From: the jennings [mailto:cjennings003@centurytel.net]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 7:23 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Cc: pete delaunay; wendy delaunay; trish gasparich; lynn rovig; Torri Canda
Subject: SR 520 Expansion

April 14, 2010

I-290-001 In Regard to Opposition to Option A of the SR 520 Bridge Expansion Project

We are writing to you torequest mitigation of the below concerns over the SR520 Expansion project. We are owners of a condominium unit and moorage slip at the Portage Bayshore Condominium, which is a condominium building with 24 residential units, with a dock extending over the water into Portage Bay which is located adjacent and nearly below the SR520 bridge nearest the Boyer Avenue access to the bridge.

1. Marina Access Mitigation: We request that construction process follow a plan that will allow access to our boat slip during the construction period. We request mitigation financially if in order to allow usage of our sailboat it would necessitate the relocation of our boat to some other marina facility located elsewhere in the city which would be costly to us and far less convenient.

I-290-002 2. Property Impact Mitigation: We request that there be financial mitigation for fractures, cracks, settling deterioration damages to our 24 unit condominium building structure, and damages which could result from boats being knocked about in their moorings, dock and/or piling shifting, etc. due to construction vibration.

3. Noise Mitigation: We request that the construction process utilize a sound barrier system to minimize the noise for the 24 residential units of the Portage Bayshore condominium.

I-290-003 4. Congestion Mitigation: We request mitigation for loss of parking and difficult ingress and egress access to parking spaces of the condominium due to heavy equipment blockages and street closures.

I-290-004 5. Aquatic Habitat Environment Mitigation: We request mitigation for pollution cleanup and restoration of the aquatic environment of Portage Bay which includes the Montlake Park boat shoreline areas.

We respectfully request consideration be taken for preservation of the quality of life both at the human scale and native animal habitat scale throughout the construction endeavor.

Connie and Gerald Jennings, Owners of Unit 102 and Moorage Slip #26, Portage Bayshore Condominium, 2524 Boyer Ave. E., Seattle, WA 98102. Email: address: cjennings003@centurytel.net.

From: oppa3@aol.com [mailto:oppa3@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 10:11 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: SDEIS Comments: Air Quality concerns

I-291-001 Attached are the air quality concerns of the Love-Kane Family who live in the adversely affect neighborhood of Montlake
The SDEIS does not adequately address the issue of increased air pollution during construction and after construction due to increased traffic

*** eSafe2 scanned this email for malicious content ***
*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***

Dear Governor Gregoire,

I-291-002 We are opposed to Plan A as described in the SDEIS:

I-291-003 I feel it is important to share with you our personal story in order to attach a family, a face, and a life to the decision the state is making purely on budgetary considerations. There appears to be no recognition for the people in our community or for the generations to come.

On August 5th 2009, our son Declan was born almost 6 weeks prematurely. Please see the attached photo. He spent close to one month in the NICU at Swedish fighting for his life. On an average day he would stop breathing up to 8 times and needed intervention. He was intubated, on a respirator, and feed by gavage. He will not be able to tolerate the air quality that will prevail in our neighborhood because of Plan A's short term and long term effects. The dust, particles, and unknown airborne elements during construction pose a huge risk. The general air pollution and emissions will be devastating. Declan has had breathing issues since birth. We simply cannot knowingly put our son in harms way.

I-291-004 We bought our home in 2005. In it is our life savings. We have 5 children and at the time considered this our best investment for our children and desired the quality of life Montlake offered them. My Husband and I made the very difficult decision to put our house on the market 3 weeks ago based on the extreme health related issues Plan A guarantees for our son and other children as well. We had to list our home at a price that is less than what we paid for it. We will not be able to sell it unless we take a huge financial hit. Every single realtor and potential buyer loved our home but used terminology such as "Black Plague" to describe our situation, based solely on the 520 initiative. If the state can give the University of Washington $500 million for inconveniences, then they can easily buy us out. Please let me know how to proceed to make this happen before construction begins. For those who elect to stay, we request compensation for lost property value, retrofitting of windows and an air filtration system to mitigate the harmful effects this project will bring.

It would certainly be a gesture of good faith and create positive press to a neighborhood devastated. A class action suit is inevitable unless you exhibit the leadership and take quick decisive action to do the right thing for the people you govern.

I-291-005 All construction options pose short term issues and disruption. The Pacific Interchange option and iterations of that would have a long term positive outcome for us, the city of Seattle and the state. I would think that simply retrofitting the 520 bridge would still be on the table as a viable option. At the very least until the state can afford to do this project the right way.

I-291-006

We are vehemently opposed to Plan A because it destroys the historical Montlake Bridge and surrounding homes, encourages 7000 cars daily on Montlake Boulevard, is designed with insufficient lids, and will ultimately not improve the congestion merging onto interstate 5. I know you are aