the new freeway options are going to help transportation (cars and other modes) in the 21st century. This can explain why the Options presented so casually eliminate the "Montlake Flyer" freeway station, but do not recommend an option for how to replace the traffic there. C'mon WashDOT, get into the 21st century!	Omission

<p>I-311-338</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 39</p>	<p>321</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Existing Conditions": This section omits discussion on the existing conditions of pedestiran and bicycle traffic. Why? Are these not valid transportation options that the new freeways are supposed to have an impact on? Yet in the Environmental Impact Statement, there is no discussion of the current state of pedestrian traffic (very common in the area) and bicycle traffic (just as common), and how they link to Mass Transit and Cars. Isn't there an "existing condition"? My assessment of the existing condition is that the current bridge setup completely ignored these modes of transportation, and pedestrians/bicyclists have to engage in large intersections that are dangerous and unaccomodating to pedestrians. The community sponsored designs make an effort to improve upon this signifciantly, so the fact that this is omitted shows a pro Option A bias, and undermines the positive impact that other Options provide. This needs to be in the executive summary or "key findings" for the SDEIS to be valid.</p>	<p>Omission; other options not considered; Error</p>
<p>I-311-339</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 39</p>	<p>322</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"are frequently congested during the morning and afternoon peak hours." Again, while peak hours are pretty bad on Montlake and Lake Washtington Boulevard, non-peak hours are just as bad because of the draw bridge grinding traffic to a halt, and creating backups. Why does this SDEIS only look at "top throughput" and not on how the new options make the overall conditions better? This shows a bias toward commuters, not residents, and toward Option A, not community suggested options.</p>	<p>Omission; other options not considered; Error</p>
<p>I-311-340</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 39</p>	<p>323</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Traffic congestion can extend across the Montlake Bridge to the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection and as far back as 25th Avenue NE near University Village (approximately 1 mile)." The "as far as" comment is inaccurate. It backs up further than that. And it isn't only during "peak hour" congestion, as so frequently mentioned in this SDEIS. It is during the non-peak times, such as Saturday and Sunday, when many boats are out and about, causing the bridge to go up. The fact that it is not clear what is backing up the traffic shows an incomplete picture of what is going on in the local area, and is reflected in the poor design of Option A, that tries to solve the problem by just making a bigger roadway (that halts traffic)</p>	<p>Omission; other options not considered; Error</p>
<p>I-311-341</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 39</p>	<p>324</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Montlake Boulevard NE is also an important transit corridor, serving both local and regional buses between the SR 520 interchange and the University District." This is written to imply that busses exist only on Montlake Boulevard. Not true. So many busses go through the "Montlake Flyer" freeway station, with a high volume of tranist riders who get on and off there. This is where the vast majority of the "regional" transit goes. This needs to be included in the discussion for the SDEIS to be complete.</p>	<p>Omission; other options not considered; Error</p>
<p>I-311-342</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 39</p>	<p>325</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Montlake Bridge openings can have long-lasting effects on traffic flow in this area. The bridge does not open during the morning and afternoon peak periods; however, the last opening at 3:30 p.m. can affect traffic operations throughout the afternoon commute." This still has a strange emphasis on the "peak times." The emphasis on the 3:30 bridge opening's impact has the effect of minimizing the other opening times, which have a huge impact on the transportation corridor and especially to the local residents. This SDEIS needs to better understand that the traffic isn't there ONLY during peak times, but all of the time, and the Options presented need to be designed to stop this poor design.</p>	<p>Omission; other options not considered; Error</p>

<p>I-311-343</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 39</p>	<p>326</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Bridge openings compound whatever congestion is present on the local street network and can cause traffic on the SR 520 westbound and eastbound off-ramps to back up onto the SR 520 mainline. Congestion on the eastbound off-ramp can affect traffic on I-5." This statement doesn't seem very accurate to me. They do "compound" the network, but they also "create" congestion were there to be no bridge opening. This needs to be changed to reflect the bascule bridge actually creates as well as compounds congestion.</p>	<p>Error</p>
<p>I-311-344</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 39</p>	<p>327</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Montlake Bridge opening delays affect travel times and reliability for all travelers. This makes it difficult for bus drivers to keep to their schedules, affects bus travel time reliability, increases transit service costs, and can make transit a less attractive option to driving alone." This is a good, strong statement on the current state of transit in the area. Yet it is still incomplete in that it doesn't mention the Montlake Flyer freeway station and the experience in getting to and from it, and how the current design make transfers difficult because pedestrians generally have to navigate car-centric intersections and freeway on-ramps to take transit. In addition, bicyclists have to carry their bicycles up and down staircases. There needs to be more discussion on the bicycle and pedestrian situation, since this is a common mode of transportation, and this is the transportation Discipline Report.</p>	<p>Omission; other options not considered; Error</p>
<p>I-311-345</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 39</p>	<p>328</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Existing Conditions" This section seems to focus only on the Montlake exchange area. There is no discussion of the Roanoke area, 45th street area, Lake Washington Boulevard area (and especially for pedestrians in the Arboretum), and as noted elsewhere, discussions of Fuhrman/Boyer and Delmar/Lynn are omitted altogether, despite being pass-through traffic areas. It appears that this section simply was not completed. What are the existing conditions in these other important intersection areas?</p>	<p>Omission; other options not considered; Error</p>
<p>I-311-346</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 39</p>	<p>329</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Existing Conditions" This section could benefit from a description of the current traffic demand that is going through the local area, and what percentage of it is going on and off the freeway. This is an important distinction, because treating it all the same would argue for one design (such as Option A), and treating it as different would argue for a different design (Option K) -- Option K takes the high volume of traffic aimed at getting on and off the freeway with as little delay as possible. Option A is designed at getting people across a drawbridge, and then maybe they'll get on or off the freeway. It's a very incomplete picture of the current situation and creates the image that Option A is a good design, when it is repeating and exacerbating the bad design from the past (having a drawbridge be the gatekeeper to getting on and off the freeway for a huge swath of Seattle).</p>	<p>Omission; other options not considered; Error</p>
<p>I-311-347</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 39</p>	<p>330</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Existing Conditions" This section doesn't really capture the fact that the Arboretum, with it's emphasis on ramps, becomes a de-facto highway, when it was designed as a one-lane road through a natural park. The discussion needs to be included to help reviewers understand why people do not think freeway ramps in the Arboretum is a good idea. As it is currently written, the Arboretum is considered a minor issue, when in fact it is a park that has been innundated with freeway and traffic. Otherwise, the comment in Section 41 doesn't seem to have any context: "Less traffic in the Arboretum compared to the No Build Alternative (up to 900 vph)" This is a pretty big deal, and would make the no arboretum ramp option seem more viable when you better understand the "current state" and why people would want to remove these on ramps. The logic in the discussion is missing, and makes the SDEIS incomplete.</p>	<p>Omission; other options not considered; Error</p>

I-311-348	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 39	331	Walter Oelwein	"Existing Conditions". This section ignores the fact that the existing conditions do not have tolls on the freeway. This will have a huge impact on the number trips that people will want to take, and should be accounted for in the discussion. Otherwise, it paints the picture that there is NO WAY to regulate the number of cars getting on and off the freeway, when the tolls is a very precise way to regulate the amount of traffic demand (increase/decrease tolls accordingly). This makes this section incomplete.	Omission; Options not considers
I-311-349	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 41	332	Walter Oelwein	"Increased traffic and congestion at the Harvard/Roanoke intersection and I-5/East Roanoke Street and I-5/NE 45th Street interchange areas" This area was not discussed in the "existing conditions" area (Section 39). So when you say "increased traffic in Roanoke", it doesn't really have any context, and makes this statement seem more benign, when it isn't. A discussion in the existing conditions section would note that Roanoke/Harvard is a very difficult intersection for all modes of transportation (and the bias against pedestrians is particularly striking, as it doesn't come up at all).	Omission; other options not considered; Error
I-311-350	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 41	333	Walter Oelwein	"Suboption A would retain but reconfigure the SR 520 westbound off-ramp and eastbound on-ramp with Lake Washington Boulevard. This would result in traffic volumes and intersection operations in the overall SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange area being similar to the No Build Alternative." This omits discussion about what impact it has on traffic in the arboretum itself (Lake Washington Blvd). It stands to reason that with the the increased throughput of the bridge, and with the increase in population, this already clogged thoroughfare that was not designed for increasing cars (and shouldn't be), is a glaring omission and needs to be added for this SDEIS to be complete. The environmental impact of this section is very important!	Omission; other options not considered; Error
I-311-351	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 41	334	Walter Oelwein	"6-Lane Alternative" Overall, this section is confused and spotty. It is hard to follow and understand what parts of transportation, which areas, and which options it is discussing. It sometimes talks about the impact for different options, but not very systemically. It is hard to follow and does not really reveal the environmental impact.	Omission; other options not considered; Error
I-311-352	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 41	335	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would provide a new SR 520 interchange east of Montlake" These key findings are not found in the executive summary or the summary at the beginning of this document. However, they demonstrate significant improvements that Option K provides. Why the omission? This is very important and shows Anti-Option K bias.	Omission
I-311-353	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 42	336	Walter Oelwein	"Increase congestion at the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection due to increases in traffic volumes to and from the north" This does not seem to be supported. Why wouldn't this be specifically called out for Option A? And wouldn't the boat traffic resolution get cars through the area better, with the increased traffic (which isn't a result of the option, but the increased population, etc.)	No support
I-311-354	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 41	337	Walter Oelwein	"Provide a new crossing of the Montlake Cut that would not be affected by boat traffic (i.e., subject to bridge openings)" This needs to be quantified like the other sections are. This implies that this impact has not been studied, so a qualitative measure is substituted for it, when it could have been quantified. WashDOT needs to improve the quality of this research, because this is the main area of debate between the different options, and to gloss over the impact with vague and minizing statemetns "would not be affected" without even trying to quantify it makes it difficult for decision-makers to make a good choice.	Omission, error
I-311-355	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 43	338	Walter Oelwein	"What are the key findings for nonmotorized travel?" I'm glad to see this discussed, but it gets less discussion than the car-related discussion, as there is no "existing conditions" section. This needs to be added for the SDEIS to be complete.	Omission, error

I-311-356	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 43	339	Walter Oelwein	"Bicyclists and pedestrians would continue to reach the SR 520 corridor in Seattle via a combination of trails and on-street bicycle lanes." Again, there are relatively few bicycle-friendly sections in the current Montlake area, even the Bill Dawson trail is narrow and is dominated by a freeway overpass. Intersections are completely car-oriented, and do not have design that encourages bicycle or pedestrian travel. This discussion is not made in here, so it is incomplete and needs to be better understood so that the correct option can be chosen.	Omission, error
I-311-357	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 43	340	Walter Oelwein	"The number of buses with available bike racks would be reduced because transfers to buses on Seattle routes would not be possible when the Montlake Freeway Transit Station is removed." This discussion is so incomplete it is hard to know where to start. First of all -- what are the regional transit buses to do to pick up and drop off the Montlake/UW traffic. Is bus 545 no longer going to be able to serve this area? Are there MORE busses planned to make up for this? Why is this a good decision to remove a major transfer point when there is an employment hub (UW) a Sound Transit station, a major park, and walkable neighborhoods in the area where transit and regional connections make sense. The fact that this is glossed over makes this SDEIS very incomplete, and it needs to better articulate the plans for increasing regional bus service, rather than just drop it.	Omission, error, no support
I-311-358	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 43	341	Walter Oelwein	"What are the key findings for nonmotorized travel?" This section is entirely substandard compared to the motorized travel discussion. In the motorized travel discussion you have great detail about the increase and decrease of traffic in certain options and sub-options. Nothing for non-motorized travel, just general statements regarding connecting neighborhoods and bike paths. Also, there is no estimate about the amount of bus-takers, transfers, sound transit riders, etc. Also, do the depressed intersections of options K and L encourage more bike-riding vs. Option A? We don't know because it is not discussed in this SDEIS. So it is just a slight section overall, and makes this document incomplete. Given that increasing non-motorized travel would be a highly desirable result of the investment of the project, this needs to be quantified better so that we understand the environmental impact.	Omission, error, no support
I-311-359	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 43	342	Walter Oelwein	"Bicyclists who wish to cross Lake Washington by bus, during inclement weather or at night for example, would be able to board on NE Pacific Street near Montlake Boulevard." This is the only statement of the impact on non-vehicle transportation, and demonstrates just how non-quantifiable it is. Why would you spend a sentence about bicyclists in inclement weather and at night when there is no mention on how pedestrians get across the intersections or could catch a bus to the eastside?	Omission, Error, No support

<p>I-311-360</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 44</p>	<p>343</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The options would affect the non-motorized environment in the Arboretum by either decreasing or increasing vehicle volumes. Compared to the No Build Alternative, Option A would reduce vehicle traffic in the Arboretum by up to 900 vph, improving the walking, bicycling, and recreation environment. Suboption A traffic volumes would be similar to the No Build Alternative. Options K and L and their suboptions would increase traffic by up to 300 vph through the Arboretum." This statement does not provide an explanation for why Option A can have the option of no Arboretum ramps, but Options L and K can't. I've read quite a bit of this SDEIS, and it is unclear how WashDOT can not add or subtract Arboretum ramps for every option; thus discussion about the impact of arboretum ramps should be extended to be allowed for all options. I suspect that the proposers of Option K didn't know that it was an option to remove the Arboretum ramps, and WashDOT allowed this option only for Option A, to make Option A look better. WashDOT needs to articulate why this benefit couldn't be found with Options L and K.</p>	<p>Omission, Error, No support</p>
<p>I-311-361</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 44</p>	<p>344</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Recent travel time data reviewed by King County Metro indicated that actual bus travel times between NE 51st Street in Redmond and the Montlake Freeway Transit Station (approximately 10 miles) during the morning commute can range from 10 to 30 minutes for both westbound and eastbound trips, with most trips (more than 90 percent) taking an average of 16 minutes" Hey-- you're removing the Montlake Freeway stations, so it is invalid to make arguments about how the project can improve travel times to the Montlake freeway station, as you are doing here. You instead have to articluate how someone is going to get on in Redmond and zoom through the Montlake area, get off Downtown, and transfer back to the Montlake area. What is the travel time then?</p>	<p>No support, Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-362</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 44</p>	<p>345</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Options K and L and their suboptions would increase traffic by up to 300 vph through the Arboretum." It's not clear why these options require the Arboretum ramps, while Option A doesn't. This indicates that options were not considered.</p>	<p>No support, Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-363</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 44</p>	<p>346</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"With the gaps in the existing HOV lane system, transit cannot reliably bypass this congestion." Here you also fail to mention that there is no light rail option, and this wasn't mentioned in the "Existing Conditions" section. Focusing on Bus trasport shows a limited vision for what this document could provide: What would be the environmental impact of a light rail train?</p>	<p>Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-364</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 45</p>	<p>347</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The primary changes in the transit infrastructure for the 6-Lane Alternative are completion of the HOV lanes across the SR 520 floating bridge to the I-5/SR 520 interchange (where direct access would be provided to the I-5 express lanes) and removal of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station." This would be a good section to describe why it was absolutely necessary to remove the Montlake Freeway Transit Station. Otherwise, it argues that this is for the benefit of cars only</p>	<p>Omits important info</p>

<p>I-311-365</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 45</p>	<p>348</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>The "Did you know" section ("This addition to the transit connections in the Montlake area will make the Montlake Triangle a more robust multi-modal center. Travelers will be able to access light rail in addition to local and SR 520 bus service. Pedestrian and bicycle traffic to and from the transit services will increase activity in the area.") doesn't seem to be supported in the main body of the text. SR520 bus service is not explained at all, and this is the only mention of the Montlake Light Rail system. Also, the pedestrian commentary doesn't really mention this. This "did you know" section cannot replace an actual environmental impact statement.</p>	<p>Omits important info; info not supported</p>
<p>I-311-366</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 45</p>	<p>349</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"between transit services and other travel modes would also improve." This implies that there are transit services to transfer to, but I have yet to see an explanation for how you are going to replace the high volume of travelers who catch the 545, and other Downtown to Eastside routes. And with Sound Transit, it is important to estimate how many more people are going to want to use Montlake to Eastside/Montlake to Downtown transit services. This section has no metrics and is very incomplete, especially in comparison to the SOV traffic volume analysis, which indicates that this is a statement only on SOV impact, and not on Pedestrian, Transit and Bicycle impact, all of which everyone agrees needs to have a significant role in the 21st century transporation infrastructure.</p>	<p>Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-367</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 45</p>	<p>350</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"HOV travel times between I-5 and SR 202 would improve by up to 5 minutes for westbound HOV traffic in both morning and afternoon peak periods." This is unsupported, because there is no statement articulating how the carpool lane between Medina and 405 will be managed. Currently it is a very narrow carpool lane that must weave between traffic, so even with the benefit of HOV, it is a crowded, difficult stretch of road. As a result, this statement appears to be incorrect or unsupported</p>	<p>Omits important info, error, no support</p>
<p>I-311-368</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 45</p>	<p>351</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The 6-Lane Alternative would result in approximately a 14 percent increase in daily transit person trip demand compared to the No Build Alternative. Peak period transit person trip demand would increase similarly (11 percent during the morning commute and 14 percent during the afternoon commute). These increases are due to the HOV lane completion and a toll on general purpose traffic." Here you say that tolling will have an impact on general purpose traffic, yet you do not mention the impact of tolling in the summary of impacts on traffic "(What are the key findings for Street Traffic, Section 38). This inconsistency needs to be reconciled for this SDEIS to be correct and allow someone to understand the impact of the changes being proposed. I find that the discussion of impact on traffic ignores the impact of tolling's ability to manage demand.</p>	<p>Omits important info, error, no support</p>
<p>I-311-369</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 45</p>	<p>352</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"With Option K, SR 520 buses would no longer be directly delayed by Montlake bridge openings during off-peak hours." You have the opportunity to quantify this here, but as per typical in this SDEIS, you gloss over the positive impacts of Option K, and systemically quantify the impacts of Option A when you can make Option A better (i.e., The arboretum ramps reduce traffic by 900 vph, whilc Options L and K increase it!). So while I agree with the statement that Option K helps SR520 buses, it reflects sloppy analysis and unsupported information.</p>	<p>Omits info, no support</p>
<p>I-311-370</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 45</p>	<p>353</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"With Option K, SR 520 buses would no longer be directly delayed by Montlake bridge openings during off-peak hours." A second issue with this statement is that it implies that there are SR520 buses, while there is no evidence to support that Sound Transit and Metro will change their bus routes accordingly. The removal of the freeway station has a significant impact on access to transit, so it needs to be better articulated how transit will adjust to the various options.</p>	<p>Omits info, no support</p>

I-311-371	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 46	354	Walter Oelwein	<p>"The Montlake Freeway Transit Station is being removed to address the community goal of narrowing the project footprint through the Montlake neighborhood." This is a statement that is so objectionable that it is hard for this local citizen to believe that our government officials are even beginning to listen to the community. The statement implies that the bus transit stop in Montake is the thing that is widening the road. No, it's the shoulders and the extra lanes that do, and this is what the community objects to. The community wants BETTER access to transit, and for WashDOT to intimate that there is no way to design a freeway bus stop is unconcionable. How about a bus tunnel that cuts underground a bit? How about using that shoulder space for that small section? If you were actually interested in meeting the community goal of narrowing the footprint, you would propose a tube/tunnel, rather than reject it; you would propose a new freeway station where buses get off in option K, go to right next to Sound Transit, and get back on. C'mon WashDOT! Stop giving these false choices by punishing the community with poorer transit options, but a bigger road. This shows terrible design thinking, and reflects why the community is so frustrated with the options WashDOT proposes. Another issue is that if you were really interested in narrowing the footprint in the Montlake area, you would not propose and advocate for a SECOND bascule bridge that widens Montlake even further -- what you are trying to pass off is a widened 520 AND a widened Montlake Blvd, that does NOT meet the community goal of narrowing the project footprint.</p>	No support, Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-372	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 46	355	Walter Oelwein	<p>"The Sound Transit Link rail project would provide service between the University area, downtown Seattle, and Sea-Tac by year 2016." I know that you cover it later, but in this summary you need to discuss how eastbound commuters are affected. I'm on page 46 and I'm still not clear on what the plan is to make transit better, rather than worse, otherwise it appears that you are trying to make the impact appear better than the current plans allow.</p>	No support, Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but
I-311-373	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 47	356	Walter Oelwein	<p>"With Option A, a transit stop would be located at the termination of the westbound transit-only direct access ramp at the Montlake overpass, allowing people to make connections in the Montlake area. With Options K and L, the first Seattle transit stop for SR 520 University District routes would be at the Montlake Triangle." This section diminishes the differences between Option A and Options L and K. In Option L and K, a transfer would be much quicker to Sound Transit, since the bus would stop so much closer to Sound Transit. You need to articulate the pedestrian travel time from the Option A Montlake Stop to the Sound Transit stop. This is another example where you do not quantify the differences between Option A and Option K, when you can, and it appears that you are not doing so because it would make Option A look worse. This shows anti-Optoin K bias.</p>	Omits important info, error, no support

<p>I-311-374</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 47</p>	<p>357</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"This could mean some out-of-direction travel for people destined for areas south of the Montlake Cut." The fact that you highlight this for Option K, but don't mention the extra travel time for someone transferring from a Bus in Option A to Sound Transit demonstrates that you are not disclosing the environmental impact so that a decision maker could understand the difference and benefits of the options. This fits with a theme that the differences between the Options are not articulated when it makes Option K better, but they are when Option A looks better.</p>	<p>No support, Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-375</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 47</p>	<p>358</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"With Options K and L, riders transferring between local and SR 520 buses could continue north for a half mile on Montlake Boulevard to the Montlake Triangle to board an eastbound SR 520 bus." You highlight the half-mile distance here, when the person is riding the bus, so it wouldn't make a difference, yet two bullet points above ("board an eastbound bus at the traffic island located at the entrance to the eastbound SR 520 on-ramp") without mentioning that the Sound Transit riders would have to WALK that same half-mile to the bus. This again shows pro-Option A bias and anti-Option K bias.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info.</p>
<p>I-311-376</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 47</p>	<p>359</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"This could add approximately 1 to 3 minutes of travel time for riders originating from areas south of the Montlake Cut by car or bus, or approximately 7 to 10 minutes for those who walk." You then proceed to quantify the 1-3 minute travel time, but don't quantify the walk time for someone leaving the Sound Transit station and going to the Option A on ramp station. What is the pedestrian travel time and how come it isn't disclosed here? This is another example of Anti-Option K bias, and pro Option A bias, and reveals why the Legislative Workgroup would be inclined to think that Option A is the best option, when it is presented in the best possible light, and Option K is presented in the worst possible light. It is reasonable to assume that estimates of the budget, a major consideration, had similar machinations, where Option A is estimated more rosily, and Option K is estimated in a more dire fashion. On the Legislative Workgroup website, it even declares that Option A " has the least environmental impact". This is true only by systemically showing anti Option K bias and ignoring the issues raised by the community about why Option A is undesirable.</p>	<p>Omits or ignores important info.</p>
<p>I-311-377</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 47</p>	<p>360</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>I find the section describing transit alternatives to be wholly unsatisfying. It describes new transit options that don't appear to make things better, but makes things neutral or worse. This indicates poor freeway design that biases cars over mass transit. It appears that you put down the roadway and then tried to figure out where the busses would go, rather than figure out where mass transit would optimally be placed, and then had the cars work around it. That would have been design that would reflect good urban planning and 21st century design.</p>	<p>Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-378</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 47</p>	<p>361</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>Similarly, imagine a tube/tunnel option that actually submerges the freeway across portage bay. You could have a low profile train and bike/pedestrian path be the elevated part, with convenient stops in Montlake, and the messy car exchanges underground. People who wanted the views could ride mass transit, and SOVs can be relegated to the underground. Because WashDOT was not willing to invest in good design, we missed these opportunities.</p>	<p>Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>

I-311-379 Transportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 50	362	Walter Oelwein	"Construction Truck Volumes" You mention that construction trucks will be on the freeway, but will they be on the local streets?	Omits important info
I-311-380 Transportation Discipline Report part 1	Secton 50	363	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would have a greater effect on SR 520 traffic operations compared to Option A, Suboption A, or Option L." I'm not sure I can buy-in to this assessment. Option K creates a separate path to the bridge, so it would affect the existing path the least. Option A, in contrast, expands on the existing set-up, so it would be most close to the current traffic.	Error
I-311-381 Transportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 50	364	Walter Oelwein	"Detour routes would be provided during construction of the Delmar lid, and the project would minimize the duration of these detours." These need to be articulated in the summary, because it is hard to imagine what the detours are, or at least provide a reference where this is found later in the document	Omits important info
I-311-382 Transportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 53	365	Walter Oelwein	"The cumulative effects scenario is expected to result in fewer person and vehicle trips across Lake Washington on SR 520 compared to the No Build and 6-Lane Alternatives because of improved traffic conditions on other routes in the region." This statement is hard to understand. Doesn't the cumulative effects scenario include either No-Build or 6-lane alternatives? What is cumulative effects scenario without SR520 no build and 6-lane alternatives? I'm reading this section and it is hard to understand.	Error
I-311-383 Transportation Discipline Report part 1	Overall	366	Walter Oelwein	There are very few side-by-side comparisons between the different options in this discipline report. The only one that does appear is a comparison of parking affects, which naturally shows Option A as the least affecting. Other comparison charts are not found. Why? My suspicion is that it is anti-Option K bias, and charts would show the better travel times with Option K, but since this doesn't fit WashDOT's agenda, it is buried in the prose.	Omits important info
I-311-384 Transportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 61	367	Walter Oelwein	"The SR 520 project travel demand model for the SDEIS No Build and 6-Lane Alternatives did not include Eastlink light-rail across Lake Washington on I-90 because the ST2 proposal was not approved and programmed when the analysis was performed." I also expect a statement about whether the Sound Transit Montlake station is taken into account here. It often figures in the discussion points throughout the document, but if the models didn't include it, this needs to be stated outright.	Omits important info
I-311-385 Transportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 62	368	Walter Oelwein	This section on travel modeling could be cleaner so that it could be understood. In it it appears that it did not include transit across I-90, and the impact of tolls is murkily described. A chart saying which models were used, when and what their assumptions were would help here. Otherwise, it is a meaningless section at worst and hard to follow at best.	Omits important info
I-311-386 Transportation Discipline Report part 1	Overall	369	Walter Oelwein	There is little or no discussion on the traffic impact on Delmar Dr/E. Lynn St., and Fuhrman/Boyer. Also, Roanoake/Harvard is not mentioned much, and with little analysis. For this SDEIS to be complete, you need to include analysis on the environmental impact of the local area. You mention "9 of 39 intersections" but there is no visualization of this.	Omits important info
I-311-387 Transportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 69	370	Walter Oelwein	"Traffic volumes were forecasted for three time periods: daily, morning, and afternoon." This might reveal why the analysis regarding the Montlake Bridge impact is incomplete. Morning and Afternoon, boat traffic does not affect the drawbridge, and daily seems to be a summary of the entire day, and not reflect the sudden changes in traffic flow ability that a draw bridge can have.	Omits important info, error, no support

I-311-388	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 69	371	Walter Oelwein	"Traffic forecasts and operational analysis results are reported here for the peak 3 hours (6:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 to 6:00 p.m.)." This statement again reflects the lack of analysis that a second bascule bridge has on traffic, when this is one of the main points of creating Option K -- not to repeat the mistake of putting a draw bridge in between freeway traffic.	Omits important info, error
I-311-389	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 69	372	Walter Oelwein	"the purpose of the project is to improve mobility for people and goods across Lake Washington." This is an incomplete statement and needs to include: "in a manner that is safe, reliable, and cost-effective, while avoiding, minimizing, and/or mitigating impacts on affected neighborhoods and the environment." The fact that you focus only on the movement piece and not the impact to neighborhoods piece indicates an unbalanced focus.	Omits important info, error
I-311-390	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 69	373	Walter Oelwein	"The best way to measure the improvement of mobility is two-fold. First, assess the person demand associated with any specific action on the corridor; and second, measure how many of those people are actually served during a specified time period." But if you have only these criteria, and not the impact on the community and environment, then this is a meaningless assessment. Why not measure it with 30 lanes? You need to have the full balance in these statements.	Omits important info, error
I-311-391	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 69	374	Walter Oelwein	"Demand refers to the number of vehicles or people that want to use the freeway during a given time period." I'm trying to assess in this SDEIS whether demand and mode choice was calculated, and then the transportation needs were determined, or whether it was first determined that it is a 6 lane freeway, and then determined what the transportation throughput could be. It looks through this discussion like the analysis was created to fit the design, rather than the design created to fit analysis. It should be that the demand models should be created, and the identify the correct mix of transit, HOV, cars, tolls, pedestrian, bicycles, etc, and then design the transportation corridor. We might have very different results, rather than a push for 6 lanes.	Omits important info, error, specific design choices not considered
I-311-392	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 70	375	Walter Oelwein	"Vehicle- and person-trip forecasts for buses were based on the travel demand model forecasts." I'm concerned that the forecasts were based on a freeway that allows actual stops in transporation hubs, rather than a 'design' that cuts off and transportation hubs. In this case, your design (Option A, specifically), actually makes transportatoin	Error
I-311-393	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 73	376	Walter Oelwein	"What are the measures of effectiveness for the freeway operational analysis?" This SDEIS has many explanations of the flow of traffic and demand for cars, and to a certain degree transit, but I haven't seen anything about pedestrians and bicyclists. Did similar simulations get performed? Or is this not considered at all? This needs to be stated outright.	Omits important info
I-311-394	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 73	377	Walter Oelwein	"What are the measures of effectiveness for the freeway operational analysis?" Similarly, the visual impact section didn't have as sophisticated a model for impact of different options. For example, if you had a simulation the different designs and what a pedestrian would experience from a visual/noise, as you're doing here with throughput, then maybe the designs would be different. I feel that this report has high sophistication for identifying how to get cars through, but low sophistication on how to maximize the design quality so it has a positive impact on the local community.	Error
I-311-395	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 73	378	Walter Oelwein	"Congestion and backups occur at locations where traffic demand exceeds the capacity of the roadway, limiting how many vehicles and people can be served." When the Montlake Bridge goes up, the capacity is zero. It is no longer a street and becomes a boat right of way. This model does not seem to indicate that there are times with Current Option, Option A and Option L are actually capacity zero. This needs to be done for this environmental analysis to be complete.	Error, omits or ignores significant info

I-311-396	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 74	379	Walter Oelwein	The "Did you know" section is correct partially. In the Montlake area, it is not like a funnel at all during peak times. It is like a stopper. Where it doesn't matter how many lanes you have, it goes for x number of lanes to 0 number of lanes for extended periods of time. With two bridges, this is likely to be even worse. You need to include a "did you know" that explains that Montlake is not like most on-ramps and off-ramps with funnels, but with a random stopper. Hence, Option K was developed to not have that be an issue for the high volume freeway traffic.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-397	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 76	380	Walter Oelwein	"Distribute freeway ramp traffic. Future freeway volumes were distributed through the local roadway system during the morning and afternoon peak hours using existing intersection turning movement ratios." I feel like you missed an opportunity here. The local neighbors are not concerned about freeway onramps as much as they are concerned with "cut through" traffic. For example, people get off at Boylston, drive down Delmar Drive, and get on at Montlake. Similarly, people don't get on at 45th, and go through Fuhrman/Boyer and get on at Montlake. There does not appear to be any analysis on how much of this kind of traffic there exists, and if the new freeway will alleviate this. It may, but we don't know. The environmental impact statement is incomplete.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-398	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 76	381	Walter Oelwein	"peak hour". Peak hour is a big issue with this Discipline Report. In the Montlake area, the bascule bridge makes things worse during Non-Peak hours, but this does not seem to have been analyzed.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-399	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 76	382	Walter Oelwein	"Traffic on local streets is comprised of two types: 1) traffic using local streets to primarily access the freeway, and 2) traffic using local streets to access other local locations." There is a third type of traffic, and I'm surprised you didn't include it, because it is a big issue with residents: People who use local streets in lieu of the freeway, also known as cut-through traffic. This is very common and needs to be included in your models.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-400	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Overall	383	Walter Oelwein	You mention in section 76 that there is traffic that goes to the freeway as a major traffic source. There is no mention on how the design will make sure traffic will actually go to the closest on-ramp. For example, someone on Broadway and Aloha - which is the best onramp for 520 eastbound? Is it going down 10th to Roanoke to Delmar to Lynn to Montlake? (As is common), or is it going to Pine street and jumping on the freeway there? The impact difference to the local community would be huge if there is a way of encouraging people to get on the freeway early, rather than late. This does not seem to be addressed in the designs or mentioned at all in the discipline report, and makes this SDEIS incomplete as a result.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-401	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 77	384	Walter Oelwein	"Future pedestrian volumes were assumed to remain consistent with existing volumes" This indicates that there was little consideration to the pedestrian traffic experience, and indicates a bias toward maximizing cars, and ignoring pedestrians. This makes the SDEIS incomplete and needs to be improved.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-402	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 77	385	Walter Oelwein	"Forecasting Local Street Traffic" This section does not mention that there is an unusual draw-bridge configuration that makes the situation much different than normal "Local street traffic", because it is local street traffic and local boat traffic. This needs to be demonstrated that this is addressed -- especially in light of the key differences between Option A and K, and ignoring this makes Option A look better than it actually is.	Error, omits or ignores significant info

<p>I-311-403 Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 78</p>	<p>386</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Traffic conditions for street systems are typically measured for a single peak hour during the longer morning and afternoon weekday commuter peak periods." Again, this is an error, because the main difference between Option A and K is that the non-peak times will be much better with Option K, since the bridges will not be stopping traffic. The fact that this is not discussed is a glaring omission to the analysis.</p>	<p>Error, omits or ignores significant info</p>
<p>I-311-404 Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Section 79</p>	<p>387</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>I'm shocked to see that the following two intersections were not analyzed: Fuhman and Eastlake, and Boyer and Lynn. Both of these intersections are at nextus points where local streets serve as a proxy for the freeway within the study area. Someone can choose to go down Boyer and get on the freeway at Montlake, rather than get on the freeway at 45th, which is VERY common. Similarly, someone can go down Delmar Drive instead of get on at Pike street, or a different person can get off at Boylston and cut through Delmar/Lynn and hit Boyer Ave. So the Boyer/Lynn Street intersection should get particular study. It does not appear that you study the volume of cut through traffic, and showing that you don't even include Boyer/Lynn as an intersection worth studying demonstrates that this is an incomplete SDEIS.</p>	<p>Error, omits or ignores significant info</p>
<p>I-311-405 Tranportation Discipline Report part 1</p>	<p>Overall</p>	<p>388</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>I did not see any discussion on the number of traffic lights Option A has vs Option K. It would seem to be that Option A would continue to have the similar number of traffic lights as is inches through the Montlake neighborhood. While Option K has only the existing Pacific street intersection and then SPUID. I'm surprised that this is not mentioned. Also, there is no discussion on how this stretch of Montlake Blvd is essentially a residential neighborhood, and Option K would restore that character -- quite an opportunity indeed.</p>	<p>Error, omits or ignores significant info</p>
<p>I-311-406 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 1</p>	<p>389</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"What is traffic currently like on SR 520?" This section needs to also state that there is no option other than buses on SR520, and that railway is not an option. Omitting this makes the debate seem to be focused on more cars versus even more cars, instead of more cars vs. more transit options</p>	<p>Error, omits or ignores significant info</p>
<p>I-311-407 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 1</p>	<p>390</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The existing configuration of SR 520 does not meet current WSDOT design guidelines". There is also no mention that this is a freeway going through a residential area -- what are the guidelines for that? Similarly, why doesn't WSDOT have guidelines for freeway expansion to be transit first, and cars second? This seems to be missing a key message that new transportaion designs should start from. Finally, what right does WSDOT have to use the word "design?" The current freeways are ugly, don't integrate with the environment, crumble, etc. Who is the designer? It is not mentioned.</p>	<p>Error, omits or ignores significant info</p>
<p>I-311-408 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 3</p>	<p>391</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"This new interchange design would Exhibit 5-1. Distribution and Type of Eastbound and Westbound Crash Rates along SR 520 provide a much improved configuration to potentially reduce the level of crashes associated with the intersection." This acknowledgement of Option L and K having a better design from a safety perspective is not found in the summary of the Discipline report or in the Executive summary. This needs to be noted other than deep in the discipline report.</p>	<p>Error, omits or ignores significant info</p>
<p>I-311-409 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 14</p>	<p>392</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>This graphic shows that Option K compares favorably to Option A in terms of actual vehicle trips and person type. Yet I have not seen this described in the executive summary or the key findings in this discipline report. Only statistics that are favorable to Option A apper in the executive summary, when this finding appears to be diminished. Why?</p>	<p>Error, omits or ignores significant info</p>

I-311-410	Transportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 15	393	Walter Oelwein	<p>"With the new structure (tunnel or bridge) across the Montlake Cut, both options would increase roadway capacity in the Montlake area. Traffic patterns would shift in response to this new capacity, increasing traffic volumes on the on- and off-ramps at the new Montlake area interchange. Without the westbound auxiliary lane between the new interchange and I-5 and the increase in traffic volumes on the ramps, the westbound on-ramp merge would be over capacity and congestion would spill back onto the local system." I object to how this is presented and is consistent with the anti-K bias found in this report. By emphasizing "increasing traffic volumes" with Option K, it makes it seem like this is a bad thing, when this is what it is precisely hoped that it would do. Meanwhile, the following statement emphasizes Option K's shortcomings and brings up the value-laden term "spill back", the first time I've seen this mentioned in the report other than as a definition of the term. I would expect this to be revised to instead describe the Option K diverts freeway traffic away from a neighborhood corridor and better meets the objective of keeping the profile of the Portage Bay bridge slim, per project goals. The graphic in section 14 shows that Option K has more capacity than Option A. Why isn't this discussed in this section?</p>	Omission, Error
I-311-411	Transportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 17	394	Walter Oelwein	<p>This graphic shows Option K as appearing to have the best impact on handling traffic demand. I don't see this mentioned as a favorable point in comparison to Option A in the executive summary or other summaries of the analysis, instead it leaves the impression that K increases congestion. (Same thing goes for graphic in Section 18 and 26 as well). This needs to be corrected.</p>	Omits important info
I-311-412	Transportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 26	395	Walter Oelwein	<p>This is another example where the concept of "spill over" should apply to Option A and not K, as is stated in section 17. When the bridges go up, this will create the same spill-over. The graphics being provided in Section 17, 18 and 26 all make them look the same, but what about spill over traffic from backed up traffic waiting for the bridge to go up and down? There is no analysis on this, and I'm sure the heat maps would look different.</p>	Omits important info
I-311-413	Transportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 27	396	Walter Oelwein	<p>It is not clear anywhere the impact on tolling and just the overall discentive to cross the bridge at all given this traffic. If you look at the charts in section 27, it is clear that there is a greater discentive to cross the bridge with the greater traffic. At a certain point, people will change their behaviors: Move closer to work, carpool more, shift their work schedule. Similarly, employment centers will not develop in the same way -- with this kind of traffic that even an expanded bridge can't handle, employers will encourage other means of getting places, such as telecommuting, private buses (already in place at Microsoft), or changing where the employment center is. In looking at these graphs, it is clear that the assumptions are absurd, and need to be revised for this SDEIS to be complete. No one would sign up for a commute where everyday traffic is backed up between 51st and 405 for the entire 3pm to 7pm period. Behaviors will change and adjust. This report does little to articulate what the future actually will look like.</p>	Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered
I-311-414	Transportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 27	397	Walter Oelwein	<p>In a similar vein, it looks like the real choke point is not the bridge, but the area between Redmond and I-405. It is kind of a crazy chart-- is this because there is no tolling at that stretch of freeway? Do you think that you could add some?</p>	Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered

<p>I-311-415</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 30</p>	<p>398</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>In this section about the Portage Bay bridge, there is no mention of the impact of a second draw bridge creating "spill-over traffic."</p>	<p>Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered</p>
<p>I-311-416</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 30</p>	<p>399</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Vehicles traveling from Montlake Boulevard via westbound SR 520 to I-5 would pay a toll." OK, so you're saying that there is less traffic going from Montlake to I-5 because there is a toll. Now, please explain where that traffic is going instead. It must be surface streets -- and which ones? This is not documented. It is assumed that cars will take surface streets instead, creating more traffic on the surface streets. For this SDEIS to be complete, this analysis needs to be explicit. I thought the goal of the project was to reduce the impact of "spill-over" traffic. This looks like really bad design.</p>	<p>Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered</p>
<p>I-311-417</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 30</p>	<p>400</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"This is because sections of SR 520 would be tolled, including the Portage Bay Bridge. Vehicles traveling from Montlake Boulevard via westbound SR 520 to I-5 would pay a toll." Additionally, throughout this document, it says that a toll will be imposed, but I have yet to see a discussion about how much the tolls would be, and to what degree tolling can impact traffic demand. It appears in most cases in the SDEIS that tolling is an either/or thing, rather than something that can increase or reduce demand. This SDEIS seems very incomplete, since this seems like a major tool for managing traffic, yet most of the discussion is about whether 6 lanes handles more traffic than the no-build option, and the slight differences between options A, L and K. This document needs to have a better discussion of how tolling can manage the traffic flow rather than simply increase lanes. Similarly, any numbers surrounding the "no-build" alternative appear to be incorrect, since I read earlier in the document that tolling is not assumed with No-build, when it is legislatively mandated that this be the case, so it is a false assumption that WashDOT needs to correct.</p>	<p>Error, Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered</p>
<p>I-311-418</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 31</p>	<p>401</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Option A would remove the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps, providing less capacity to and from SR 520 at the SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange than the other options." I have yet to see an argument why Option A eliminates Lake Washington ramps, and why not Options K and L. This makes no sense. I can understand that in negotiations there were parties interested in mitigating the incredible damage that Option A does, but the same arguments for eliminating the Lake Washington ramps could be made for Optoins K and L. This SDEIS needs to make a plausible explanation for why this major difference between Options A and K.</p>	<p>Error, Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered</p>
<p>I-311-419</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 31</p>	<p>402</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The higher volume results in more congestion spilling back from I-5 onto the Portage Bay Bridge and the local system." In this discussion of the downside of Option A, I have not seen this mentioned in any of the general summaries. In the Executive Summary, there needs to be an explicit statement that says, "Option A creates more congestion spilling back to the local system." Shame on you for trying to hide this in page 31 of the second section of the SDEIS.</p>	<p>Error, Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-420</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 31</p>	<p>403</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Even with the auxiliary lane between the SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange and I-5, the merge point of Montlake Boulevard westbound on-ramp and the SR 520 mainline would be over capacity, adding to the congestion spilling back onto the local system." Again, you make no mention of this in the executive summar, when this is a pretty strongly worded statement that appears to me the situation worse rather than better, the exact opposite intention of the project. This needs to be explicit in the SDEIS Executive Summary.</p>	<p>Error, Omits important info</p>

I-311-421	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 31	404	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Suboption A, which would include the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps in the new SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange design, would improve these conditions." This is a locally incorrect statement. OK, so the no-ramps creates spillover into the local system (prior paragraph), but the ramps make it better. But better for Lake Washington Blvd? Obviously not, it makes things worse for Lake Washington Blvd. So it isn't better, it's worse too. So basically this section is a large error-prone section: It is trying to state that the ramps are needed via ignoring the impact of the ramps on the local streets when they are there, but highlighting the ramps are there. This is a major error and invalidates this SDEIS.</p>	Error, Omits important info
I-311-422	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 31	405	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Although Option K or L would have less congestion spilling back from I-5 than Option A, without the westbound auxiliary lane between the new interchange and I-5, the westbound on-ramp merge from the new interchange would add to congestion spilling back onto the local system." Again, this is not mentioned in the Executive summary. This is a huge problem with this document. Issues that make this project seem good are highlighted in the executive summary, but issues that make the project seem bad are hidded in the discipline report. This statement makes it clear that there is not enough done with the design to make any of the alternatives viable. Or that there is no consideration on how you will prevent spillover traffic into the local streets and neighborhoods nearby.</p>	Error, Omits important info
I-311-423	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 32	406	Walter Oelwein	<p>"The difference in travel times is due to the westbound congestion approaching the bridge in Medina, which HOVs can bypass." This is extensive discussion about an auxilliary lane between I-5 and 520, but not much discussion about which direction it would serve -- the "traditional" or "reverse" commute. According to this statement and others in the document, the reverse commute is just as bad, which makes having a single 'auxilliary' lane not make sense. Why serve one direction and not the other? This indicates some incorrect design considerations and needs to be stated in the executive summary: "We have installed in Option A an auxilliary lane that favors residents on the eastside and sacrifices the west side residents and commuters."</p>	Error, Omits important info
I-311-424	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 32	407	Walter Oelwein	<p>In Exhibit 5-20, it is clear that Option K is the best option from a travel time perspective. This is not stated in the Executive summary. This needs to be articulated in the executive summary for this document to be accurate. Why bury the good aspects of Option K in the discipline report?</p>	Error, Omits important info
I-311-425	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 32	408	Walter Oelwein	<p>"When congestion is at its peak, the 6-Lane Alternative would provide an even greater travel time savings for HOV travel compared to general-purpose travel (from a 40-minute savings with the No Build Alternative to a 50-minute saving with the 6-Lane Alternative)." This statement is false if tolls are not considered in the no-build alternative, and the price of tolls are not discussed, as is the case in this document. In the no-build alternative, there will be tolls, so there is a way to manage this demand. More demand? More tolls. People will carpool even if there is no HOV lane, just to pay the toll. The fact that this is not explored make this document incorrect.</p>	Error, Omits important info
I-311-426	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 33	409	Walter Oelwein	<p>"SR 520 congestion could extend as far back as I-5 with the No Build Alternative." This cannot possibly be true, and or is a terrible piece of analysis. First, if 520 is rarely backed up eastbound TO 405 today. As a frequent commuter, I cannot recall a time when it actually was backed up even to the collector lane to 405. Second, if it is indeed backed up all the way to 405, wouldn't you pay the toll to wait like that? That doesn't make any sense, the toll would discourage such a high volume. Third, people would take alternate routes, such as I-90 or north or south on I-5 or 522. This analysis seems to imply that this is the only way to get across. I'm actually appalled that this passes for analysis in this document.</p>	Error, Omits important info

<p>I-311-427 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 33</p>	<p>410</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The 6-Lane Alternative would substantially reduce this congestion because HOVs would be able to reliably bypass general purpose congestion after completion of the eastbound HOV lane between I-5 and Medina." Given the unsubstantiated piece of rhetoric that immediately precedes this sentence, this makes this statement completely incorrect. The only backups on 520 eastbound in Seattle are related to the capacity to merge, and less on the overall capacity of the freeway. After the chokepoints, traffic generally flows. It is more likely that these HOV lanes on the bridge proper are unnecessary, since all traffic will be flowing no problem once people are on the bridge, as is currently the case. This statement needs to be stricken from the document for the document to be correct.</p>	<p>Error, Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-428 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 33</p>	<p>411</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>Exhibit 5-21 shows that Option K has the ability to handle the most vehicle person trips -- by a large numbrer over option A. This needs to be explicitly stated in the executive summary for this to be an accurate document. Another example of the Anti-Option K bias.</p>	<p>Error, Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-429 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 34</p>	<p>412</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"By the year 2030, congestion on SR 520 approaching the SR 520/I-405 interchange would be worse due to I-405 traffic backing up onto the SR 520 ramps. This congestion would limit the amount of traffic that can exit from SR 520 to I-405. Congestion on the SR 520 off-ramp to northbound I-405 would spill back onto the SR 520 mainline and cause congestion extending back to I-5." This statement needs to be stricken from the document for the document to have legitimacy. Currently there is no backup TO 405 from 520 Westbound. Never, ever. Compare this to the daily backups in Montlake and Westbound 520, where there is an actual problem. To state that traffic would back up all the way to I-5 is an eggregious exaggeration or a lie or a completely faulty piece of analysis that calls into question the entire SDEIS.</p>	<p>Error, Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-430 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 35</p>	<p>413</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>This chart is completely absurd. There is no explanation why backups would start occuring where there are currently no backups to I-405. Additionally, it is not clear why Option A is allowed to have a sub-option with no on-ramps at Lake Washington Blvd, and not the other Options. This makes Option A look better than the others in this chart, creating the false impression that it is specific to Option A's design, an not that similar sup-options were not considered.</p>	<p>Error, Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered</p>

<p>I-311-431</p> <p>Transportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 37</p>	<p>414</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"General-purpose travel times would range between 22 minutes (average) to up to 1 hour and 25 minutes during the peak hour of travel. With the 6-Lane Alternative, HOV travel would be 6 to 31 minutes faster than general-purpose travel because an eastbound HOV lane would be added between Medina and the SR 520/I-405 interchange." Again, this has no basis in reality. Why is it that traffic backing up onto 405 is going to be so bad, when it doesn't occur at all currently. And if it were to start to be this bad, would people even take I-405, or 520 for that matter? couldn't they avoid 520 altogether, given the 1.5 hour commute nightmare ahead of them, even if they aren't getting on 405? Finally, this is perhaps the most dire commute time projection seen thus far in the SDEIS -- backups on Eastbound 520 approaching 405 with commute times up to 1 hour 25 minutes, and 1 hour with the 6 lane alternatives. This didn't make it into the executive summary, and should. There has been a lot of talk about with the expanded 520, cars would not have anywhere to go to get on I-5, but this analysis says things are much worse going eastbound approaching 405. If anything, this makes the argument that 520 should be restricted even further (4 lanes? 2 lanes) -- that adding capacity would create greater traffic snarls. Best to keep them off the road entirely -- This is a piece of bizarre analysis and needs to be seriously revised -- either with a better highlighting of this dire backup to 405 in the executive summary, or a revision of this SDEIS that doesn't place traffic jams where there are no traffic jams.</p>	<p>Error, Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered</p>
<p>I-311-432</p> <p>Transportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 37</p>	<p>415</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>Exhibit 5-24 does not explain why Option A has such significantly better general purpose wait times, compared to Option K and L. The differences between Options A and K and L are on the west side of the lake, and even then, so how would the eastbound travel times be so different (30 mins. vs 55 mins.)? The auxiliary HOV lane can't possibly make this much of a difference (nor is it credited for it), so what is the difference? No on-ramps at Lake Washington Blvd? That can't be, since the back-up is at 405, according to your analysis. What is the difference? I suspect that this is making an argument of Option A that is not justified at all. First, you trump up the backup to 405 (which doesn't exist), and then you say that option A has a 25 minute improvement than Options K/L. Suddenly, Option A looks better. However, there is no basis in reality here.</p>	<p>Error, Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered</p>
<p>I-311-433</p> <p>Transportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 37</p>	<p>416</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>Exhibit 5-24 does not offer any anticipation of spillover traffic into Medina, when this is obviously going to happen if there are 30-48 minute wait times trying to get on 405. This has to happen, yet the SDEIS does not mention it at all. There needs to be a clear articulation that there will be, according to this rather dire scenario, thousands of cars cutting through Medina, Clyde Hill and Bellevue. I suspect that you are either trumping up this 405 backup to make Option A look better (and without justification), or you are hiding from the Medina, Clyde Hill and Bellevue residents the impact of the expanded 520 bridge: Expanded cut-through traffic in their neighborhoods. Spill over is discussed repeatedly in the west side, but not on the Eastside? This makes the document strikingly incomplete. I suspect that if you mentioned that there will be massive spill-over traffic into Medina (trying to avoid that back-up onto 405), the Eastside residents might not be so excited about this freeway expansion. This omission is scandalous.</p>	<p>Error, Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered</p>

I-311-434	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 39	417	Walter Oelwein	<p>"This comparison allowed us to determine what local street and intersection traffic operations would be like without the project. The 6-Lane (Build) Alternative was then compared to the No Build Alternative to determine effects on traffic conditions with the project." This methodology is error-prone. Here's why: The no-build alternative does not assume tolling, even though this is legislatively mandated and will occur soon, so the No-Build scenario does not exist. You need to at least have a "no build with tolling" as a baseline. Second, you need to have a "bridge collapse" scenario. You have mentioned several times in the document that the bridge could very likely have a catastrophic failure. What would be the impact on local roads then? Third, since you do not study -- ever -- the impact of the second draw bridge, any discussion on "local streets" must be incomplete, since this is an ongoing character of the local area, and defines the traffic. Finally, you mention in the prior section that back-ups to I-5 of cars waiting to get onto 405 are inevitable. This means that there will be even more spillover traffic in the West-side neighborhoods, trying to avoid freeway backups. If this is not considered in the analysis, then this entire section needs to be called into question, and considered error- and omission-prone.</p>	Error, Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered
I-311-435	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 39	418	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Traffic operations at five study area interchanges are discussed in this section. These five interchange areas include SR 520/Montlake Boulevard, SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke Street, I-5/NE 45th Street, I-5/Mercer Street, and I-5/Stewart Street." It is odd that you would not include in this list the interchanges at Roosevelt/Eastlake/Fuhrman and Boyer/Lynn, as these are proxys for the I-5 interchange to 520 on the surface street, and local residents can assure you that there is massive spillover traffic in this area, making analysis necessary. It is a general fear by residents near these streets that increased freeway traffic and throughput means increased local street traffic. The fact that these roads/intersections are not analyzed shows both disrespect to this concern (we should know what to expect with this increase in capacity-- perhaps it could even be better? We don't know) and a lack of understanding of the local traffic conitions.</p>	
I-311-436	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 39	419	Walter Oelwein	<p>"The SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange area, which provides access to and from SR 520, is congested during the morning and afternoon peak hours." This is an incomplete statement that ignores a core experience with this intersection: It is ALSO congested in the middle of the day, due to the bridge going up regularly. The fact that this is not stated outright and in the introductory statement about the intersection is an eggregious omission and does not correctly reflect the current state of the intersection.</p>	Error, Omits important info
I-311-437	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 40	420	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Congestion in the Montlake area affects transit service efficiency and reliability, constraining transit service." This statement is incomplete, because the combination of local transit service trying to compete with freeway access traffic adds to the problem. Add in a draw-bridge, and you have extra-unreliable transit service. This is something that only Option K tries to solve. However, by missing this aspect of the current state, you are omitting important info that would help idnetify the best option. This is an example of Anti-Option K bias.</p>	Error, Omits important info
I-311-438	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 41	421	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Montlake Bridge openings can have long-lasting effects on traffic flow in this area. The bridge does not open during the morning and afternoon peak periods; however, the last opening at 3:30 p.m. can affect traffic operations throughout the afternoon commute." This statement again emphasizes only the peak period aspects of bridge openings. This is an incomplete assessment of the current conditions.</p>	Error, Omits important info

I-311-439	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 41	422	Walter Oelwein	"Bridge openings compound whatever congestion is present on the local street network and can cause traffic on the SR 520 westbound and eastbound off-ramps to back up onto the SR 520 mainline. Congestion on the eastbound off-ramp can also affect traffic on I-5." This statement is buried as a sub-statement of the fourth bullet point describing the current conditions of the intersection. This de-emphasis shows an incomplete understanding of the impact of combining a draw bridge with a major freeway interchange.	Omits important info
I-311-440	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 41	423	Walter Oelwein	"Morning and afternoon peak-hour traffic volumes on streets within the SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange area are shown in Exhibits 6-1 and 6-2." Again, a chart about non-peak traffic needs to be added, due to the unique aspect of a draw bridge, and the impact of doubling this unique aspect with two of the three options.	Omits important info
I-311-441	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 41	424	Walter Oelwein	"Traffic volumes are shown for comparison between Options A, K, and L." This section requires comparing Option K to Option A and L during non-peak times, because there is a serious and tangible benefit of Option K here, and to understand the environmental impact of the different options, this needs to be articulated and made explicit, not ignored entirely.	Omits important info
I-311-442	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 42	425	Walter Oelwein	This image shows that Options K and L reduce traffic across the Montlake bridge significantly. However, this is not mentioned in the executive summary. This would be a huge step for creating a better neighborhood environment, where the neighborhood traffic is not co-mingled with the freeway traffic. This is de-emphasized in the SDEIS, and reflects an anti-Option K bias.	Omits important info
I-311-443	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 42	426	Walter Oelwein	Similarly, the image shows Option K having much more capacity than Option A in the future. This is not discussed in the Executive summary, and the lack of highlighting the traffic flow benefit of Option K reflects and anti-Option K bias.	Omits important info
I-311-444	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Secction 43	427	Walter Oelwein	This image shows that Options K and L reduce traffic across the Montlake bridge significantly. However, this is not mentioned in the executive summary. This would be a huge step for creating a better neighborhood environment, where the neighborhood traffic is not co-mingled with the freeway traffic. This is de-emphasized in the SDEIS, and reflects an anti-Option K bias.	Omits important info
I-311-445	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 43	428	Walter Oelwein	Similarly, the image shows Option K having much more capacity than Option A in the future. This is not discussed in the Executive summary, and the lack of highlighting the traffic flow benefit of Option K reflects and anti-Option K bias.	Omits important info
I-311-446	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 44	429	Walter Oelwein	This analysis does not appear to be correct. First, how is that Option K, which actually adds an outlet towards the freeway, is worse than Option A, which keeps the existing funnel in one direction. The same extends for the upstream intersections near U-Village. This analysis that Option K would have a worse impact -- when it does not get backed up behind two additional lights as it goes through the Montlake neighborhood doesn't make sense. This does not seem to be mentioned. Also, since the intersection at Montake and Pacific Street has equal impact in the AM, how is it that Option A is better than Option K in the AM in the intersections toward U Village? When it comes to the PM, how is it that Option A has only a "B" rating for the right hand turn onto Montalke from Westbound 520, when suddenly Option K has an "F" rating for essentially the same traffic -- (but not stuck behind two extra intersections in the Montlake neighborhood). The analysis seems to be incorrect or insufficient.	Error

I-311-447 Transportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 44	430	Walter Oelwein	It should be noted again that there is no analysis of what the intersections look like during non-peak hours, when Option K would provide a tangible benefit and Option A and L would be a significant problem, making this SDEIS very incomplete.	Omits important info
I-311-448 Transportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 44	431	Walter Oelwein	What is missing is the discussion about how Option K ultimately has more throughput than any of the other options. This is not highlighted, and reflects an anti-Option K bias.	Omits important info
I-311-449 Transportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 46	432	Walter Oelwein	"Generally, the westbound SR 520 off-ramp queue does not extend onto the SR 520 mainline." The lack of precision of this statement reflects how incomplete it is. Of course the westbound SR 520 off-ramp queue extends to the SR520 mainline. The right lane on 520 is frequently backed up as it waits for this to be cleared out. This statement needs to be more precise and revised for this SDEIS to be correct.	Error
I-311-450 Transportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 47	433	Walter Oelwein	This graphic depicts that traffic volumes are actually going to get worse on the local streets (10th and Roanoke, for example). This means that an objective for this project is not being met. It would be hoped that an expansion of the freeway would remove some congestion on the local intersections, especially as there is less cut-through traffic trying to skip ahead to Montlake via Delmar Drive. However, this graphic demonstrates that the expanded freeway makes things worse for the local residents, compared to the No Build option. So therefore the freeway design is a failure. This needs to be articulated in the Executive summary: "After analysis, despite expanding the freeway and trying to find ways to alleviate traffic on local streets, the new freeway design makes it worse for the local residents than the no build option, making our freeway design poor." This would be an accurate reflection of the impact of your freeway design, and should not be glossed over or hidden in the discipline report.	Error, Omits important info, options not considered
I-311-451 Transportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 48	434	Walter Oelwein	Interestingly, Option A is the only option that is worse than the other options, yet this is not mentioned in the summary statement. Why is Option A generating 100 more cars in the peak hour at Roanoke and 10th? This needs to be explained for the SDEIS to be complete. As a resident nearby, I want to know why Option A dumps more traffic on my street. I need to know the environmental impact.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-452 Transportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 49	435	Walter Oelwein	In this graphic, it shows the intersection at Harvard/Roanoke and Roanoke/Boylson as F. What have you done to make this a better design? Was there even a designer involved to alleviate this clearly terrible set of intersections? Why is this acceptable that after this massive project, you just keep the worst elements of the existing state? This should be a signal to go back to the drawing board and create an intersection design (or tube/tunnels) that do not overstress a portion of the neighborhood. The expanded freeway does nothing good here, and needs to be articulated in the executive summary. An accurate statement would be: "We have decided that we can do nothing about the poor conditions at Harvard/Roanoke, so we are just putting in more freeway capacity and letting that intersection be terrible for the next 30 years. This is our idea of freeway design and mitigation for the local area. Environmental Impact: Really Bad." This way the reviewers can better understand what we're getting with this default roadway placement.	Omits important info
I-311-453 Transportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 50	436	Walter Oelwein	The fact that this graphic shows no real impact means that you need to be studying some other, closer in intersections, specifically Boyer/Lynn and Roosevelt/Fuhrman. The fact that you have no analysis, data or commentary on this section makes this SDEIS incomplete.	Omits important info

I-311-454 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 52	437	Walter Oelwein	There is no discussion as to why Option K outperforms Option A here. However, there is much discussion elsewhere in how Option A outperforms Option K. This demonstrates anti-Option K bias.	Omits important info
I-311-455 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 52	438	Walter Oelwein	In this graphic, it shows the intersection at Mercer and Fairview as F and Fairview and Valley as D. What have you done to make this a better design? Was there even a designer involved to alleviate this clearly terrible set of intersections? Why is this acceptable that after this massive project, you just keep the worst elements of the existing state? This should be a signal to go back to the drawing board and create an intersection design that do not overstress a portion of the neighborhood. The expanded freeway does nothing good here, and needs to be articulated in the executive summary. An accurate statement would be: "We have decided that we can do nothing about the poor conditions at Harvard/Roanoke, so we are just putting in more freeway capacity and letting that intersection be terrible for the next 30 years. This is our idea of freeway design and mitigation for the local area. Environmental Impact: Really Bad." This way the reviewers can better understand what we're getting with this default roadway placement.	Other options not explored
I-311-456 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 59	439	Walter Oelwein	In this graphic, it shows the intersection at Stewart and Denny as F. What have you done to make this a better design? Was there even a designer involved to alleviate this clearly terrible set of intersections? Why is this acceptable that after this massive project, you just keep the worst elements of the existing state? This should be a signal to go back to the drawing board and create an intersection design (or a tube/tunnel) that do not overstress a portion of the neighborhood. The expanded freeway does nothing good here, and needs to be articulated in the executive summary. An accurate statement would be: "We have decided that we can do nothing about the poor conditions at Harvard/Roanoke, so we are just putting in more freeway capacity and letting that intersection be terrible for the next 30 years. This is our idea of freeway design and mitigation for the local area. Environmental Impact: Really Bad." This way the reviewers can better understand what we're getting with this default roadway placement.	Other options not explored
I-311-457 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 62	440	Walter Oelwein	"With these increases, congestion is expected to worsen compared to today's conditions. Intersections in the SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange area where traffic operations would degrade to worse than LOS D under the No Build Alternative are described in detail below." Another area where the SDEIS is misleading, since there is no mention of the impact of tolling on traffic congestion, and the No Build option assumes no tolling, which is inconsistent with the reality.	Other options not explored
I-311-458 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 60	441	Walter Oelwein	"What would traffic be like at the study area interchanges in 2030 without the project?" This section ignores Roosevelt/Fuhrman and Lynn/Boyer. These are important intersections that are proxies for the freeway, and often serve as overflow. These need to be studied for this SDEIS to be an articulation of the environmental impact.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-459 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 66	442	Walter Oelwein	"With the 6-Lane Alternative, the SR 520 corridor would be tolled, which would cause some drivers to change their routes, modes of travel, or time of day traveled to avoid the toll." It is precisely because of this statement that it must be studied what the traffic flow will be to Delmar/Lynn and Fuhrman/Boyer, sections that could provide short-cuts to and from the freeway. These intersections are not even mentioned anywhere in the document.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-460 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 66	443	Walter Oelwein	"Some SR 520 traffic would shift to the SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke Street interchange area regardless of which build option is selected." . . .and down Delmar/Boyer	Error, Omits important info

<p>I-311-461</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 67</p>	<p>444</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"It would result in arterial traffic operations that are better than the No Build Alternative." This is a statement of value that is not supported in this document. Not studying the impact of a second draw bridge during non-peak hours is a big omission. It is easy to imagine that backing up the increased freeway volume on a second draw bridge would make things worse than the No-Build Alternative, since traffic will only tolerate a certain amount of backup and shift to other transportation corridors. This would be better stated as, "We have no idea if Option A would be better than the no build alternative, as it repeats the same design problems of the existing setup, and essentially doubles it with a second draw bridge. During peak times we expand the capacity and widen the road significantly through a neighborhood, but still, we don't know." This would be a more accurate statement.</p>	<p>Error</p>
<p>I-311-462</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 72</p>	<p>445</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Option K would include a new lowered single-point urban interchange (SPUI) that combines the functions of the existing SR 520/Montlake Boulevard and SR /520 Lake Washington Boulevard interchanges to the east." There is no similar statement of value that you provide for Option A in Section 67. For this SDEIS statement to be correct, you need to state, as you do with Option A in Section 67, that "Option K would result in arterial traffic operations that are better than the No Build Alternative." This is a glaring example of anti-Option K bias in this document</p>	<p>Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-463</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 69</p>	<p>446</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"No westbound left turn with Suboption A" And where will this traffic go instead? It is assumed it will go up Delmar Drive (and further clog Harvard Roanoke--our infamous F intersection which this design does nothing about). I do not see this mentioned anywhere in the SDEIS. It needs to be discussed for this to be complete.</p>	<p>Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-464</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 69</p>	<p>447</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>As a citizen, I have to say that this intersection looks like a total mess, and cannot be supported as a desirable transporation alternative. I know that this is the car section, but this graphic is the best view of what a nightmare it is for non-cars. The sheer square footage of concrete is terrible. It is a capitulation to cars who are dominating the landscape. This is not what a future transportation system should look like -- this seems like the the most eggreious intersections in Bellevue, only worse. This does not reflect the values and interests of the Seattle citizenry, and you should be ashamed for even thinking that this is somehow acceptable.</p>	<p>Really bad design. Really.</p>
<p>I-311-465</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 69</p>	<p>448</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Additional GP lane No HOV lane with Suboption A" C'mon! An additional lane on this on-ramp? So now you have three lanes merging onto three lanes. This looks like again, terrible freeway design that will just create back-ups, and is a good example of how expanding the freeway doesn't solve traffic problems, it just makes them more absurd. Also, earlier in the document it is cited that the local residents wanted a narrower 520, so you remove the bus stop -- yet you simply take that exact same space and add an extra lane on the on ramp. This makes your design contractory to the stated goals of the project.</p>	<p>Error. Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-466</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 69</p>	<p>449</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Third southbound lane between Lake Washington Boulevard and E Louisa Street" This isn't discussed anywhere about the impact of having 3 lanes merge into 2 here. Why 3 lanes anyway? There is no discussion or rationale for this expansion of the street, other than to create more backups on surface streets.</p>	<p>Error. Omits important info</p>

<p>I-311-467 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 69</p>	<p>450</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>In this visual depiction of the Montalke Interchange, it appears that there is a fairly wide median between the westbound and eastbound lanes. When the stated goal was to narrow the freeway in this area, why keep the super-wide median? Or if you are going to use this much right of way for the freeway, why not narrow the median and keep the Montlake Freeway station? It appears that there is plenty of room for this here. This decision is not discussed anywhere that I have found, and narrowing this median seems to solve a lot of bad decisions (keeps the freeway narrow, keeps the freeway station). Of course, with Option A, having the freeway station here is stupid, because the transit points are a 1/2 mile away near the stadium. This looks like some really bad design.</p>	<p>Error. Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-468 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 69</p>	<p>451</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>After looking at this depiction of Option A, you should characterize this interchange as a Lid, but a bridge over the freeway expansion. It is occupied exclusively by a high volume of cars, and would be a nightmare for pedestirans and bicyclists, further disconnecting the neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Error. Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-469 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 69</p>	<p>452</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>What is that strange orane structure over the Bill Dawson Trail? This needs to be explained. Are pedestrians being asked to walk through a tunnel? This needs to be mentioned. I didn't see anything on this part discussed on the pedestrian impacts.</p>	<p>Error. Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-470 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 70</p>	<p>453</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Option A would not degrade intersection operations during either peak hour compared to the No Build Alternative." I expect to see a similar evaluative statement for Option K, otherwise this is anti-Option K bias, but instead I see a statement that is less evaluative, and sounds like more of an implication of Option K: "With Option K, traffic volumes in the overall SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange area would increase by 23 percent compared to the No Build Alternative because of the new capacity associated with the new interchange and crossing of the Montlake Cut. By shifting SR 520 freeway traffic to the SPUI, drivers would choose to take advantage of the capacity made available on Montlake Boulevard." This sudden change of terms in comparison to Option A's valuative statement that says things are better. Instead, you say that Option K increases capacity, not "Makes things better for freeway commuters."</p>	<p>Error. Omits important info</p>
<p>I-311-471 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 71</p>	<p>454</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>For Option A: "With these changes, traffic operations would improve at the following intersections (compared with No Build Alternative)" "Option A would not degrade intersection operations during either peak hour compared to the No Build Alternative." "This shift would decrease traffic volumes at intersections north of the SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange area, including Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street and NE Pacific Street/15th Avenue NE." "As with Option A, this suboption's design would improve intersection operations compared to the No Build Alternative." "With the improvements to the SR 520 mainline, the Lake Washington Boulevard eastbound on-ramp merges would improve, allowing the ramp meters to serve more traffic. This would substantially reduce congestion that spills back onto Lake Washington Boulevard compared to the No Build Alternative."</p>	
<p>I-311-472 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 71</p>	<p>455</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"NE Pacific Street/15th Avenue NE Intersection operations would improve from LOS E under the No Build Alternative to LOS D with Option A. Removing the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps would result in less traffic traveling through this intersection and, thus, less delay for drivers." This appears to be an error. How does the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps have an impact on NE Pacific Stret/15th Ave NE section? These are very far away from one another and don't seem to be connected.</p>	<p>Error</p>

I-311-473 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 71	456	Walter Oelwein	"Drivers destined for areas south of SR 520 would need to use the Lake Washington Boulevard westbound off-ramp to travel southbound on Montlake Boulevard rather than using the U-turn movement as they do today." This appears to be an error. Drivers are not allowed to make a U-Turn off of Montlake today (unless they make an illegal move). To state that this is what drivers do today is misleading and incorrect.	Error
I-311-474 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 74	457	Walter Oelwein	In this image of Option K, why the big median between the main lines of 520? Elsewhere in the document you mention how you're trying to narrow the width of 520 in this area, per the request of the residents, but in this concept, there is a median that appears to be 2-3 lanes wide? Why not narrow the median and return access to the Montlake freeway station? Or put a replacement Montlake freeway station near the new intersection to the east, allowing people to make relatively easy transfers to Sound Transit or walks to the UW? There appears to be plenty of room, and a pedestrian that gets you to the new bike trail isn't out of the question.	Options not considered
I-311-475 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 74	458	Walter Oelwein	That Tear-drop turn-around is awesome! I like option K because it puts the freeway interchanges over the freeway, and keeps the residential streets and Montlake/24th a residential street. I expect this to be highlighted as a benefit in the SDEIS, but I don't see this really mentioned as a benefit of this design. Why?	Options not considered; Omits Important Info
I-311-476 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 73	459	Walter Oelwein	This image needs to show where people will be able to catch the bus to and from 520. It appears that this was not examined very closely with Option K, although there are many opportunities for creating integrated bus-stops. This visual depiction would help.	Omits important info
I-311-477 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 74	460	Walter Oelwein	This visual depiction hides one of the main benfits of Option K-- the lack of the second draw bridge and the widening of Montlake Blvd. In order for this document to be fair, it needs to better demonstrate this visually.	Omits important info
I-311-478 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 75	461	Walter Oelwein	"A grade-separated pedestrian crossing of the Montlake Boulevard/NE Pacific Street intersection." This is not visually depicted in Section 73, which makes the visual depiction of Option K worse than it actually is. For this SDEIS to be complete, you need to add this.	Omits important info, Error
I-311-479 Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 73	462	Walter Oelwein	"No right turn pocket with Option K" This appears to be an error. The caption indicates a right turn pocket. It appears that this section on Option K was put together sloppily and not with due consideration.	Error

I-311-480	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 73	463	Walter Oelwein	Throughout the document, you discuss how the Option K version of the intersection at Pacific Street and Montlake Boulevard would be an LOS F, and that it has no hope for ever being better than this level. Given that you have two levels to work with here, I believe that you aren't considering other options that would drastically improve traffic flow in this area, and perhaps even preclude the need for a stoplight at all for those getting on the freeway (er, tollway). Here's what you do: The surface traffic (not getting on or off the freeway) stays at street level. The freeway traffic goes underground getting on the freeway. The people getting on the freeway going southbound would merge into the left lane, the people coming from Pacific street eastbound would merge into the center lane, and the people merging from northbound would merge into the right lane. Since they are going underground, there is no need for a stoplight for any of them. OK, for people getting off the bridge, here's the plan: They get to surface level coming off the freeway, since they are returning to surface streets. Those turning left should be relatively few, since many people would take the awesome offramp onto 24th Street. One lane for going straight onto Pacific street, and the two lanes to go north on Montlake Blvd. It would be a much slimmer intersection on the surface, with much less traffic, since the people getting on the freeway would be removed from the equation. So before saying, "Oh, option K is too busy and makes things worse, you need to be more creative in your designs. You would still have a lid, but the traffic on it would be much more managable. The people getting on the freeway would have ony the SPUID interchange to deal with.	Specific design options not considered
I-311-481	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 74	464	Walter Oelwein	The Bill Dawson Trail is not indicated as a bike/pedestrian trail on this image. This is another error that indicates that Option K was not examined as thoroughly by the producers of this document.	Error
I-311-482	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 75	465	Walter Oelwein	"With Option K, traffic volumes in the overall SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange area would increase by 23 percent compared to the No Build Alternative because of the new capacity associated with the new interchange and crossing of the Montlake Cut." This is an entirely misleading statement. In the option A summary, you use the term "Improve" a lot, and here with Option K you state that it would "Increase". The implication is that "increase" sounds bad, while "improve" sounds good. In truth, Only option K can handle the increased traffic demand, while Option A replicates it and creates worse jams. This is not articulated fairly in this SDEIS, and makes Option A sound better than K, when it clearly is not.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-483	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 76	466	Walter Oelwein	"The pedestrian lid at the Montlake Boulevard/NE Pacific Street intersection would improve pedestrian travel (no signal delays) and traffic operations (more signal green time available)." This is the first time in the Option K discussion that the word "improve" is used, while in the parallel Option A discussion, it is used several times. For Option K, the only "improvement" cited by the SDEIS is pedestrians, when it is clear that there will be improvements for local traffic, and traffic getting on and off the freeway, but this is stated as "increases", which has a negative connotation compared to "improved." This discussion is filled with anti-Option K bias.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-484	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 76	467	Walter Oelwein	"As shown in Exhibits 6-1 and 6-2, some local streets would experience greater traffic increases than others, with the greatest increase on Montlake Boulevard north of NE Pacific Street." Here you highlight local streets having traffic increases, when this interchange is specifically designed to get the traffic off of the local streets, and onto an interchange away from the neighborhoods, unlike Option A. This statement is not supported and needs to be revised to better reflect the benefits of Option K.	Not supported, Error

<p>I-311-485</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 76</p>	<p>468</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"However, because of roadway improvements associated with the project, Option K would not degrade operations at any intersections during the morning peak hour and one intersection (Montlake Boulevard/NE Pacific Street) during the afternoon peak hour (see Exhibits 6-3 and 6-4). Traffic operations for this intersection as well as other elements of this option are discussed below." Here, instead of saying "improve" as you repeatedly do in the option A discussion, you say, "would not degrade." This is clearly an effort to make Option K look less appealing compared to Option A.</p>	<p>Not supported, Error</p>
<p>I-311-486</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 76</p>	<p>469</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The intersection of the SPUI ramps would operate acceptably at LOS B during both the morning and afternoon peak hours." This completely whitewashes the benefits of this exchange. In the Option A discussion, an "improvement" is cited compared to the "no build" to LOS E, but here, with much better LOS B at the corresponding exchange, it is merely "acceptable". This is actually a MAJOR improvement and should be cited as such, and the fact that this improvement is deminished, and uses the value negative term "acceptably" compared to the value-positive term "improved" indicates anti Option K bias.</p>	<p>Not supported, Error</p>
<p>I-311-487</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 76</p>	<p>470</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"At times, SR 520 freeway congestion on the Portage Bay Bridge would affect the westbound on-ramp, causing congestion to spill back into the street system surrounding the SR 520/SPUI. As discussed in Chapter 5, the freeway congestion is associated with Portage Bay Bridge traffic volumes and bridge design. Option K would not have an auxiliary lane on the Portage Bay Bridge, affecting the capacity of the merge point with the westbound on-ramp." This section is completely misleading and needs to be revised for this SDEIS to be correct. You are using terms like "spill back" with Option K, while this term is not used at all in the corresponding Option A discussion. Is there no Spill Back with Option A? Actually, Option a is pure spill back, because all of the back-ups are on the local surface streets, and not on the interchages. But this is not described as such. Option A is consistently compared to the "No Build" alternative, and Option K has discussion about "spill overs" and "traffic increases". This entire section is misleading about the benefits and effects of Option K, and needs to be revised to parallel the analysis provided for Option A.</p>	<p>Not supported, Error</p>
<p>I-311-488</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>		<p>471</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The eastbound off-ramp would also operate over capacity at times during the afternoon peak hour. Congestion would back up onto the SR 520 mainline, requiring exiting drivers to slow down before leaving the SR 520 mainline." This discussion is not provided for Option A. Are you saying that Option A does not have any back up on to the SR520 mainline? This is implausible, since a) you state that there will be backups to I-5 all the way from I-405. Second, there is a draw bridge that currently backup up to the 520 mainline -- will this not happen with the two drawbridges?</p>	<p>Incorrect, error, omission</p>
<p>I-311-489</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 76</p>	<p>472</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Because the SPUI is located farther away from the local street system, congestion associated with on-ramps would be relocated away from the Montlake neighborhood, improving access and mobility through this area, especially south of the Montlake Cut." Why is this the last statement associated with this Option, and not the first? You appear to be burying this feature and benefit from the reader. Additionally, this statement should be in the Executive Summary as it is an important distinction, and it is hidden from decision makers. Buried in the discipline report, and at the end of the section within the discipline report</p>	<p>Error, Incorrect info, Omission</p>

<p>I-311-490</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 77</p>	<p>473</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Drivers traveling through the traffic turnaround south of the SPUI would experience congested conditions during the afternoon peak hour because of high traffic volumes and lane changes approaching the turnaround (see Exhibit 6-21). The traffic turnaround roadway was designed for slow speeds (25 mph), which was an outcome of the mediation process. Given these conditions, both the southbound and northbound sections of the roadway would operate at low speeds with restricted maneuverability in the afternoon peak hour. Vehicles heading north through the traffic turnaround would see similar conditions in the morning peak hour." I find this analysis completely inadequate. First of all the traffic turnaround is not subjected to a stop light, like is found in Option A. Second, this is the first mention of the impact of lane changes. Lane changes at 25mph doesn't sound like such a difficult prospect, and will not likely cause additional backups. Third, what pertinence is the mediation process? Why cite this? Why not cite every other detail that is the result of the mediation process? By citing this, you make it sound like the mediation process has made this option worse, rather than better. This needs to be stricken for this SDEIS to be a fair assessment of environmental impact. Or, how about cite every element of Option A that the mediation process objected to? I could help you do that.</p>	<p>Error, Incorrect info, Omission</p>
<p>I-311-491</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 77</p>	<p>474</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Under Option K, operations at this intersection would improve to LOS E from LOS F under the No Build Alternative. Traffic volumes would decrease as a result of the change in access to SR 520, which would shift traffic to the new tunnel." This appears to be faulty analysis. The improvement would seem to be significantly more than to LOS E, since you have an entirely new interchange to the east that is handling the freeway traffic, and that is at LOS B. So the local traffic gets the existing Montlake Interchange minus the Freeway traffic, which should be a much better improvement. For you to say otherwise needs to be justified or else it appears that you are trying to make Option K look worse than it actually is.</p>	<p>Incorrect, error, omission</p>
<p>I-311-492</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 2</p>	<p>Section 77</p>	<p>475</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"By removing the connection to SR 520, northbound and southbound traffic operations would improve because the need to keep off-ramp traffic from backing onto the SR 520 mainline would no longer exist." This statement is buried in the analysis, and contracts the minor improvements (LOS F to E) that are stated just prior. This appears to be a major improvement, and needs to be cited as such, and in comparison to the "No Build" alternative, as you frequently do with Option A.</p>	<p>Incorrect, error, omission</p>

I-311-493	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 78	476	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Under Option K, this intersection would operate acceptably at LOS D during the morning peak hour. During the afternoon peak hour, it would continue to operate at LOS F under Option K. With Option K, this intersection would serve as the primary access from the University District to SR 520, accommodating the majority of trips destined to SR 520. Traffic volumes would increase through this intersection, causing it to be 38 percent over capacity (compared to 26 percent over capacity with the No Build Alternative)." This is counterintuitive and needs to be justified. Here's why: With Option K, you are adding an extra spoke to a three-way intersection. The vast majority of the intersection is turning right off of 520 north to Montlake. It should be able to handle that traffic no problem. Second, there are two left-hand turn lanes onto 520 from Southbound 520, which would seem to handle lots of capacity, and there are two lanes straight from Eastbound Pacific, again more capacity that the intersection should be able to handle. The traffic trying to get on the freeway is separated from the traffic trying to stay local, and they each get their requisite number of lanes, compared to Option A which combines and funnels them across Montlake, through three more lights. Finally, with the additional SPUI interchange, this provides extra capacity. Why the Pacific Street/Montlake Blvd exchange is so bad isn't really explained in the SDEIS, and creates suspicion as to what the actual analysis says. In order for this SDEIS to be complete, it needs better study about the impact of the tunnel on the intersection.</p>	Incorrect, error, omission
I-311-494	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 78	477	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Congestion would increase under Option K compared to the No Build Alternative. The increased congestion would affect adjacent intersection operations to the north, south, and west." This is a value-laden statement that is not supported, especially compared to the repeated statements that Option A "improves conditions" while with Option K, "Congestion would increase." With the extra capacity, the specific intersection design, the avoidance of the draw bridge, the separation of freeway traffic from local traffic, this statement seems completely unjustified, and I haven't been able to find real analysis that supports it.</p>	Not supported, Error
I-311-495	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section1	478	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Public comments on the project have emphasized the benefits of these features to residents in the project vicinity." Why do you need public comments to make this point? Did you not know this already? Also, why don't you mention all of the other public comments that could help provide background. Perhaps in the next draft of the SDEIS, you can mention, "Public comments show that our analysis of Option A was entirely biased in its favor, and our analysis of Option K was completely biased against it."</p>	Omission
I-311-496	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 5	479	Walter Oelwein	<p>"All three options include a lid that would be constructed over SR 520 between 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East." By stating this, you mean to say that if these lids are not built, then the SDEIS is entirely incorrect, and the project did not go through the proper regulatory review. Right?</p>	Omission

I-311-497	Transportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 5	480	Walter Oelwein	"Several design enhancements were added to Option A during the mediation process." I have a problem with this statement in that it implies that design enhancements were not provided prior to the mediation process. This indicates that WashDOT did not actually do designs, but simply put down greater-sized roads, and then did mediation/mitigation. This reveals a flaw in the the process, and calls into question the entire project. What should have happened was to identify the project needs (including enhancements to the local environment and neighborhoods), and come up with a great design using top talent. Then you wouldn't need mediation, because the designer actually meets the desgin needs. Instead, you used mediation as a proxy for design, and you come up with a three-headed mess with no consensus, forcing you to write a SDEIS covering three options. If you had applied design thinking from the start, used actual urban planning and proposed something that would appeal to the various stakeholders, you wouldn't be in this mess.	Omission
I-311-498	Transportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 6	481	Walter Oelwein	"A new grade-separated pedestrian crossing over the lowered intersection would allow pedestrians to have free movement without traffic conflict." This is not mentioned in the Executive Summary, and would seem to be an important detail, especially in comparison to the monstrosity of intersections provided by Option A.	Omission
I-311-499	Transportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 6	482	Walter Oelwein	"This design would allow movement between potentially expanded bus zones, the light rail station, and the University of Washington (UW) Medical Center without changing grades. The lid in this option would provide pedestrian connections over NE Pacific Street and Montlake Boulevard NE." This is not visually depicted in the exhibits found in part 2 of the SDEIS. This needs to be corrected in order for people to understand the environmental impact of the various Options.	Error, Omission
I-311-500	Transportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 6	483	Walter Oelwein	"The lid design and layout would be confirmed through continued coordination with the University of Washington, the City of Seattle, and neighborhoods." This is a highly sketchy comment. You should have a proposed design on the table so we don't have to rely on the "trust us" component. This indicates to me that this SDEIS was released too early, and should only have been released after a proposed design has been developed. In addition -- why is it that the street intersections are all perfectly laid out in the SDEIS, but the pedestrian ones are still being worked out? This seems to be a bias in favor of the automobile aspect of this project, and not the pedestrian/bicycle aspect of the project.	Error, Omission
I-311-501	Transportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 6	484	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would reduce a substantial amount of vehicle traffic south of the Montlake Cut from Montlake Boulevard. This traffic reduction would improve the experience of cyclists and pedestrians using that roadway to travel between areas south of SR 520." This comment is not made in chapter 6. All I read was that Option K would increase vehicle traffic, and intersections would be clogged. This calls into question all of the analysis provided in chapter 6, and needs to be revised to reflect this suddenly, in chapter 7, improved view of Option K	Error, Omission
I-311-502	Transportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 6	485	Walter Oelwein	"This design feature would reduce the potential for pedestrian and bicycle conflicts with motorized vehicles." This is mentioned as a benefit for pedestrians and bicyclists, but not as a mention as a benefit for vehicles in chapter 6. This needs to be noted in chapter 6, that Option K reduces the chance of conflicts with vehicles, which in turn implies that it would help vehicular traffic. Instead, all we hear about in chapter 6 is that Option K is increased in congestion, but not here.	Error, Omission

I-311-503	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 7	486	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Options A, K, and L each has a land bridge suboption at Foster Island to increase/maintain connectivity of regional trails to the Washington Park Arboretum." This appears to be an error. Option A (and L I believe) are repeated stated elsewhere, such as the Executive Summary, as not having an optoinal land bridge over Foster Island. This is made clear repeatedly, but here suddently Option A has an optional land bridge. Not only that, the other sections repeatedly denegrate Option K for the costs, visual impact, stormwater impact, etc. of the Foster Island land bridge, while saying that Option A avoid these terrible enviornmental impacts. However, when you get to the part of the pedestrian benefits, where landbridges are suddently desirable, you now say that Option A could have this. This is a serious error, and appears to be intentional, as it makes Option A look better to readers interested in the positive pedestrian impacts of the project. Instead, you need to articulate here: Option A cuts through Foster Island and does not have a land bridge that will make the pedestrian experience better. In fact, Option A takes more land away from Foster Island, making the pedestrian experience worse.</p>	Error, Omission
I-311-504	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 11	487	Walter Oelwein	<p>I expected to see a discussion on pedestrians on Boyer Ave and Delmar/Lynn. These are common pedestrian and bicycle thoroughfares, and with a 520 bike path, would probably increase. There is no discussion about the quality of these bicycle paths, when there should, since it is part of the same immediate network</p>	Error, Omission
I-311-505	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 14	488	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Sidewalks are provided throughout the SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke Street interchange area. Boylston Avenue East, Harvard Avenue East, and East Roanoke Street have sidewalks on only one side of the street where they are adjacent to I-5, except in areas that provide access to bus stops. There are currently no marked pedestrian crossings on the north or west legs of the East Roanoke/Harvard Avenue East intersection, or the north or east legs of the Roanoke/Boylston Avenue East intersection." It should be noted that it is an extremely inhospitable experience for bicyclists and pedestrians, as this intersection is over-run with cars (as other analysese show), have narrow sidewalks, and massive freeway noise. Not a good pedestrian experience, and it really discourages walkers.</p>	Error, Omission
I-311-506	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 17	489	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Two of the primary considerations when designing a bicycle/pedestrian path are personal safety and comfort on the path." In this case, you need to include the path on Delmar Dr./E. Lynn St. This is a bicycle/pedestrian corridor that feeds the 520 project area, with terrible design that provides neither safety nor comfort. Cars frequently crash into the guardrail, and provide peril for bicyclists and pedestrians alike. The 520 project, if it is interested in "designing safety and comfort", should include this stretch of road, connected to lids, so that the design is good in the entire project area.</p>	Error, Omission
I-311-507	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 17	490	Walter Oelwein	<p>"the ability to walk and ride bicycles around the neighborhood to parks, community facilities, and commercial areas is important. Safety should be addressed and walkways and trails enhanced." Again, Delmar Dr./E. Lynn St. should be in the study area, because it is an important bicycle connection corridor that is not safe and probably does not comply to the standards articulated on this same page.</p>	Error, Omission

I-311-508	Transportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 17	491	Walter Oelwein	"After hearing public concerns about the existing nonmotorized network, the state has worked to proactively address concerns for newly constructed nonmotorized facilities and thereby achieve maximum benefit as part of a planned interconnected system." Again, why is it that only AFTER hearing public concerns do you take action? Wasn't this an obvious public concern to begin with? This statement implies that the design process was not intending to meet the needs of non-vehicular traffic, and only after the public vociferously requests this do you take action. This statement implies that WashDOT did not even consider bicycle and pedestrian impacts in this project, which calls into question the design methodology for all aspects of the project. WashDOT appears to have expanded the roadway, and then asked at public hearings that this is what they are going to do. This was not effective at garnering support, and has been an abject failure, causing lots of re-work with the mediation and multiple options. Incorporate some design thinking from the start, and you can get your project built faster.	Error, Omission
I-311-509	Transportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 18	492	Walter Oelwein	"After the DEIS was published, Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 6099 was passed, directing the state to hire a mediator to facilitate an agreement among stakeholders on the bridge design." This shows the mistake behind the project. Why did you engage in mediation AFTER the DEIS? Why didn't you engage with the stakeholders PRIOR to the DEIS, hire a proper design firm, and come up with designs that actually meet the needs, values and ideals of the project stakeholders. Instead it's been a series of difficult, contentious negotiations, and even when you get designs that people like (like Option K), you still go against it, and push the original, non-mediated option. The project needs to start over with proper design thinking, and when this happens, you will be able to get it built.	Error, Omission
I-311-510	Transportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 18	493	Walter Oelwein	"Other than the main bicycle/pedestrian path along the floating bridge itself, all proposed nonmotorized connections in the Draft EIS have been altered as a result of the mediation discussions." I find it interesting that in the SDEIS you are advertising the suggestions from stakeholders when it comes to bicycle/pedestrian facilities, but there is very limited commentary regarding the roads/intersections etc., where the mediation process also netted big changes. I believe that you want to de-emphasize that Option K is the preferred option by the stakeholders, and in areas of lesser controversy -- such as improved bike paths, you speak freely about the results of mitigation. I believe that your backwards thinking has hurt the project, and it is reflected throughout this SDEIS.	Error, Omission
I-311-511	Transportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 20	494	Walter Oelwein	"All of the design options would meet the project goals of providing transportation and livability benefits to the affected neighborhoods and to the region as a whole." This is an incorrect statement. Option A creates bigger sprawl, creates worse visual impact, doubles back-ups with two bascule bridges, and that interchange at Montlake/520 is a mess. This should be revised to say, "Only Option K has the support of the local residents as meeting the project goals. . ."	Error, Misleading
I-311-512	Transportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 20	495	Walter Oelwein	"Options A, K, and L include an optional land bridge at Foster Island that provides additional connections from the SR 520 bridge to the existing Arboretum trails." Again, this is patently incorrect, as elsewhere in the document it is explicitly stated that only option K has a landbridge. And additionally, Option K is repeatedly made to sound worse because of claimed negative impacts of the bridge (which I object to). But when it is in the "improvements" section, suddenly Option A gets in on the action, and can claim to have this feature when it sound good for pedestrians, park users, and bicyclists.	Error, Misleading

I-311-513 Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 20	496	Walter Oelwein	"While all of the design options meet the basic project goals, they contain slight differences in their effects on nonmotorized transportation." Again, only Option K has the support of the local residents, so it is impossible to claim that the goals are met with Options A and L. This should be stated, "Only option K meets the goals of the people most affected by the project."	Error, Misleading
I-311-514 Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Overall	497	Walter Oelwein	I find it disturbing that there is no discussion of the to-from destinations of pedestrians. And what the pedestrian patterns there will be with the Sound Transit Sation. This seems glossed over.	Omission
I-311-515 Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 21	498	Walter Oelwein	"As described below, the ease of nonmotorized travel from place to place will be most improved to the east and southwest through Option A." This statement is incorrect and unsubstantiated. Option A has the worst traffic interchanges for pedestrians and bicyclists.	Error, Unsupporte d
I-311-516 Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 21	499	Walter Oelwein	"Option A offers the most direct access on paths from the SR 520 bridge to Lake Washington Boulevard, the Arboretum, and the Bill Dawson Trail." The "lid" over 520 at Montlake/24th cannot be characterized as such, because it is a monstrous intersction, and is extremely non-pedestrian and bicycle friendly. Option K significantly reduces the traffic at this intersection, keeps it at a reasonable size, and is thus more hospitable. I cannot abide by this assertion that Option A is "most direct." The exhibits provided don't make this clear how this could possibly be true. This section needs to be revised for it to be correct.	Error, Unsupporte d
I-311-517 Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 23	500	Walter Oelwein	"In Seattle, an HOV lane is located along short sections of NE Pacific Street (eastbound only) and Montlake Boulevard (southbound only) leading to the Montlake Bridge." This appears to be an error. There is no HOV lane on Montlake Boulevard, unless you count that merge lane just before the bridge? Or are you talking about the onramp to Eastbound 520? This section is incorrect, whatever it is trying to say.	Error
I-311-518 Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 31	501	Walter Oelwein	"This high variability means that travelers needing to keep a regular schedule must plan for the worst conditions and expect a relatively long travel time." As is a common theme with this SDEIS, there is no or limited discussion impact on having draw bridge in the local area, and only discusses peak times, but not non-peak times, when the draw bridge opens. This should be a discussion point in any EIS, since it is a part of the environment. Major sections of this need to be rewritten for it to be correct.	Omission
I-311-519 Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 35	502	Walter Oelwein	"The No Build Alternative was assumed to be untolled for all vehicles." Again, this is a faulty assumption that can wildly skew the impact analyses of the project. There will be tolling on the no-build option. This SDEIS needs to be re-written with this assumption, or else it is filled with errors wherever the no-build option, an comparisons to other options occurs.	Error
I-311-520 Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 35	503	Walter Oelwein	"For the SDEIS transportation analysis, it was assumed that this general service structure would continue into the future, but with improved service frequencies and additional bus routes during peak and off-peak periods." It's not clear how you can make this assumption, since there is no freeway station, frequency of service for anyone boarding or alighting in the Montlake area is limited to U-District busses. This cuts down the number of accessible busses significantly.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-521 Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 40	504	Walter Oelwein	"When the update to the transportation analysis for the SDEIS began in 2006, the ST2 Plan had not yet been approved by voters and was unfunded." Perhaps you should mention that the SR520 project is not fully funded either?	Error or Incorrect

<p>I-311-522</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 40</p>	<p>505</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Inside HOV lanes (3+) in both directions across the SR 520 bridge to I-5" Why is it assumed that it is 3+ HOV? The only 3+ lanes are ones where it is litterally too narrow for 2+ level traffic (Westbound 520). Everywhere else it is 2+. I can't imagine that 3+ would be the default set-up. Your analyses need to include 2+, because this is a very likely scenario.</p>	<p>Error or Incorrect, specific options not examined</p>
<p>I-311-523</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 40</p>	<p>506</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"In addition to the HOV facilities listed above, Option A would include a westbound transit-only direct access off-ramp to northbound Montlake Boulevard." In looking at this, it seems to add to the width of 520 unnecessarily, and doesn't seem to serve much purpose. I haven't seen an analysis that states why Option A should have a special HOV off-ramp. Why couldn't busses take the non-HOV off-ramp? Also, where that bus-stop dump people off is into a very inhospitable location forcing the disembarkers to cross three lanes of off-ramp traffic. Yuck!</p>	<p>Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-524</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 41</p>	<p>507</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"In addition to the HOV facilities listed above, Option A would include a westbound transit-only direct access off-ramp to northbound Montlake Boulevard." It is not stated whether busses would then get back on to 520 westbound, or just keep going north across the drawbridge, and into the U-District. If it is "get back on the freeway", then this is less desirable than the no-build option, since a) pedestrians have to cross three lanes of traffic to go northbound, and b) the bus then has to wait at the intersection to get back on the on-ramp. This is not discussed or described in the SDEIS, making it incomplete.</p>	<p>Incorrect or incomplete</p>
<p>I-311-525</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 43</p>	<p>508</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Based on discussions with Montlake area residents and the 2008 mediation process, it was decided that the Montlake Freeway Transit Station would not be rebuilt so the footprint of SR 520 through the Montlake neighborhood could be narrowed." I find it interesting that you cite the narrowing of the bridge in this one instance, yet you do not mention all of the times when you ignored the imput of the local residents. For this document to be correct and consistent, you need to include all of the times you specifically ignored the local residents requests, and made the impact worse, of which there are plenty of examples. By repeatedly citing the one time you did narrow the footprint of the project in relation to local residents' requests, you create the impression that this is the only request of the local residents, and all of the objections to the project don't exist. Secondly, because you are taking away a popular and important transit stop by meeting this request, you effectively blame the local residents' request and make them the "bad guys" for the project, when it was your systemic lack of design thinking that caused the problem in the first place, forcing the residents to fight for slightly improved design, and then resulting in comprimised design that takes away the one thing that is working about the existing design. This is why there is opposition to this project -- you do not meet the local residents' requests, and when you do, you repeatedly blame them for the failures of the design. For this document to be correct, you need to do the reverse -- blame WashDOT for all of the failures of the design to improve the local area, to create more pollution, to improve visual impact, to reduce noise, and to make the intersections work better. Something like, "Because of WashDOT's failure to incorporate design thinking and priciples that meet the stakeholders, the Roanoke Park/Harvard intersection remains at LOS F." This would need to be repeated throughout the document. On this example, the same could be said, "WashDOT has no ideas for making this freeway station integrate with the other bus transit options, so we are blaming the local residents for the failure to continue to have a local freeway stop." Any aspect of inadequacy of the project needs attribution, and since WashDOT is the "project leader", then you need to make this explicit. Don't blame the local residents for faults with the project.</p>	<p>Misleading and incorrect.</p>

<p>I-311-526</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 44</p>	<p>509</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"With Option A, a westbound transit stop would be located at the termination of the westbound transit-only direct access ramp on the Montlake overpass, allowing people to make connections in the Montlake area." I have not seen justificatin for why this direct access ramp is necessary. It appears to be something that WashDOT has thrown in to Option A to make it appear more "transit friendly", when it in essence dumps people off into a huge, unwieldy intersection. The extra expense and location of the ramp is not justified.</p>	<p>Not supported. Design options not considered</p>
<p>I-311-527</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 44</p>	<p>510</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"With Options K or L, the first Seattle transit stop for SR 520 bus service would be at the Montlake Triangle. This would mean some out-of-direction travel for people destined for areas south of the Montlake Cut." Why don't you also say, "But bus service that connects right to Sound Transit, without having to wait for bridge openings, and three stop lights as the bus sloggs through the Montlake neighborhood."? You consistently de-emphasize the positives about Option K and emphasize the positives about Option A (when they aren't even positives).</p>	<p>Misleading and incorrect. Omission.</p>
<p>I-311-528</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 45</p>	<p>511</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"This would add approximately 1 to 3 minutes¹ of travel time for people originating from areas south of the Montlake Cut by bus, or approximately 10 to 15 minutes² for those who walk." Only when discussing Options K and L do you mention the additional walk time, but with Option A, you say nothing. It appears to be the same, since you would have to get to the Montlake Triangle for each of the Options. This is misleading and makes it look like Option A is the status quo and Options Ka and L are worse.</p>	<p>Misleading and incorrect. Omission.</p>
<p>I-311-529</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 45</p>	<p>512</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Under all options, some passengers would transfer at the Evergreen Point Freeway Transit Station to reach their final destinations." This seems to be a massive design failure. You basically are saying that when people didn't have to transfer in the U-District, they now do have to transfer at Evergreen point. So you have just spent 4.5 Billion dollars on making public tranportation users add a transfer and wait more. Similar to the blame you place on "requests by the Montlake residents" to eliminate the freeway station, why don't you blame the failures on your part to identify how to keep similar transporation hubs? How about, "Due to our design failures, some passengers would transfer at Evergreen Point Freeway Transit Station."</p>	<p>Misleading and incorrect. Omission.</p>
<p>I-311-530</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 46</p>	<p>513</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Eastbound transit riders in the Montlake and University District that want to cross the SR 520 bridge would have fewer routes to choose from with the removal of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station." This is an especially embarrassing statement for WashDOT, because with Sound Transit, you are precisely going to get more people expecting to transfer at Montlake to the eastside, more so than now. This is something that shows the shortcomings of your design, and needs to be fixed prior to attempting to construct the west side interchange.</p>	<p>Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>
<p>I-311-531</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 46</p>	<p>514</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Once preferred design options are selected, more detailed transit planning and intersection design will be conducted in coordination with transit agencies to determine whether existing bus stops would need to be replaced, relocated, or removed." The fact that this is in the Option K and L analysis shows that less thought has gone into considering Option K and its impact. In order for this SDEIS to be complete, you need to say this about Option A as well, or better yet, you should actually solve these on paper before spending billions of dollars, and then try to solve the problem.</p>	<p>Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered</p>

I-311-532	Transportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 48	515	Walter Oelwein	"Expand the transit network to include the ultimate development of an SR 520 high capacity transit system, which may include exclusive, dedicated transit facilities in the corridor" This statement does not seem to make sense when reviewing the rest of the document. In the previous section, you claim that the freeway is too narrow to even have a freeway bus stop. Yet you now say that "high capacity transit" may be included in the coordidor? How are you going to pull this off? Where are you going to put it? A more accurate claim would be, "We have put no thought and have no ideas for how to add high transit capability in the cooridor." This would give a better understanding of the potential of this project, and where it stands.	Error, Misleading, Omission
I-311-533	Transportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 50	516	Walter Oelwein	"Freeway Traffic – Afternoon Peak Period No Build Alternative" These sections are misleading, since there is not the assumption of tolling on the no-build alternative. This makes the entire project seem more necessary than it is. If you include tolling on the "no build", you could then manage traffic better and increase HOV traffic even without HOV lanes. Then you could concentrate on just fixing the structural problems, rather than try to expand the bridge.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-534	Transportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 52	517	Walter Oelwein	"However, when I-405 congestion is at its worst, westbound SR 520 general-purpose travel times would be the same as the No Build Alternative because the project is generally not adding general-purpose capacity." This appears to be an example of unsystemic thinking. If I-405 traffic gets worse, wouldn't tolling be instituted? Wouldn't transit be increased? Could it be that by 2030, Bellevue will have a "no car" policy like London? Just because they aren't adding general purpose lanes doesn't mean you can't get people there. I find your analyses of the 405 situation to be incredibly simplistic, and focused only on more cars, and not more and better transportation systems that integrate with the built and non-built environment. It is as though you are making a statement of value that more general purpose lanes will solve problems. It won't.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered; Misleading
I-311-535	Transportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 52	518	Walter Oelwein	"The eastbound HOV lane allows HOVs to bypass the queue, reducing congestion in the eastbound general-purpose lanes." "Eastbound HOV travel times would be reduced by nearly 40 minutes with the 6-Lane Alternative options because the HOV lane between I-5 and Medina would be completed" This analysis is suspect, since there is no evidence that there will be a queue by today's traffic patterns. There is never a back-up to 405 from eastbound 520. Secondly, where there are HOV lanes on eastbound 520, they are never necessary to use, as it is rarely backed up where those HOV lanes are located. That project was a waste. So your claims of "nearly 40 minutes" is suspect, since this does not seem to be the main problem with the corridor, but you are advertising it as such.	Misleading, Error
I-311-536	Transportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 52	519	Walter Oelwein	"Local Arterial Traffic" Again, only focus on peak times, when the main difference between the options is the improved non-peak times of Option K.	Misleading, Omission
I-311-537	Transportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 52	520	Walter Oelwein	"Local arterial traffic operations along Montlake Boulevard NE and NE Pacific Street would improve with all options compared to the No Build Alternative, except for Montlake Boulevard northbound approaching NE Pacific Street under Options K and L." Another example of anti-Option K bias, when it is not clear how Option A is so great at funneling traffic and Option K is so poor that you can make this kind of evaluative statement, especially since Option K has some cars that bypass the Montlake bridge and reduced the total number of stoplights.	Misleading, Error

<p>I-311-538</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 53</p>	<p>521</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Option K would result in the most reliable travel times for SR 520 buses because they would not be affected by bridge openings." This directly contradicts the first sentence in the section, which specifically outlines Option K as being worse. This is inconsitent, and it appears this information stating that Option K is more recent, and it is the first citation that I could find that states the advantage of no bridge openings. This calls into question the rest of the analyses throughout the SDEIS, which clearly has not considered this. The SDEIS is contradictory, incomplete and error prone.</p>	<p>Error, Omission</p>
<p>I-311-539</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 53</p>	<p>522</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Northbound congestion would improve the most with Option A or its suboption because the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection does not introduce additional corridor congestion. Options K and L would have longer travel times because of increased congestion approaching the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection." This is a claim that is repeatedly made in the SDEIS, but is not supported. How, exactly, does Option A not introduce more cooridor congestion? All three options provide additional lanes to funnel traffic, and all three options have the same amount of demand through Montlake/Pacific street. The best I can understand is that Option K does too well at getting people on the 520, so more people will use it, causing more cooridor congestion? This analysis does not make sense, yet it is a cornerstone of your argument that Option A is better. This is clearly misleading and incorrect</p>	<p>Misleading, Error</p>
<p>I-311-540</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 54-56</p>	<p>523</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>Option A commentary: "would improve", "adds capacity" "would benefit" "would improve", "congestion and delays would decrease, improving transit travel times" "would improve even more" "would improve" "would remove a bottleneck" "continue to benefit transit" "but with less congestion" "travel times would be better" "avoid signal delay" "enter directly" "reducing delay" Option K commentary: "would allow buses to bypass general purpose traffic congestion" "would benefit" "would be able to bypass the Montlake Bridge" "Delay. . . would worsen" "increased congestion" "over capacity" "back up and block" "delaying" "would improve""travel times would be affected" "no longer be able to bypass" "would improve substantially""would improve""would improve" In looking at the comparative analysis, rhetorically, there is a clear bias toward Option A. "Would improve" is used consistently, while in Option K, while there is some "would improve", there is frequent citation of worsening of events. This section still does not explain why the Pacific Street intersection is SO BAD with Option K, since the same amount of traffic has to go through that same spot with Option A. I can see why the Legislative Work Group was snowballed into recommending Option A.</p>	<p>Misleading, Error</p>
<p>I-311-541</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 63</p>	<p>524</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Option A has a much wider footprint and would extend SR 520 approximately 120 feet north of its current location." This needs to be stated elsewhere in the SDEIS for it to be a fair assessment of the impact of Option A. Only here is it really obvious that the wider footprint has an impact. Otherwise, it is implied that Option A is the same as the others, which clearly isn't the case.</p>	<p>Misleading, Omission</p>
<p>I-311-542</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 64</p>	<p>525</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"However, Options K and L both propose to extend West Montlake Place East to the intersection of Montlake Place East and East Lake Washington Boulevard." This isn't mentioned really much elsewhere, but this seems to really improve the design of the Montake Blvd exchange -- rather than have two intersections near the Hop-in, you have one. This aspect of the design isn't articulated much -- and its benefits -- elsewhere in the document. Only when it shows the negative aspects of the design (loss in parking), is it highlighted. This indicates to me Anti-Option K bias.</p>	<p>Misleading, Omission</p>

<p>I-311-543</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 64</p>	<p>526</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"However, Option A would eliminate the gas station, its entire parking lot, and thus all five parking spaces. It should be noted, though, that because the gas station itself would be removed, the associated demand to park in this lot would also be eliminated. Therefore, there would be no effect on the community by removing the lot itself." This seems to be making an rhetorical argument in favor of Option A, and the argument isn't necessarily true. First, you shouldn't be making rhetorical arguments in favor of one option over another -- you specifically call out how this loss of a gas station and parking has "no effect", when clearly this is not true-- losing a gas station and its parking obviously has an effect. Now -- you also gloss over what is there if there is no gas station. In Option A's case, there is an expanded off ramp. This is not "no effect" - it is a larger road and interchange and no local gas station (and parking). To specifically call out that this has "no effect" is incorrect. Similarly, with option K, with its loss of parking on W. Montlake Place, you make no rhetorical argument such, well since the gas station stays, then I guess it's the same amount of parking that is lost with K and A.</p>	
<p>I-311-544</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 64</p>	<p>527</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Option A would not affect these six spaces. However, Options K and L both propose to extend West Montlake Place East to the intersection of Montlake Place East and East Lake Washington Boulevard." This analysis is incomplete and error prone. With Option K, you have W. Montlake Place extending to the north side of the (preserved) gas station. That means that there is very limited traffic on the once highly busy E. Roanoke Street in comparison to before. Would it stand to reason that you could ADD parking up and down both sides of that street? There won't be a 25 bus stop there any more (that's now on Montlake Place E.), and I'm sure that the Hop-in would reconfigure the entrance to their back-parking lot to the north side, leaving more parking. On the Eastbound part of Montlake Place East it is two lanes (to handle the traffic, remember?), well now that's diverted to a brand new road (W. Montlake Place), so that means that the right lane on Montlake Place East would be used for on street parking. I estimate that this would add about 15 parking spaces. I find it curious that in the one place where Option K actually makes parking better, you make it sound like Option K is worse.</p>	<p>Incomplete, Error, Specific design options not considered.</p>
<p>I-311-545</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 69</p>	<p>528</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"However, Option K would eliminate the entire parking lot to provide a new access between Lake Washington Boulevard and SR 520. This lot appears to be highly utilized as an access to area trails and parks." You fail to mention that this space will also create new parkland, and you don't do much research to identify how this lot can be replaced, as you do in the areas where Option A removes parking. For Option A, it's, "We can find parking elsewhere." and Option K it's, "Parking is lost, sorry."</p>	<p>Incomplete, Error, Specific design options not considered.</p>
<p>I-311-546</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 74</p>	<p>529</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"West Approach (north half - 4 lanes, includes work in Union Bay) 30 months 54 months (Includes Foster Island lid) 30 months" In the Pedestrian Section, you explicitly say that the Foster Island bridge is for each option. But here, it is only associated with Option K. This make Option K look worse than the other options. So which is it?</p>	<p>Error</p>
<p>I-311-547</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 78</p>	<p>530</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"All Options: Delmar Drive E closed. Traffic would detour to Boyer Ave E or 10th Ave E." This is a really bad idea, and you need to suggest alternatives to sending people down 11th Ave (a.k.a. "Devils Dip"). It is extremely steep, narrow, and cannot handle that kind of capacity. It is also an omission, since this graphic should say "via 11th Ave" instead of just Boyer. This is important, since this glosses over the more contentious aspects of this detour. (Really, it's a bad idea).</p>	<p>Error, Specific options not considered</p>
<p>I-311-548¹</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 78</p>	<p>531</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Potential Detour Route" I think that you need to be a little more clear -- "potential" makes it sound like it may be something else. Perhaps, "Proposed detour route" instead.</p>	<p>Error</p>

<p>I-311-549</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 83</p>	<p>532</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>One thing to note is that Boyer and Fuhrman are potential haul routes, but there is no mention on the impact of traffic on this stretch of road in the local traffic section of the SDEIS. Do you see the obvious contradiction? It's close enough to be a haul route, but not affected by the project itself. This demonstrates that the analysis is incomplete, and needs to be included: What is the impact of Fuhrman/Boyer when the project is completed? If it's impacted by construction, surely it will be impacted by the project completion.</p>	<p>Omission</p>
<p>I-311-550</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 87</p>	<p>533</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>I don't see any mention of Fuhrman/Boyer in this listing of haul routes. So you should remove Furhman/Boyer as being a haul route in Section 83 (Exhibit 10-6)</p>	<p>Error</p>
<p>I-311-551</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 95</p>	<p>534</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>It's still not clear why Fuhrman/Boyer are needed as a haul route. This needs to be explained</p>	<p>Omission</p>
<p>I-311-552</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 120</p>	<p>535</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Option K was chosen as the representative build option for comparison in this chapter because it has the potential to result in slightly higher volumes along the SR 520 corridor compared to the other options." OK, so you choose Option K when you think that the cumulative effects will be better, yet throughout the rest of the document you repeatedly state that Option A is "improves" things the most. So why didn't you choose Option A? In order for this SDEIS to be complete, you need to choose the option that you are advocating, and compare it -- objectively -- to the one you are not.</p>	<p>Omission</p>
<p>I-311-553</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Section 139</p>	<p>536</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The public response to the proposed design options was not favorable, forcing the state to reconsider the configuration of the Westside interchange near Montlake Boulevard and SR 520." Correct, because you did not offer any "designs," you offered default roadway placement. Had you done the project with an actual design thinking mentality, hired qualified designers, and identified stakeholder interests, you wouldn't be putting yourself through this difficult process of doing an SDEIS on multiple configurations. By continuing to offer the sad Option A, that has support only from those who live far away from the interchange, you are continuing this pain. Drop Option A and focus on Option K. I would prefer that this statement include how WashDOT actually came up with the design options, and how it attempted to meet the project needs without dragging local residents and so many others through a difficult mediation process. Did Rem Koolhaus have to go through a mediation process to get the Seattle Public Library built?</p>	<p>Omission</p>
<p>I-311-554</p> <p>Tranportation Discipline Report part 3</p>	<p>Overall</p>	<p>537</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>For the record, I was on Montalke Blvd today, March 6, 2010, a Saturday at 3pm, not peak period by any stretch of the imagination. Because of the traffic volume and the bridge going up frequently, the traffic was backed up to the 45th street viaduct and to 15th street on Pacific. This is the consequence of having a draw bridge in blocking people heading onto 520 from the North. I can't believe that Option A or L are even discussed in this document, since this is a really stupid problem to replicate and exacerbate. This kind of traffic problem needs to be studied and noted in this SDEIS for this document to be complete.</p>	<p>Specific design options not considered, Omission</p>

<p>I-311-555</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 13</p>	<p>538</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"This discipline report describes indirect and cumulative effects expected to be associated with the proposed Interstate 5 (I-5) to Medina: Bridge Replacement and High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Project (I-5 to Medina project) and discusses potential mitigation measures." This section should have started instead with, "Here's how the I-5 to Medina 520 project improves our environment," rather than, "Here's how we are going to mitigate the effects." The fact that you need to start with mitigation indicates that you have made no effort to make this an appropriate project for the natural and built environment, and the FIRST measure you take to make it a better project for the region is via mitigation, a defeat to the project's adverse effects. This indicates that the project is faulty from the start, and needs to be reconsidered instead to, "Here's how we are designing a transportation corridor that reflects our current values and meets the needs of the corridor that specifically ENHANCES the natural and built environment." Instead, as it reads, it says, "Here's the DAMAGE our project causes, and a few ways we can make to COVER OVER the DAMAGE." It would be a more honest writing to indicate this more outright, rather than hide behind the soft term of "mitigation."</p>	<p>Specific design options not considered, Omission</p>
<p>I-311-556</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Overall</p>	<p>539</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>Do you cover indirect effects of ineffectively designing a project that is illegal, making it impossible to meet the core need of enhanced safety? In this case, it is reasonable to assess that an indirect effect of this project is a bridge collapse.</p>	<p>Omission</p>
<p>I-311-557</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 15</p>	<p>540</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"evaluate a new set of community-based designs for the Montlake area in Seattle." Why are these designs "community-based." This implies that the designs aren't professional and are of less merit. If you are going to call out specific designs as community-based, you need to call out the kind of designs the non-community-based "designs" are. Here is what I propose: "Default roadway placement inserted by WashDOT without regard to community impacts." or "Larger freeway footprints placed without regard to design possibilities or considerations by inexperienced WashDOT staffers." This should be noted everywhere in the SDEIS for any references to "community input" to be valid. If it didn't come from the community, you must state where it DID come from.</p>	<p>Error, Omission</p>
<p>I-311-558</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 18</p>	<p>541</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The proposed width of the roadway would be approximately 18 feet narrower than the one described in the Draft EIS, reflecting public comment from local communities and the City of Seattle." Again, why do you specifically call out where this idea came from? And if you can make it narrower, why didn't you do this in the first place? What was the incentive to make it wider than the current 115' span? Where did this idea come from -- you talk about the idea for where the narrower footprint came from -- where did the wider footprint come from? If it was a qualified freeway designer, would they have said, "Let's make it 133'!" No, they would have known the community input and transportation needs, and created a bridge that best reflects the needs of the corridor --both traffic and community. Since you specifically call out community input, you are now obliged to call out EVERYWHERE in the SDEIS where input for other ideas. The 133' proposal should say, "133' proposal offered by WashDOT staffers WITHOUT REGARD FOR COMMUNITY INPUT or CONTEMPORARY FREEWAY DESIGN". This needs to be repeated throughout the SDEIS for it to be accurate. As such, it seems to call out local residents as the problem--they are the ones who made you narrow the bridge width, they are the ones creating new designs. They are the ones prolonging the process. If you had designed a reasonable bridge that met the non-secret needs, you wouldn't have had to go through these extra iterations.</p>	<p>Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered</p>
<p>I-311-559</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 18</p>	<p>542</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>Exhibit 3: Nowhere in this SDIES is it clear to me why the shoulders and the HOV lanes have to be so wide. You can cut down the shoulders at least 3 feet apiece, as well as the HOV lane 1-2 feet. Why isn't this done?</p>	<p>Specific design alternatives not considered</p>

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

<p>I-311-560</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 19</p>	<p>543</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Citizen recommendations made during the mediation process defined this option to include sound walls and/or quieter pavement, subject to neighborhood approval and WSDOT's reasonability and feasibility determinations." Again, I object to you calling out when it is a citizen recommendation when you don't indicate where other recommendations came from. You are now obliged to state, "WashDOT has made no effort to identify how to make the freeway quieter, and instead placed similar roadway construction techniques from the prior freeway. We have waited for citizens to identify how to keep noise to a minimum, and we have proposed nothing. We would prefer that citizens fight amongst themselves to determine the best way to keep noise down, and not enlist any expertise ourselves to make sure that the new, wider freeway has less noise impact from the start." Everywhere you state citizen input changing the project, you need to state WashDOT's input in making it an insufficient project that requires further citizen input. If it is a good idea, then WashDOT needs to actively embrace the idea as though it is its own -- rather than defer to citizens as to what the best approach is.</p>	<p>Omission</p>
<p>I-311-561</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 19</p>	<p>544</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Citizen recommendations made during the mediation process defined this option to include sound walls and/or quieter pavement, subject to neighborhood approval and WSDOT's reasonability and feasibility determinations." The fact that you cannot assert whether there will be noise walls or quieter pavement indicates that this project design is incomplete, and the environmental impact, whether primary or indirect can be assessed. It is easy to imagine that a 6 lane freeway without any noise mitigation across Portage Bay would create a net negative or depressive effect on property values, and create indirect losses for the City of Seattle, stunting growth for a central area of the city near a major employer. With extensive noise mitigation (beyond just noise walls and quieter pavement -- i.e., no trucks at certain times or on weekends, lower speed limit, no combustion engines, noise canceling speakers--hey this is one citizen's input on noise abatement - -you're the experts -- or are you? -- this could be much different.) Therefore it is clear that this SDEIS is grossly incomplete and any analysis of the cumulative and indirect impacts will not be reasonable, since you don't even know the nature of the project.</p>	<p>Incomplete, Error, Specific design options not considered.</p>

<p>I-311-562</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 21</p>	<p>545</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Citizen recommendations made during the mediation process defined this option to include only quieter pavement for noise abatement, rather than the sound walls that were included in the 2006 Draft EIS. However, because quieter pavement has not been demonstrated to meet all FHWA and WSDOT avoidance and minimization requirements in tests performed in Washington State, it cannot be considered as noise mitigation under WSDOT and FHWA criteria." This disclaimer about quieter pavement appears throughout the SDEIS as part of the general description of Option K. It is unclear as to what this statement about how quieter pavement does not meet the tests performed in Washington state is germane to the overall description of Option K. First, it distracts from the description, making it seem as though Option K has noise abatement problems, when it doesn't. Second, it makes it seem like quieter pavement is off the table, which it isn't, since it takes a careful parsing of the statement to show that WashDOT's tests show it not capable of being noise abatement, yet it somehow does qualify as noise abatement in other areas of the country. This needs to be re-written to say, "WashDOT does not know how to create noise abatement for this transportation corridor -- we have no ideas. The ideas suggested by citizens are better, but we can't even test the pavement well enough. We give up!" This would be a more accurate statement rather than the clouding of the issues in a summary of Option K. Third, it is still not clear what WashDOT plans to do to create noise abatement -- other than attempt to settle disputes with citizens via the SDEIS. I expected to see a list of all the things that WashDOT plans to do to make noise abatement possible, only to find that WashDOT is trying argue AGAINST noise abatement measures as insufficient, but abjectly refusing to offer alternative suggestions. Anywhere this statement about quieter pavement not meeting the testing standards needs to be followed with all of the things, if any, WashDOT is doing to make it so that it IS a quieter freeway. I have yet to see anything other than a tepid endorsement of noise walls, which don't really make sense, since many residences reside above the freeway. WashDOT, you need to bring something more to the table here rather than try to settle scores via the SDEIS. You're just adding more work. Offer your full list of noise abatement in the summary or revise the whining about quieter pavement to say that you commit to doing it.</p>	<p>Incomplete, Error, Specific design options not considered.</p>
<p>I-311-563</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 22</p>	<p>546</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Noise mitigation identified for this option would include sound walls as defined in the Draft EIS." Why not say, "via WashDOT input, we are refusing to add quieter pavement like is being suggested for Option K?" This would make it a more consistent writing style where you cite community input. What's WashDOT's input wherever a decision to include or not include something is mentioned. Here is a location where you are obliged to do this.</p>	<p>Incomplete</p>
<p>I-311-564</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 26</p>	<p>547</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>In this section you clearly outline the priorities of the project, based on likelihood of disaster. First, the middle bridge. Second, Portage Bay bridge Third, the West Approach of the bridge. How come WashDOT has recently advocated starting the project in Medina? This isn't on the priority anywhere. This makes this entire SDEIS invalid, since even still during the comment period, you are doing something completely different from what is documented in the SDEIS. You need to re-write the document to reflect why starting on the east side is so important, when you systemically document the earthquake and winde-related dangers of the west side. Also, if this is the priority, shouldn't the designs proposed be such that they offer to fix the instability issues first, rather than adding capacity as the first order of business? This incosnsistency found throughout this document calls intoquestion the accuracy of the SDEIS.</p>	<p>Error, Incorrect info, Omission</p>

<p>I-311-565</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 30</p>	<p>548</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Assess Consequences and Develop Appropriate Mitigation and Enhancement Strategies—Assess consequences of indirect effects and develop strategies to address unacceptable outcomes." Would re-design of the project be something that could count as a "strategy to address unacceptable outcomes?" In this project, I would like to know what the acceptable bar is. I would have expected a net improvement on each area of impact, rather than a net loss -- we shouldn't be spending this much money without striving to achieve this. It is easy to see how this project, with its additional lanes creates a net loss in many area, so it should go back to the drawing board: Start with a better design-- say a tube or tunnel using design options that WashDOT rejected without fully exploring.</p>	<p>Specific design alternatives not considered</p>
<p>I-311-566</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 43</p>	<p>549</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>Open space and waterfront. -- this section has no background or commentary, when there could be. For example, the street end at Edgar St. was reclaimed by local residents in 1980 and created a small park. Just recently, at South Portage bay, local residents have reclaimed and established the South Portage Bay Park. So just to call it "open space and waterfront" does not accurately describe the pained and ongoing efforts to improve the local environment by local residents.</p>	<p>Incomplete</p>
<p>I-311-567</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 45</p>	<p>550</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"resulting in increased property values." Here you specifically cite as historical reference, and presumably because it is important to understand what is important, the property values. Is the impact of the I-5 to Medina project on property values being assessed in the SDEIS? If not, then why is property values mentioned here in relation to the I-90 bridge being developed? If so, what is the net impact of increasing the size of the bridge on the property values nearby? I have not seen any commentary on this, but it must be important, since it is mentioned specifically here -- at the moment where the first Lake Washington bridge is built -- to have an impact on property values. I would like this SDEIS to state specifically what the anticipated impact of property values would be with the no-build, option A, L, K. Or else this analysis is not complete.</p>	<p>Incomplete</p>
<p>I-311-568</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 45</p>	<p>551</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"For the Eastside communities, the new bridge would lead to even more residents and greater development pressures." You mention the impact of the initial bridge construction -- for EASTSIDE communities. But what about the Westside communities? You do not mention that the residents -- in the area since the 1800's now had to deal with a large above-ground freeway that brought noise, traffic, visual blight and pollution. Also, the bridge forever scarred the Washington Park Arboretum, established earlier in this essay as an early park in the City of Seattle. There is no mention on the benefits of the bridge to the residents of the City of Seattle, so it can be established with the publishing of this SDEIS that the 520 bridge benefitted people on the Eastside, but not on the Westside. This section has the opportunity to establish the terrible design that the original SR520 brought to the sensitive area, but you don't. This makes this section grossly incomplete.</p>	<p>Incomplete, Omission, No support</p>

<p>I-311-569</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 45</p>	<p>552</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"an engineering feat of outstanding proportions" This is an engineering feat, to be sure, but is it an architectural feat? No. Is it an aesthetics feat? No. Is it a feat of engineering that successfully preserves the natural and built environment? No. This needs to be called out specifically for this section to be valid. It needs to articulate that in addition to the positive "engineering" accomplishment, it is a massive failure in terms of integrating a transportation corridor with the local environment. It might be worth stating that in other urban areas, it was de facto assumed that new road or transportation development should take place underground, as has been done in major cities throughout the world since the 18th century. This section glorifies the "engineering feat" but completely neglects the ongoing price of that feat, and how it was, indeed built, but built on the cheap -- using parkland so that they didn't have to buy land from land owners. This section needs to be re-written to further indicate how the people who have been living with SR520 in their backyard feel about it.</p>	<p>Omission, Error, No support</p>
<p>I-311-570</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 46</p>	<p>553</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"many of which function today as Seattle suburbs" This is an abject incorrect statement. To call Bellevue and Redmond suburbs of Seattle is to mischaracterize their contributions as employment centers. People in Seattle commute to Redmond just as much as vice versa. The so-called "reverse commute" is much worse than the "regular commute." So to intimate in any way that "today" this corridor is to serve for suburbanites to come into the city is blatantly incorrect. This is important since the "design" (or as I believe is more accurate, default roadway placement) decisions indicate this mentality still exists -- such as the non-sensical Option A HOV lane to I-5. Also, this is an especially insidious statement in that it implies that there are residents living in the pristine suburbs, and the industrial jobs are in Seattle, when Seattle actually has a better residential quality of life (better bus service, closer transit stops, narrower roads) than the car-centric Eastside. This is important, because if you had indicated this in the history of the area, it would have made it easier for the designers (should you have hired them) to create designs that reflect the values of the local residents: Reduce cars, reduce the impact of freeways, improve transit, improve parkland. Instead, the "design" reflects the car-centric culture of the Eastside.</p>	<p>Omission, Error, No support</p>
<p>I-311-571</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 46</p>	<p>554</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Medina has become one the most affluent residential communities in the region. Today Bellevue, Kirkland, and Redmond are prosperous and growing commercial and residential communities." I expect to see (and I don't) a similar explanation about the relative affluence of the close-in neighborhoods of Seattle: Capitol Hill, Montlake, Roanoke Park, Laurelhurst, Madison Park. These are very affluent areas of the city, and provide an enormous amount of tax revenue in a very small area of land. For the freeway to dominate it so much has a severe impact. If this is not articulated, then this SDEIS is incomplete.</p>	<p>Omission, Error, Incomplete</p>
<p>I-311-572</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 47</p>	<p>555</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The Washington Park Arboretum lost approximately 60 acres of lagoon area to the SR 520 project." You could improve this statement by saying what the environmental impact of this was back then. It sounds like the existing 520 bridge caused severe environmental impact that never has been assessed. This project should be the catalyst to try to mitigate and restore the mistakes and damage caused back then. At the very minimum, you could provide a statement about how the residents felt about having a freeway cut through their parkland, across Portage Bay, and the visual and noise impact (not to mention the pollution) of this freeway.</p>	<p>Omission, Error, Incomplete</p>
<p>I-311-573</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 47</p>	<p>556</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Growth Centers are...." This inset emphasizes the importance of pedestrian, bicycle, and mass-transit options. Other than the bike-lane on 520, what have you done to reflect these values? None. This needs to be explicitly mentioned in the SDEIS: The 520 project does not reflect the goals of growth centers. It focuses on car transportation, freeways, and things that reduce the appeal of residential and job growth.</p>	<p>Omission, Error, Incomplete</p>

<p>I-311-574</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 49</p>	<p>557</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Continued growth in the region is seen as an opportunity to restore watersheds, develop more environmentally sensitive approaches to treating stormwater, enhance habitat, and pioneer new technologies and industries that benefit both the environment and the regional economy (PSRC 2008)." This statement seems directly in opposition to the main features of the 520 project: More lanes, bigger footprint, more parkland destroyed, more noise and visual blight. This needs to be stated outright in the SDEIS: "Our plan for increased overland freeway does not serve to meet these opportunities. We have opted for default roadway placement increases, and hoped that someone else restores watersheds, and pioneers new technologies and industries. . ."</p>	<p>Incomplete, Error, Specific design options not considered.</p>
<p>I-311-575</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 51</p>	<p>558</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>Exhibit 17a does not show the restoration of the South Portage Bay park. This is generically shown as part of Montlake Playfield, but this is not accurate. It needs to be called out as specifically a new park, because this was not accessible or usable before.</p>	<p>Error, Incorrect info, Omission</p>
<p>I-311-576</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 61</p>	<p>559</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Finally, the analysts suggest ways by which cumulative effects could be mitigated. WSDOT does not mitigate cumulative effects because it does not have jurisdiction over the many non-WSDOT projects that contribute to them. Even so, WSDOT is required to disclose cumulative effects and to suggest practical mitigation options that the responsible parties could take (WSDOT et al. 2008)." I believe this to mean that WSDOT does have the ability to mitigate cumulative effects for things within its jurisdiction, and the analysts are obliged to suggest things to WSDOT that mitigates the cumulative effects. By this I mean that WSDOT is a responsible party, and if they suggest designs that create a negative cumulative effect, they need to re-design the project so it creates a net positive cumulative effect for the areas it has jurisdiction over. As it is worded, it makes it appear that WSDOT can suggest a large freeway through sensitive areas, and then say that it has no jurisdiction over cumulative effects. This section needs be re-written to more squarely place the onus on WSDOT to provide designs that minimize cumulative effects.</p>	<p>Incorrect info, Omission</p>
<p>I-311-577</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 62</p>	<p>560</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The transportation analysis conducted for the I-5 to Medina project focuses on the potential effects that the project might have on traffic volumes and the flow of vehicular traffic for both freeway and local street traffic" This is incorrect, and needs to state that it does not take into account local street traffic for streets that serve as a proxy for 520/I-5 when 520 is clogged: Namely Fuhrman/Boyer and Delmar/Lynn.</p>	<p>Incorrect info, Omission</p>
<p>I-311-578</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 62</p>	<p>561</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"A major change in the corridor will be tolling on SR 520 and new westbound and eastbound HOV lanes. These changes will alter driver behavior, causing some drivers to change their travel mode (to bus or carpool), time of day for travel, or route (some drivers will avoid SR 520 and either drive around Lake Washington on SR 522 or use I-90)." You need to add, "Or attempt to take nearby surface streets to save money on tolls." (For example: Why would someone take 520 to Montlake when they could take surface streets and pay nothing -- increasing congestion on surface streets).</p>	<p>Omission</p>

<p>I-311-579</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 62</p>	<p>562</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"cut transit travel time by up to 3 minutes for westbound travel and 40 minutes for eastbound travel, depending on the time of day" This repeats a gross error in the transportation discipline report, and should be immediately suspect. OK -- so Westbound you cut travel time by 3 minutes, and eastbound -- it's up to 40 minutes! That doesn't pass the sniff test. In the Transportation Discipline report, you assert that traffic will be backed up going eastbound to North and South 405, at times all the way to I-5. This is patently absurd, as currently, with no-build, traffic is never backed up even on that off ramp to 405. Where you get this in your model needs to be re-examined, because that on-ramp -- of all the on-ramps related to 520 -- NEVER backs up. If it did, you would be hearing big worries from the residents of Medina, Clyde Hill and Bellevue. Please do not use this error about eastbound to 405 to justify the 520 expansion project.</p>	<p>Error</p>
<p>I-311-580</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 62</p>	<p>563</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"These changes will improve traffic circulation and decrease congestion" This statement is logically inconsistent to other parts of the report and needs to be corrected. You specifically call out Option K as the option that increases congestion, because it allows so much more traffic to go through Montlake -- you cite this as having a negative impact on traffic circulation. Yet here you say that as traffic circulation increases, congestion decreases. Please correct this to take a stand: Does the change decrease congestion? If so, you need to point this out for Option K in the Transportation Discipline report.</p>	<p>Error, Incorrect info, Omission</p>
<p>I-311-581</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 63</p>	<p>564</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The project will cause some loss of parking spaces around the Montlake area at the University of Washington." This is based on a faulty analysis in the Transportation Discipline report. In it, you state that Option K will remove parking spaces on E. Roanoke Street near the hop in. This misses the fact that Roanoke Place will not be an arterial any more, and, as it is a 4 lane road -- with parking -- could easily handle MORE parking in the future. So you need to state more precisely: With the Exception of Option K, which actually improves on-street parking in the Montlake area -- UNLIKE the other options L and A.</p>	<p>Error, Incorrect info, Omission</p>
<p>I-311-582</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 63</p>	<p>565</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Loss of parking near the University of Washington (particularly Parking Lot E-12 under Option K)." Here you specifically call out the losses provided by Option K, but you earlier did not identify the GAINS provided by Option K. This indicates anti-Option K bias and not fully considering the option's merits.</p>	<p>Error, Incorrect info, Omission</p>
<p>I-311-583</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 64</p>	<p>566</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"No additional, quantifiable, indirect effects were identified for the transportation analysis." I'm going to object to this statement: Because you have not studied the amount of traffic (cut-through or otherwise) on Delmar/Lynn and Fuhrman/Boyer, this analysis is incomplete. If 520 backs up, then people take these streets, as they are the surface option. Since there is no discussion about these corridors here or in the Transportation Discipline report, this conclusion is faulty and needs to be reassessed. The local residents would be glad to meet with you to tell you how much "cut-through" traffic there is in Montlake and Delmar during peak times, so there must be indirect or cumulative effects of this project.</p>	<p>Error, Incorrect info, Omission</p>

<p>I-311-584</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 62</p>	<p>567</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"What direct and indirect effects will the project likely have on transportation?" I have to say that this section seems woefully incomplete. Really -- no indirect effects? When you add up the noise, visual issues, increase in population, extra-wide lanes, Sound Transit etc. This would surely have an impact (either good or bad) on property values, and the amount of revenues the City of Seattle and King County would take in from this extremely valuable piece of land. For example, the Foster Island park, under Option A, would be much worse than it is today -- doesn't this have some sort of indirect impact in how people view the City of Seattle, and whether it is a "green" place --when it builds a new freeway through a nice park like that, repeating mistakes of the past? So I'll help you identify some indirect effects: National and Global Reputation; Property Values; Attitude toward civic engagement; Attitude toward green space; ability to manage traffic in a 21st century manner; unwillingness to invest in 21st century mass transit (lowering investment in the area, as it will be perceived as provincial). There are many intangible things that this project expresses, and this is the precise place to identify them. Do you need to reach out to the community for us to tell you this?</p>	<p>Omission, Error</p>
<p>I-311-585</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 65</p>	<p>568</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The configuration of SR 520 adds to the problem because of the limited capacity of its four lanes, the incomplete HOV system, the need for traffic entering SR 520 on the westbound approaches to the Evergreen Floating Bridge to weave through the HOV traffic, and SR 520's narrow shoulders" Shouldn't you add "the lack of tolling of this highly valuable corridor" and "the lack of mass transit". These are things that "add to the problem" but are being ignored in this analysis.</p>	<p>Omission, Incomplete</p>
<p>I-311-586</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 65</p>	<p>569</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Congestion on SR 520 also backs up traffic onto local streets such as Montlake Boulevard and Lake Washington Boulevard, creating travel delays and circulation problems on local streets and through the Arboretum and University of Washington campus." Since you specifically called out Option K's "reduction in Parking in E12" earlier in this document, here is a chance for you to specifically call out Option A as a failure: "These travel delays will be enhanced by adding a second draw bridge across Montlake with Options A and L, but not K." C'mon -- say it!</p>	<p>Omission, Incomplete</p>
<p>I-311-587</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 65</p>	<p>570</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Congestion on SR 520 also backs up traffic onto local streets such as Montlake Boulevard and Lake Washington Boulevard, creating travel delays and circulation problems on local streets and through the Arboretum and University of Washington campus." This also misses the opportunity to state that when traffic backs up, many people choose to use surface streets, such as Delmar/Lynn and Furhman Boyer to cut through. This is an area that has not been studied, and the potential for a huge impact on the local area (we don't know whether positive or negative -- it needs to be studied.)</p>	<p>Omission, Incomplete</p>
<p>I-311-588</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 66</p>	<p>571</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Travelers will continue to face congestion in some areas, particularly during the morning and evening commutes." And you need to say, "And with Options A and L, at all other times of the day, when the first and second bascule bridge need to frequently open."</p>	<p>Omission, Incomplete</p>

<p>I-311-589</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 66</p>	<p>572</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"investments in the region's transportation system will be targeted to preserve the existing system, improve system efficiency, increase choices to users, and provide strategic capacity improvements to meet future travel needs." OK, let's see how I-5 to Medina stands on this: Preserve the existing system (actually -- no, because it makes it bigger and more obnoxious); Improve system efficiency (Only Option K does this, since Options L and A have the same inefficiencies of the current system, also, the lack of the Montlake freeway station for all options in general would seem to make the system less efficient); increase choices to users (Nope. Only thing added is a bike lane, no mass transit, fewer busses); and strategic capacity improvements (I think you could claim that the HOV lanes are going to do this, but it doesn't seem strategic enough -- is this really what we need -- more HOVs?). My analysis shows that this project doesn't meet the regional transportation needs. Not sure why you're pushing for it so bad. If it's safety that's the problem, then fix the safety issues.</p>	<p>Omission; Incomplete</p>
<p>I-311-590</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 66</p>	<p>573</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"causing worsening congestion on SR 520 and the connecting local street system" You do not do an analysis of Fuhrman/Boyer or Delmar/Lynn, or with tolling, so this statement is by definition incomplete. Perhaps it will make things better with tolling? Perhaps people will be so frustrated with the bridge they'll decide to locate closer? Perhaps you make it one general lane and one HOV lane, so that transit could get through? This does not seem to be analyzed, so this section is incomplete.</p>	<p>Incomplete</p>
<p>I-311-591</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 66</p>	<p>574</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Travel times for eastbound traffic would increase by 60 minutes." I cannot emphasize enough that this assessment needs to be looked at again. If it actually takes an ADDITIONAL 60 minutes to go eastbound, a) people would not pay the toll, as there is no point in doing this b) they would take alternate routes -- most likely i-90 or even south or north -- remember, they have 90 minutes here -- or just not go at all (telecommute), and re-locate or go at off-peak times. This is a completely unreasonable assumption in your traffic models, and needs to be reassessed for this SDEIS to have any validity at all.</p>	<p>Error, Incorrect info, Omission</p>
<p>I-311-592</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 66</p>	<p>575</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Without the project, two of the 39 study intersections would experience worse level of service operation (that is, increased delay at intersections) during the morning commute, and operation of nine study intersections would worsen during the evening commute (see Chapter 2, Transportation Discipline Report [WSDOT 2009h])." First you didn't study two important intersections: Eastlake and Fuhrman and Boyer and Lynn. Second, your analysis of Option K's Pacific street intersection made the contracting argument that it increases traffic flow and increases congestion.</p>	<p>Omission</p>
<p>I-311-593</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 66</p>	<p>576</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Truck traffic traveling through the SR 520 construction zone from construction vehicles and delivery of materials" In the transportation discipline report, you are very vague as to where these trucks will be -- will they be on the detour routes?</p>	<p>Omission</p>
<p>I-311-594</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 66</p>	<p>577</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Additional lane closures and road detours, particularly on the local street system, which would cause slowdowns and some drivers to alter their routes (this may result in more cut-through traffic in neighborhoods)" Here cut-through traffic is specifically cited as an environmental impact, yet there is no mention about cut-through traffic not related to construction impacts, when this is an ongoing issue in the Roanoke Park/Portage Bay neighborhood. So which is it -- cut through traffic has an impact or not?</p>	<p>Omission</p>

I-311-595 Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 67	578	Walter Oelwein	"Additional lane closures and road detours, particularly on the local street system, which would cause slowdowns and some drivers to alter their routes (this may result in more cut-through traffic in neighborhoods)" It should be noted that in the Transportation Discipline report, you are extremely vague as to which roads will be shut down. You do provide a map of "potential" closures, but not any discussion about how you would actually detour traffic on 11th (both north and south of Roanoke), which are highly narrow, highly residential roads. There's parking on both streets. So this is a request to improve this discussion, because it will have an impact on the indirect and cumulative effects (home values, training people to use these streets as arterials, etc.).	Omission, Error
I-311-596 Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 67	579	Walter Oelwein	"With or without the project, there will be additional demand for transit options, including buses and light rail. It is anticipated that the overall transit demand would increase 51 percent under the No Build Alternative and 14 percent under the 6-lane Alternative by 2030 (see Chapter 2, Transportation Discipline Report [WSDOT 2009h])" OK, in looking at this, it makes an argument to keep the 4-lane structure and build light rail. It appears as though the design of the project is such that it encourages driving, rather than taking transit. You are making an argument to re-think the 6-lane HOV configuration, and identify how to make this a mass-transit corridor, instead of a car-corridor. You could do that, you know!	Error
I-311-597 Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 68	580	Walter Oelwein	"Similarly, tolling and the focus on increased transit opportunities would reduce demand for use of the SR 520 corridor by single-occupancy vehicles. There would be increased opportunities for non-motorized travel, which would also reduce some vehicle traffic." Again, this seems to argue that the freeway should be as narrow and unobtrusive as possible, since with tolling you can increase mass transit demand and decrease SOV demand. Why is the freeway twice as large again? Your analysis does not match the design. You need to take this analysis, and create a design that reflects the increase in transit demand, ability to decrease SOV demand via tolling. Instead, you created a design, and then did the traffic analysis. This is backwards, and needs to be revised for this project to be viable and worth investing in.	Error, Specific options not considered
I-311-598 Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 68	581	Walter Oelwein	"Cumulative construction-related effects can be mitigated by developing a comprehensive plan to control traffic during construction and a public outreach/communication plan to inform people of such things as lane closures, detours, and delays." OK, you've already failed on this. Here you have the SDEIS that is supposed to document the impact of construction, and you have no discussion about how you are going to manage 11th Ave. E (north and south of Roanoke) as detour points. So you have not communicated at all on this level. These streets do not appear capable of handling the extra traffic, especially since 11th is essentially one-lane and very steep, not suitable for arterial-style traffic.	Error, Specific options not considered
I-311-599 Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 68	582	Walter Oelwein	"Measures to minimize disruption of access to businesses and properties. Details on required street and lane closures including timing. Measures to minimize impact on transit operations. Traffic enforcement measures, including use of police officers. Measures to minimize the impact of traffic and parking from construction workers." This section totally punts -- the question of the section is "how could it be mitigated", and then you say, "we'll take measures to mitigate." You have not supplied anything other than a logical loop. This section needs to be re-written so that it at least makes logical sense. Only the second bullet point qualifies as an actual defined mitigation measure, the other four are essentially rephrasing, "mitigation." This is a big deal, because throughout the SDEIS, you discuss how quieter pavement doesn't count as mitigation, yet you are obliged to find mitigation. So you just say, "We'll mitigate if we can." So consistently in this document you talk about mitigation, but provide sketchy, if not zero, information about what you are actively doing to make it a worthwhile project for those most affected by it.	Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered

<p>I-311-600</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 69</p>	<p>583</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Overall, the amount of land use converted from civic/quasi-public, park, and commercial and single-family residential use represents a small percentage of these types of land uses within the City of Seattle." This is a disingenuous summary. First, measuring it against the overall percentage of Seattle's usage of this kind of space is a horrible metric, and should be stricken from this document. What freeway project would actually have a "large" percentage converted to freeway? This is absurd. Instead, you need to articulate it in terms of no-build, collapsed freeway, or 6-lane. How much usage does the collapsed freeway gain? How much does 6-lane vs. No build take up? It looks like the 6-lane alternative is twice as big as the original. How is this not discussed explicitly? Next, since this is the indirect and cumulative impact report,</p>	<p>Error, Incorrect info, Omission</p>
<p>I-311-601</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 69</p>	<p>584</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"No substantial change to the overall urbanized land use pattern in Seattle would occur, and no indirect effects on land use patterns would occur." This is, by definition, incorrect. First, it is acknowledged that you are taking away up to 15.7 acres of land for freeway usage. Therefore it would have an indirect impact in making these non-freeway uses less desirable. Visits to Foster Island would be less frequent. Marsh Island now is more in the shadow of a freeway. WAC users would be more intimidated to paddle under the freeway. The Arboretum is seen less and less as a sanctuary, but a corridor in which to build large freeways. It is articulated that building freeways next to historical districts is OK, diminishing the value of the city's history. Home values increase at a lesser rate-- what would be the indirect effects of that? This is what I expected to see in this is the section the indirect effects of the project, and to say that there would be "no indirect effects" on land use reveals that this analysis is woefully incomplete.</p>	<p>Incomplete, Error, Specific design options not considered.</p>
<p>I-311-602</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 70</p>	<p>585</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"To conduct the cumulative effects assessment on land use, the analyst relied primarily on two regional planning documents." So it was one analyst looking at two documents? Would interviews with the local residents and those who actually use the land nearby be able to provide any input on the "indirect and cumulative impacts?" Here's what they would say, "I would not boat on Portage Bay, with the extra-wide freeway." "I would not go to the Arboretum as much, with the extra-wide freeway." You need to have done a better job of identifying the impacts, rather than look at a few documents and say "no indirect or cumulative impacts on land use" (of a greatly expanded, noisy freeway). This analysis is incomplete.</p>	<p>Incomplete, Error, Specific design options not considered.</p>
<p>I-311-603</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 71</p>	<p>586</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Much of this growth has occurred on the Eastside where, since the 1970s, Bellevue and Redmond have become urban centers." This is inconsistent with another section of this document which specifically lists these same communities as "suburbs". This inconsistency makes the SDEIS incorrect in its analysis.</p>	<p>Error, Contradiction</p>
<p>I-311-604</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 71</p>	<p>587</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"According to the Transportation 2040 Draft EIS, the total number of housing units in the central Puget Sound region increased from approximately 683,000 in 1970 to about 1,484,000 units in 2006." This discussion also needs to include a discussion of the more immediate study area -- the communities near the 520 bridge expansion. Not providing a look at the changes and demographics of the immediate area makes this SDEIS incomplete.</p>	<p>Error, Incorrect info, Omission</p>

<p>I-311-605</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 72</p>	<p>588</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"As described above, this finding was supported by the land use analysis in the Transportation 2040 Draft EIS, which incorporated reasonably foreseeable changes in central Puget Sound's future land use, population, employment, and travel patterns, including the SR 520 project." I find this discussion lacking in that it doesn't seem to acknowledge that removing up to 15.7 acres is a dramatic take-away from the parks and other land for an urbanized area. You are actually making an argument for taking the 520 bridge underground/underwater. With the region growing, with the 520 corridor so important for transportation, why didn't you then say, "we need this land for growth!" Instead, you're saying, "We'll expand 520, and it doesn't take away land!" This is the wrong thinking, and works at cross purposes to the urban planning necessary to sustain growth in the already built environment. You need to re-think this project such that it actually PROVIDES LAND for growth and recreation in a highly valuable area. This is what the analysis shows, so the project should reflect this.</p>	<p>Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered</p>
<p>I-311-606</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 73</p>	<p>589</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Although these conversions would reduce the area of land available to a small extent, they would cumulatively convert only a small portion of the total land in the central Puget Sound region over the next 30 years. The SR 520 project's contribution of between 11.1 and 15.7 converted acres would not be substantial in a regional context." This analysis is incomplete and needs to then discuss, and in a specific project area context. . . it takes away 15.7 acres of parkland in one of the most coveted urban parks in the world. Why is it not articulated this way, when this is how the local residents feel about the project. To provide only the "regional" percentage is disingenuous, because it is impossible that a freeway would be able to take anything other than a "small portion." Again, your arguments seem to say, "there will be steady urban growth" and "we are taking away urban growth area". This is an argument to re-think the freeway from above ground to below ground -- so you can meet your transportation needs and preserve the urban area for long term growth.</p>	<p>Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered</p>
<p>I-311-607</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 73</p>	<p>590</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Regional and local planning organizations are the focal points for gathering public input and suggesting priorities for the future land uses." Wait. The priority is on minimizing the transportation corridor footprint (as the local planning agencies consistently state), but this project actually maximizes the transportation corridor footprint. So this project is in contradiction to the regional plan. This needs to be reconciled through a different design that actually gives back land for regional growth.</p>	<p>Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered</p>
<p>I-311-608</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 73</p>	<p>591</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Because the proposed project would replace part of an existing transportation corridor through an urban area that has already been developed, it would not change land use or development patterns." This analysis is incomplete. The larger freeway will indeed change land-use and development patterns -- it is a large freeway that runs through several neighborhoods! You need to provide a discussion of this impact in the Impact Statement. You can't just say, "Well, it won't change anything." You've doubled the size of a freeway during a time when carbon footprints, green building, energy efficiency, density, etc. are all on the upswing, and with a large freeway, do you think that we are articulating a vision that is in synch with this trend? Would the development be altered in the area -- where a premium on density and urban living cannot have the best air quality and noise quality? This project has a HUGE impact on the future development of the west-side neighborhoods through what it reflects: Big roads, SOVs, no mass transit, and little regard to minimizing the footprint. Think of the alternative: If you put the bridge underground, what impact would THAT have on development in the area? Would home values increase? Would people want to develop the areas near the UW campus as higher density?</p>	<p>Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered</p>

I-311-609	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 73	592	Walter Oelwein	<p>"The analyst concluded that construction-related effects of the 6-Lane Alternative on economic activity would be positive but temporary, and that long-term operation of the proposed project would not directly or indirectly affect the economy. For these reasons, the analyst concluded that the proposed project would not contribute to lasting trends from other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable actions that would have a cumulative effect on economic activity." This analyst's analysis is clearly cursory and incomplete. Readers of the SDEIS want to know what the impact of the bridge project will be. There is a basic concern that having a large freeway that doesn't reflect the core values of increased density, green construction, high-quality of life (no freeway noise), etc. would have a negative long term impact on the local community and potential growth of the region. This discussion is not had -- When you go to Texas, and see all of the soaring freeways, the wide laned traffic corridors, it tells you that this place has lots of room to build, land is not valuable, cars are king, we don't care about emissions, etc. When you go to London, and there is a robust Underground, cars have to pay to get inside the city, etc., this tells you that traffic is not tolerated, alternate transportation is preferred, and they're going in the direction of improving the livability of the city. This project goes in the "Texas" direction, and will certainly have an impact on the long-term image of the city, its growth and investment prospects, and if you don't actually have the land to expand -- like they do in Texas -- it also means that we're pretty stupid. I expected to see this level of thinking in the SDEIS, but it is not here, making this an incomplete document, and we're still wondering what the impact will be of creating a wider freeway is.</p>	Incomplete, Omission, Specific Alternatives not explored
I-311-610	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 74	593	Walter Oelwein	<p>"After construction, the operational project would result in several long-term benefits to community cohesion." There is agreement that the lids will improve cohesion, and this is supported. However, this discussion again lacks the larger issue of identifying the best usage of land and water. The project articulates that an additional 15.7 acres for transportation is needed, and this is the BEST usage of this land and water, when the option of having this same transportation corridor underground/underwater would not only preserve the 15.7 acres, not have a 115' wide freeway in a highly priced natural environment, and would actually RESTORE massive amounts of acreage for parks and developments. I expected to see this level of discussion, and without it, this SDEIS is incomplete and faulty. The local residents are gravely concerned that an extra-wide freeway -- as though land through this urban corridor was not valuable -- reflects the wrong values. The local residents expected the designs to reflect these values, and instead reflected thinking of the mid 20th century. So there will be improved cohesion, but the noise and visual blight of a massive freeway still enhances the mistakes of the past. This project analysis needs to reflect this for it to be complete.</p>	Incomplete, Omission, Specific Alternatives not explored
I-311-611	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 75	594	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Because the proposed project would have no long-term adverse direct or indirect effect on social elements, including public services and utilities, the analyst did not conduct a cumulative effects assessment (WSDOT et al. 2008)." Again, I would have expected the analyst to actually engage with the social elements -- presumably the people living near the corridor, to gain an understanding and assessment of the "social elements." The analyst would have quickly understood that there are indeed cumulative effects: A large freeway creates noise and visual blight that hurts the overall neighborhood feel, and in a highly prized location in city center, the impacts are magnified. This section clearly admits that there is no "social" in addressing the social impacts. This section also reveals that the analysts are relying on insufficient information to make their assessments, and in this case, no assessment at all. The local residents wholeheartedly disagree with this assessment that there are no cumulative social impacts to this project.</p>	Incomplete, Omission, Specific Alternatives not explored

<p>I-311-612</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 75</p>	<p>595</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Without the project, neighborhoods along the corridor would retain their current characteristics and would not benefit from lids across SR 520 or a regional trail connecting areas east and west of Lake Washington." What do you mean, "Would not benefit"? The neighbors would argue that this corridor risks gradual erosion of quality of life, as a large and massive freeway with noise and visual blight still runs through it and all parkland nearby. To say that this is "retained" is poor and unsubstantiated analysis. If there were no 520, or if the 520 corridor was placed underground, I could imagine this area being a major growth area for the city, and not the status quo that the analysts conclude. This is horrible, incorrect, and mis-informed analysis and needs to be re-done with greater understanding of the social impact of having a large, noisy freeway that runs through parkland and residential neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Incomplete, Omission, Specific Alternatives not explored</p>
<p>I-311-613</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 76</p>	<p>596</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The proposed project would benefit community cohesion as previously noted, but would also provide a social benefit through greater access to transit and improved transit service." In this section on social elements, you discount the impact of noise and visual blight on residences and parkland. It isn't articulated at all. When outside, and you can hear the freeway from a mile away, this has a social impact in that you are literally less social when outside. Seriously. You are less likely to be out on your deck, invite people over, and enjoy the outside. The same goes for going to the Arboretum. With a large freeway nearby, you are less likely to be social there. With a doubled-in-size freeway, this likelihood goes down further. This analysis is woefully incomplete.</p>	<p>Incomplete, Omission, Specific Alternatives not explored</p>
<p>I-311-614</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 76</p>	<p>597</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"The environmental justice analysis concluded that long-term operation of the SR 520 project would result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on low-income populations, and that all such effects would be related to tolling." You are making an argument to provide improved public, high-speed transportation, yet this wasn't designed in from the start. You should do the analysis first, and then the project design second. This is the conundrum you've gotten yourself into -- 8 lanes? 6 lanes? OK, 6 lanes. . . ok, now lets do the environmental analysis . . hmmm. . this affects low income populations disproportionately. If you had designed in high occupancy transit from the start, you would be able to say, "We are making it easy and affordable for low income populations to swiftly get to growing employment centers." This section indicates the faulty nature of the project, and needs to be revised to reflect the needs of the population, not interest groups who assume that more lanes is better.</p>	<p>Incomplete, Omission, Specific Alternatives not explored</p>
<p>I-311-615</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 73</p>	<p>598</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"WSDOT will continue to coordinate closely with the Muckleshoot Tribe to understand the extent to which the wider bridges would affect access to their usual and accustomed fishing areas." This statement indicates that the analysis is incomplete. I expect to see the results of the understanding of the extent the wider bridge would have in this document, not a commitment to find out the results. When you have the results of the extent the wider bridges affect fishing areas, then put it in the impact statement. This section reveals this document to be incomplete and unsupported. Additionally, this methodology of working with the Muckleshoot Tribe indicates that it is a best practice to interview affected populations. Earlier in this document you indicate that your analysts have not examined the cumulative social impacts because the analyst didn't figure there were any. Well, here you have an admittedly wider bridge span, and you anticipate (but have not pursued) the impacts to fishing. Similarly, you need to anticipate the wider-span's impact on the social impact of the local residents.</p>	<p>Incomplete, Omission, Specific Alternatives not explored</p>

<p>I-311-616</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 80</p>	<p>599</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Current socio/economic conditions highlight the importance of affordable mobility throughout the region." I would like an analysis that indicates what affordable mobility looks like. It would assume it is not via the expectation of purchasing a car, car insurance, gas and then tolls. I would assume that it is providing reliable public transportation. This project appears to have not taken this into account in the initial design. Therefore the project is not having the appropriate impact.</p>	<p>Specific alternatives not explored</p>
<p>I-311-617</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 80</p>	<p>600</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Recent and current trends and stressors (such as continued regional population growth, urbanization and global climate change) indicate that the condition of fish and aquatic habitat would most likely continue to degrade into the reasonably foreseeable future." If you had done this analysis first, rather than at the end of the design, then you would have taken a different approach to the design. You would have said, "Let's figure out a way to make this bridge create more habitat, rather than take it away." This would have led you to propose only underground/underwater solutions.</p>	<p>Specific alternatives not explored</p>
<p>I-311-618</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 83</p>	<p>601</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Cumulative effects on low-income populations from tolling could be minimized by regional planning efforts to improve transit service and implement light-rail across the region." Again, this should be a design objective, rather than a mitigation plan. If you are going to "mitigate" the cumulative impact on low-income populations via increased light-rail, then you should design-in light rail as part of this project. This way it is actual improvement, actual investment, and meets the socio-cultural needs. Instead, you make a vague assertion that light rail will be improved across the region, but in this huge project, with an "important" transportation corridor, it is not designed as part of it. This means that you need to identify this SDEIS as faulty, as the impact is negative and not getting the benefit from the investment in time, space, noise, money, etc.</p>	<p>Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered</p>
<p>I-311-619</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 83</p>	<p>602</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Ultimately, providing affordable housing in urban centers so that people could live closer to work would mitigate the adverse effects of expenses, potentially including tolling, that are associated with the daily commute." Ok, why do you have to wait for the "ultimate" moment? You should have designed this project as a way to address these problems, rather than just wait around until it is ultimately possible. Let's say you put 520 underground. You have now just increased huge amounts of acreage in a close-in neighborhood. You could put low-income housing there near public transportation. Instead, you are taking away up to 15.7 acres, creating all sorts of negative effects on precisely the areas that need to be examined on how to make things better. Your lack of design-thinking has prevented a massive opportunity, and needs to be addressed in this SDEIS.</p>	<p>Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered</p>
<p>I-311-620</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 84</p>	<p>603</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Between 5.0 and 7.6 acres of parkland would be permanently converted from recreation use to WSDOT right-of-way, depending on the 6-Lane Alternative option." OK, again, you didn't talk about this in the social effects. Removing 7.6 acres of parkland has social effects, and needs to be directly acknowledged in the SDEIS. You would also benefit from doing an analysis that says, "OK, if we put the 520 bridge underground, how much parkland would we GAIN?" This needs to be articulated in the SDEIS to know what we are potentially missing out on with this project, that forever instills a large freeway where it could be put in a place that allows for large footprint, but without the noise and reclamation of parkland.</p>	<p>Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered</p>
<p>I-311-621</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 84</p>	<p>604</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Option L would introduce a visual intrusion from a new bascule bridge across the Montlake Cut (a bascule bridge is a moveable bridge with a counter weight that continuously balances the span as each side is raised, somewhat similar to a drawbridge)." This is a major omission. You need to indicate that the second bascule bridge of Option A would introduce a visual intrusion. I would argue that it is worse than Option L, because it just makes the Montlake Blvd stretch seem more like a major freeway.</p>	<p>Omission</p>

<p>I-311-622</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 84</p>	<p>605</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Options K and L would result in the greatest effects by moving the existing interchange east into McCurdy and East Montlake parks, which are primarily used for passive recreation activities such as walking, kayaking, canoeing, and bird watching." This discusses the impact on McCurdy and East Montlake park, but you don't mention the effort to keep Option K narrow throughout the corridor, nor do you mention how Foster Island is torn further apart by the wide footprint and no landbridge of Optoin A. This needs to be addressed if you are going to single out Option K and L. Option K and L were specifically designed by local residents to best preserve the parkland, and the fact that your analysis does not indicate this shows an anti-Option K/L bias that needs to be reconciled throughout this SDEIS.</p>	<p>Omission, Error</p>
<p>I-311-623</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 84</p>	<p>606</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Many visitors and residents rent canoes here to explore the shoreline areas in the Arboretum north and south of the roadway." You go into a comparative analysis between Options A, L, and K, but do not mention in the impact of recreation on a bridge width that is twice the size. The existing freeway and its on-ramps makes it a less desirable recreational location (when it could be the absolute best), and this needs to be stated that we are starting from bad and moving to worse. Canoeing under a 115' span will not be very desirable, and may have a long-term impact on this recreational activity that brings to the character of the area. I'm surprised that this is not mentioned in the SDEIS, and indicates the cursory analysis that has been performed in this document.</p>	<p>Omission, Incomplete</p>
<p>I-311-624</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 84</p>	<p>607</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Options A and L have a higher profile than Option K, meaning that, comparatively, the structure height above the water is greater and there are fewer columns that would be needed to support the roadway through the Arboretum. These higher profiles would help to minimize negative indirect effects on canoeing in the Arboretum." This needs to be re-written to indicate that Option K does not have a second bascule bridge, making thie kayaking better. This argument about higher profile is spurious -- I don't really think that it would be much different experience how high the bridge is -- it's a massive concrete freeway that cuts across a recreational area and causes damage to it as such. This is what it should say and the relative difference of the how high the bridge is is minimal -- it's all bad.</p>	<p>Omission, Incomplete</p>
<p>I-311-625</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 84</p>	<p>608</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"For many visitors, this could create a permanent perceived barrier and reduce the appeal to explore areas south of the roadway in the Arboretum." This discussion about Option K shows an anti-Option K bias and needs to be removed or re-written. Option K is the endorsed option by the residents -- they endorse it because it causes the least amount of damage to the recreational area, and this should be reflected in the analysis. Also--in many areas of this document, you indicate the actual design of the bridge structure is "To be determined", so for you to confidently say how far apart the columns are in this area seems to indicate that you do have an actual design in mind. Either amend this section or all of the other sections where you mention that you plan to actually design the bridge. Finally, you need to indicate that -- as part of the cumulative effects on recreation -- 520 bridge hurts recreation in the area. This is an obvious point that needs to be stated. The existing structure is foreboding, loud, cuts off recreation, etc. I expected to see this in the analysis, because it does have an impact. I would have then expected to see an analysis of what it would be like to canoe under a 115' foot bridge. The fact this isn't indicated in this SDEIS shows it it incomplete.</p>	<p>Omission, Incomplete</p>

<p>I-311-626</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 85</p>	<p>609</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Option K includes a lid across Foster Island, which would require substantial fill on either side of the lid to connect the lid to ground level. This would change the setting of Foster Island to more of a manicured urban park, which could affect the "integrity" of Foster Island for park users that prefer a more natural experience." OK, this is the first time in the document that I've noticed the landbridge across Foster Island referred to as a "lid". If this is the case, then you need to fix all other areas of the document that indicate it as a "land bridge." To me, "lid" sound like an earnest effort to reclaim parkland, eliminate the poor effects of a massive freeway cutting through it, and actually bring back the character of the island, rather than say that the "integrity" is hurt by the "manicured landscape." You need to indicate that the "integrity" is affected by a massive freeway soaring over Foster Island with Options A and L. YOU need to indicate the the "integrity" is affected by the noise, shadows, pollution, etc. You need to indicate the additional acreage provided by the lid with Option K, and add that into your calculations throughout this document. Finally, it is not clear why the lid necessarily requires a "manicured" landscape. Landscape architects can easily design a way for it to grow-in seamlessly with the current landscaping. This wouldn't take much time, and for it to be called out as a negative on Option K is absurd. Can you please indicate what the landscaping for Options A and L are? I believe that it would be are a large, dark, tunnel that has no landscaping, light, greenery, and would be much more "formal" in that it is brutalist and 115' wide and worse than the existing terrible pedestrian tunnel on Foster Island. This section needs to be re-written to better reflect the costs and benefits of adding a wider freeway, and then indicating the relative merits equally rather than calling out Option K's "formal landscape" as a negative while ignoring the brutal experience of Options L and A.</p>	<p>Omission, Incomplete, Error, Specific Design alternatives not discussed</p>
<p>I-311-627</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 85</p>	<p>610</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Many of the direct and indirect effects to park and recreational resources would be positive by encouraging greater use of recreational resources, improving connectivity and linkages between parks, and improving noise levels and visual quality in certain locations." This is a dubious statement that needs to be revised in order for the document not to be lying to the general public. How does a wider footprint become "positive" right after discussing the impact on Foster Island? This statement is not supported, and appears to be inserted as basic text. I actually want to know where these "certain locations" are that are going to be better, because all I can see in the plans are a wider footprint over the existing parks. If you are specifically talking about the lids over Montlake and Delmar, then this needs to be stated. Overall, this section is hard to follow and doesn't help understanding of the impact of the project.</p>	<p>Omission, Incomplete, Error,</p>
<p>I-311-628</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 85</p>	<p>611</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Park areas are protected under both federal and local regulations; mitigation in the form of replacement property, enhancement of existing park and recreational facilities, and/or replacement of lost functionality would be implemented." This statement reflects the "put the road down, then mitigate" attitude of this project, rather than the "let's try to maximize the design of this project." If you had gone into the project with a design challenge to actually restore the parkland to its prior state -- prior to the first 520 bridge or before -- you would have more earnestly identified construction designs underground that would meet the design goals. Instead, you have a middling project where the best you can say is that you are going to mitigate the damage that it will cause long term. Not impressive at this level of investment.</p>	<p>Omission, Incomplete, Error,</p>
<p>I-311-629</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 86</p>	<p>612</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"In 1936, John Olmsted made his last visit to the city to plan the Washington Park Arboretum." I would recommend a note that specifically states that Mr. Olmsted never designed a freeway to cut through the Washington Park Arboretum. The fact that this history is missing shows that this SDEIS is not earnestly trying to illuminate the impact of the 520 project.</p>	<p>Omission, Incomplete, Error,</p>

<p>I-311-630</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 86</p>	<p>613</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Park and recreational resources are valued highly by Seattle residents." You need to also note, "Seattle residents, as a general rule, do not like large freeways cutting through parks and recreational resources." This is a bottom line fact that needs to be included with such a statement that indicates parks and recreation are important.</p>	<p>Omission, Incomplete, Error,</p>
<p>I-311-631</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 87</p>	<p>614</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"For example, traffic increased substantially on Lake Washington Boulevard, part of the 20-mile greenway originally envisioned by the Olmsted Brothers, following the construction of SR 520 in the 1960s, affecting the recreational setting of the Washington Park Arboretum." It should be indicated here WashDOT's complicity in this impact -- here are some things that you can write to improve understanding. "WashDOT did nothing to make sure Lake Washington Boulevard's traffic was at a level appropriate for the green space in its original 520 designs. 50 years later, we have done nothing but use it as an extended on-ramp, hurting the character of the Olmstead park. Now, with the new designs, we have made no effort to design in a way to improve the park-like character of the park, and instead plan only to keep using it as an extended on-ramp." Without an honest discussion of what the existing 520 does, and the lack of design to address core impacts of the current and future design, this discussion is woefully incomplete.</p>	<p>Omission, Incomplete, Error,</p>
<p>I-311-632</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 88</p>	<p>615</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Unlike the experience of past years, however, today's transportation improvement projects include mitigation in the form of replacement parkland." This statement makes an argument for addressing design flaws and aggressive take-overs of past projects. How is it OK to not use current investment to make things better, rather than just mitigate further freeway expansion? This statement requires an explanation from WashDOT why the current 520 design -- and lack of mitigation/destruction of parkland -- is still considered acceptable, and doesn't need to be addressed in this project.</p>	<p>Omission, Incomplete, Error,</p>
<p>I-311-633</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 88</p>	<p>616</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"In part, Section 4(f) requires "all possible planning" to minimize harm to affected properties. Section 6(f) stipulates that replacement property be provided, with agreement by agencies with jurisdiction." This makes an argument to put the 520 project underground. This way the 520 project actually creates replacement property for other projects, rather than being the taker-away-er. Whenever you make a discussion of why you didn't decide to put the 520 project underground (such as in the executive summary), you need to cite that you missed opportunities to fulfill the law's intent to increase parkland in the study area.</p>	<p>Omission, Incomplete, Error,</p>
<p>I-311-634</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 88</p>	<p>617</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Parklands in Seattle are further protected under Ordinance 118477, which specifies that all lands and facilities held now or in the future by the City of Seattle for parks and recreational purposes must be preserved or mitigated by providing replacement "land or a facility of equivalent or better size, value, location and usefulness in the vicinity, serving the same community and the same park purposes." Again, this appears to be an argument for not having a wider freeway overground through parkland, but for putting the freeway underground, and restoring parkland. This should appear in the executive summary as the following, "We did not take into account opportunities to enhance City of Seattle parks, and identify ways to actually improve them. Instead, we started with the assumption of increasing the road size and hoping we don't violate City of Seattle ordinances in the review process."</p>	<p>Omission, Specific design options not considered</p>

I-311-635	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 88	618	Walter Oelwein	"In compliance with the regulatory requirements discussed above, WSDOT and FHWA are working with the City of Seattle, the University of Washington, the State's Recreation and Conservation Office, and the National Park Service to identify appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that no long-term adverse effect on parkland and recreational resources would result from construction of the proposed project." This list of mitigations needs to be in the SDEIS, not the plan for discussions. A project that cuts through a park like this needs to start with these discussions, not wait until AFTER the SDEIS is published to reveal what these mitigations might be. It is unclear how WSDOT is going to identify ways to make this 115' span acceptably mitigated. It should have approached the project with the attitude, "We want to return to Seattle parkland that we took away 50 years ago."	Omission, Specific design options not considered
I-311-636	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 89	619	Walter Oelwein	"Under any design option, the new interchange at Montlake Boulevard would permanently change the local visual environment with wider roadways, a new Portage Bay Bridge with a different appearance from the one there now, noise walls, and large stormwater treatment ponds with landscaped surroundings." This is an error-prone statement that indicates an anti-Option K bias. This statement implies that there is a second bridge with all design options. This sentence should start with "With the exception of Option K, which preserves the visual integrity of the area. . ."	Error
I-311-637	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 89	620	Walter Oelwein	"The bridges proposed under Options A and L would be similar to the existing bridge passing over Foster Island." This cannot possibly be true, since the bridge is twice as wide. Consider this an error that needs to be re-written as the following: "The bridges proposed under Options A and L would be significantly larger than the existing bridge passing over Foster Island, creating detrimental visual impact."	Error
I-311-638	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 89	621	Walter Oelwein	"With regard to Foster Island, Option K would have the greatest effect on visual quality and aesthetics from the removal of nearby forest and the addition of fill soil to create the land bridge." Here is an example of you calling the bridge over Foster Island a "land bridge" where earlier you call it a lid. A lid sounds much better, since it would effectively hide the doubled-in-size freeway running through park area. The fact that the authors continually cite that the fill somehow makes Foster Island worse - but not a large 115' freeway under Options A and L -- is simply hiding something, and needs to be re-written to not reflect anti-Option K bias.	Error, Incorrect info, Omission
I-311-639	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 90	622	Walter Oelwein	"The proposed project would not produce indirect effects on visual quality and aesthetics because all changes to structures, landforms, and vegetation would be confined to the project area along the SR 520 corridor." This statement is incorrect. The visual quality of the corridor will be significantly worsened by a doubled-in-size freeway, the indirect effects of the lower visual quality will be fewer visitors to the area, lower esteem to the area, indicators that this area is not forward thinking. There are consequences of making a big freeway in an urban park -- this section is obliged to identify them, or else this analysis is incomplete, and the impact is not disclosed.	Error, Incorrect info, Omission
I-311-640	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 90	623	Walter Oelwein	"First, the analyst relied on the results of the visual quality assessment for direct effects," This was riddled with errors and omissions and does not reflect the general sentiment of people familiar with the local area. Therefore, this indirect effects analysis will be incorrect. I would imagine that over time, since freeways are the larger priority with this project, and not architecture, landscaping, and natural parkland, the indirect and cumulative visual effects is an ongoing statement of the values of the local area -- that we value freeways, roads, cars and not people, pedestrians, recreation, and public transport.	Error, Incorrect info, Omission

I-311-641 Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 90	624	Walter Oelwein	<p>"On balance, the cumulative effect on visual quality and aesthetics within the SR 520 study area and surrounding central Puget Sound region would be an increasingly urban visual character, to which the proposed project would make a small contribution with both beneficial and detrimental visual elements." Calling a freeway "Urban" isn't correct. It needs to be stated as "large roadway." Urban environments can be very pleasant, and the term urban implies a high density of people. Just about any street in Paris is pleasant, and is designed as such. Walking across Roanoke Street over I-5 is more of a "freeway" environment. There is a low density of people and buildings, and a high density of high-speed cars. This is much different. The discussion on the visual character of the bridge needs to better articulate what a bridge with cars on it is like, in comparison to an urban environment that is not freeway-centric. Please revise this section to indicate that the existing bridge adds an incongruous speeding freeway aesthetic to the Portage Bay environment, and that the expanded bridge takes it even further.</p>	Omission
I-311-642 Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 93	625	Walter Oelwein	<p>"In general, an adverse cumulative effect on visual quality and aesthetics can be minimized by community planning efforts that establish context-sensitive architectural and design standards," This is a disingenuous statement that does not reflect the community's experience with the 520 project, so why would we expect this to be the case for other architectural projects. Namely, the 520 bridge through the West-Side neighborhoods is not unto itself context-sensitive. This needs to be acknowledged in the SDEIS: "The local residents do not feel that the current designs for the 520 bridge are context-sensitive." Next, I expected to see specific measures that would be taken to "mitigate" (I'm not sure what they would be, hence I'm reading the document), but instead I'm seeing a "We'll figure it out later" attitude, which does not meet the standard of answering the question at the heading, "How could the cumulative effect on visual quality and aesthetics be mitigated?" If the project itself cannot be context-sensitive, how would other architecture be context-sensitive? Also, since the 520 bridge becomes the dominant context in the local area, do we now expect future architecture to be neo-brutalist freeway when making context-sensitive architecture? This section needs to be re-written to actually list out what the possible mitigations are for putting a massive freeway through neighborhoods, a bay and parklands.</p>	Omission, Error
I-311-643 Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 93	626	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Puget Sound Regional Council, which is composed of jurisdictions at many different levels, takes visual quality into account as a shared community value contributing to the quality of life throughout the region" This statement is an argument against the current designs for 520 and needs to make a re-set to the project from an aesthetic perspective. If the values of the community is to contribute to the visual quality, how is it that you have no designer that can take credit for enhancing the visual quality of the area? Instead, you have "options" that reflect creativity in design only from local residents. For this SDEIS to be accurate, you need to say, "WSDOT did not address this goal in arriving at initial ideas for the roadway. We simply place a larger roadway over the existing footprint, and then realized that for it to meet the regional values, we had to do something else, so we engaged in a long negotiation with various interest groups and came up with three options that we have to write a EIS for comparing all of these."</p>	Omission, Error, Specific design options not considered
I-311-644 Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 93	627	Walter Oelwein	<p>"increasing urbanization." I object to the concept that the freeway is considered "urban". Freeways such as these are more likely to be found in ex-urban and sub-urban locales. In Paris, freeways have been hidden underground. In Vancouver, no freeways go near downtown or the close-in neighborhoods. The freeway into San Francisco is an architectural delight, but then the freeway disappears into surface streets. You need to change the term to "freeway environment" because it is completely inhospitable to people.</p>	Error

I-311-645	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 94	628	Walter Oelwein	<p>"from visual intrusion caused by more prominent roadway and bridge structures." The term "visual intrusion" is not mentioned in the Visual Quality section (with the exception of Option L's bascule bridge), but it is mentioned in the cultural resources section. This needs to be corrected, because this would make the document internally inconsistent. In this section, it is assumed that the wider freeway is a "visual intrusion", yet this is not mentioned in the visual quality section, so it appears that you are hiding something in the Visual Quality assessment.</p>	Error, Omission
I-311-646	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 94	629	Walter Oelwein	<p>"No indirect noise effects were identified from construction or operation." OK, this is an incomplete analysis then. There is a general concern in the local neighborhoods that increasing traffic will creating more cut-through and spill-over traffic. With that is car-noise. Delmar/Lynn and Furhman/Boyer are streets that deal with much of this noise, especially during commuting hours. With the generally agreed up on increase in traffic, there is curiosity and concern that surface-level street noise will increase as a result of the ineffectiveness of this project. Or, perhaps, maybe this project would be successful at reducing/preventing cut-through traffic. We don't know, it isn't analyzed.</p>	Omission
I-311-647	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 93	630	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Even with noise walls present, however, relative noise levels would still increase between now and 2030, because traffic volumes would increase over time. For a detailed discussion of these effects, see the Noise Discipline Report (WSDOT 2009b)." If this is the case, then is it not clear that the basic design is inadequate? You state earlier that the current design is actually louder than in other areas near freeways, and then you state that, yes, this contemporary freeway, over time, is going to be even louder. Now this is unacceptable design, and you are making an argumnet to identify ways to make noise better (espeically in the context of the failed bridge noise efforts of the past). So you are now obliged to state what the alternative would be: Put the bridge underground so that there would be noise levels similar to pre-520. This has many other benefits. Additionally, I expect to see in your analysis additional noise abatement strategies, such as quieter pavement, lower speed limits, and other things that traffic engineers across the world have come up with. Yet this document only mentions noise walls, which this statement demonstrates as ultimately ineffective. Back to the drawing board, WSDOT!</p>	Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered
I-311-648	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 99	631	Walter Oelwein	<p>This section is entirely lacking. Given that noise is a big factor in choosing a household, having an ongoing source of noise nearby, and edified, will surely have an impact on home values. I would expect a discussion on this here. With lower home values, there are effects of lower tax revenues and economic activity. This has a cumulative impact I'm sure. I'm surprised that this hasn't come up at all, since this is a big issue with putting a freeway in an urban environment. This could also create a "tipping point" in the direction of putting the freeway underground (and the bike lane over ground), because this would surely enhance home values, and would possible create additional revenue for the state. We don't know because this has not been analyzed.</p>	Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered

I-311-649	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 99	632	Walter Oelwein	<p>"How could the cumulative effect on noise be mitigated?" This entire section basically expresses hope that things will get better, without taking responsibility beyond noise walls. This section identifies how urban centers are important, yet you are designing a large elevated freeway throughout. You need to reconsider this proposition and figure out how to get the freeway out of noise-producing, and put it underground. Or, actively offer up lots of ways to keep cars quieter or just have a quiet train (Monorail?) use the corridor instead of cars. This section reflects the poor design thinking throughout this project. A design goal would be to reduce or eliminate noise from the freeway -- perhaps the thing that makes this project most undesirable for anyone near it -- this would mean as a starting point putting it underground. All other options totally fail to meet this design goal. Instead, you put the default roadway placement down, and then hoped you could figure out how to mitigate it. You failed. So the Environmental Impact of the project: Poor. This is not something that you want to put on your resume.</p>	Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered
I-311-650	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 104	633	Walter Oelwein	<p>"Major efforts are underway to reduce vehicle miles traveled and to improve the overall efficiency of the transportation system." This statement is in contradiction to much of the rest of this document. If "major efforts" are underway to reduce vehicle miles traveled, then why create a larger freeway? You need to align your freeway design to these "Major efforts." The current default roadway expansions are not aligning to this, and this is an argument to re-design the freeway to support these major efforts.</p>	Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered
I-311-651	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 104	634	Walter Oelwein	<p>"How could the cumulative effect on air quality be mitigated?" Wherever you ask this question, you should also have a section that asks, "What are the design elements that support this goal?" (i.e., "How did we design this project to have the most positive impact on air quality?") This needs to be added for all of the discipline reports, because otherwise it isn't clear about what you've actually done to make this a positive project on all of the things that you are obliged to report the impact on. If you were obliged to answer this, you could better argue in favor of the project, rather than apologize for the project's shortcomings and identify elements that need to be mitigated. So for air quality, if you designed the project for being underground, you could say, "We designed the project to be underground so that emissions from cars -whatever the technology -- will not be spewed into the air, and will be captured and managed, contributing to the long-term goal of reducing pollutants." With this current design, you can say, "We have no design elements aimed at improving air quality. Instead, we have many design that add to pollutants -- by adding more lanes, we have increased capacity, meaning more cars and thus more pollutants. The design of this project does not aim at improving air quality." This would be an appropriate assessment of the impact of this project.</p>	Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered
I-311-652	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 105	635	Walter Oelwein	<p>"proportional to the e higher construction" This appears to be a typo</p>	Error
I-311-653	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Overall	636	Walter Oelwein	<p>The indirect and cumulative effects analysis is uncreative and does not reflect many of the intangibles that this section has the opportunity to identify. There is much concern by the local residents that this freeway, as a wider car-centric entity, creates the wrong image of what this city strives to become -- a leader in creating a sustainable transportation, commercial, and residential living. The overall message of this freeway is much different: We put highways through parkland, we don't know how to do mass-transit, we are car-centric. This has wide-spread indirect and cumulative effects: Employers will not locate here, people will not see the Pacific NW as desirable. This has the chance to erode future investment, or indicate that further transportation investments are going to be car-centric.</p>	Specific alternatives not explored

I-311-654	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Overall	637	Walter Oelwein	This report shows very little in terms of mitigation for the indirect and cumulative effects of the project. Most of the time, it is reliant on "working with the community" in the future, when there is nothing being offered as possible ways that "working with the community" would actually make the overall environment better. This kind of language needs to be replaced with other language that specifically brainstorms ideas for mitigation on the various indirect and cumulative effects. If, after 10 years of study, WSDOT is unable to offer ideas, then it is not qualified to document what mitigations are, making this analysis and report suspect.	Specific alternatives not explored
I-311-655	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Overall	638	Walter Oelwein	This document needs to describe how the design of the bridge specifically addresses the various needs of the project. Offering mitigation for each of the domain areas implies that the project is a failure from the start, and mitigation is necessary for correcting the poor impact it has on the various components being studied. In addition to this examination, the project needs to discuss what elements of the design specifically aimed at making the various disciplines BETTER. For example, I would have rather read about how, in deciding to replace the bridge, the designers thought through specially what they are going to do to make it the quietest freeway possible. This is frequently done in discussing green building design, "We put in cisterns to reclaim water, we put in flushless toilets, etc." I expect this level of discussion for a 4.5+ billion dollar freeway. Instead, we get, "We're building a freeway, and if the people want noise walls, I guess that we can put them in. It's up to them. We don't think that there's a lot of noise, so whatever."	Incomplete, Specific alternatives not explored
I-311-656	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 110	639	Walter Oelwein	"How could cumulative effects on energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions be mitigated?" This section is entirely uncreative and needs to be revised. Here are some ideas: Shut down the freeway on the weekends. Lower the speed limit. No trucks at certain hours. Only electric, low-noise vehicles allowed, turn it into a recreation facility during the weekends, convert more lanes to high occupancy transit. If you are serious about mitigating greenhouse gas emission,s you need to identify how this project can contribute to this effort, rather than just state the various things that are happening external to the project. This, as well as other sections that reflect a similar amount of lack of creativity, need to be written. You're not off the hook, WSDOT! Be creative and document these ideas.	Incomplete, Specific alternatives not explored
I-311-657	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 111	640	Walter Oelwein	"There would be no adverse indirect effects associated with the operation of stormwater quality treatment facilities as part of the project action." This is entirely incorrect. One obvious one that have been brought up to WSDOT on many occasions is that the stormwater quality treatment basins underneath the bridge are ugly. It's fair to say that not much thinking has been put into the design of these catch basins. This has an indirect effect of making the visual quality worse, and, in turn, the cumulative effects are also impacted (ugly freeways = lower quality of life). This needs to be documented and discussed for this SDEIS to meet minimum standards.	Incomplete, Specific alternatives not explored

<p>I-311-658</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 115</p>	<p>641</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"In general, Option K would have more operational effects from the project than Options A and L. Wetland fill from Option K would be three times more than from Option L and nine times more than from Option A. Option K would have the greatest shade effects from project operation, and Option A would have the least. Option K would have the most fill effects from project operation on buffers, followed by Option L, then Option A. Option L, however, would have the most effects from shading, and Option K would have slightly more shading effects than Option A." I contest this analysis entirely, and believe it needs to be re-done. Option K has the narrowest footprint, it moves underground a large stretch of road, so it doesn't make sense that Option K has the most shade effects. Additionally, Option K has additional lid space (as is specifically documented in this report), which would add to the ecosystem, so this analysis appears to discount this impact. Option A, in contrast, has the widest roads, the most surface roads, and the highest bridge span. That doesn't seem to translate to the best option. I suspect that this analysis reflects anti-Option K bias by the project members. Secondly, the comparison to the no-build alternative is missing in this section, which effectively hides the fact that this is a much wider road, so the shade effects are much worse, and needs to be articulated here.</p>	<p>Incorrect, error, omission</p>
<p>I-311-659</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 117</p>	<p>642</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"Transportation systems, which are a component of the overall urban development pattern within the Central Puget Sound Region, have historically played a key part in these ecosystem changes (PSRC 2009a)." This section needs to cite the original 520 project's wetland impact specifically. This discussion hides the issue that the original 520, which this plan essentially doubles, was a poorly conceived project from a "protect the wetlands" perspective. Instead, you address this section as though the existing 520 project is somehow acceptable, even though it cuts through large wetland areas. While you mention the construction of 520 as contributing to the wetland destruction, you need to revise this section to indicate what impact 520 has had over the years.</p>	<p>Incorrect, error, omission</p>
<p>I-311-660</p> <p>Indirect and Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Section 118</p>	<p>643</p>	<p>Walter Oelwein</p>	<p>"WSDOT avoided many impacts to wetlands through careful identification of sensitive areas early in the design process. Where avoidance was not possible, effects were minimized by raising bridge heights, treating stormwater, and improving water quality functions of aquatic wetlands". This is the first time I hear about "the design process" in this SDEIS. However, I disagree with the assessment that avoidance is not possible. If you put it underground far enough, you would avoid wetland damage-- and create acreage of new wetlands. You need to cite that, despite this obvious opportunity to improve wetlands, WSDOT specifically rejected this option early in the process, but hasn't stated why. Instead we get higher bridges, stormwater off of concrete, etc.</p>	<p>Incorrect, error, omission</p>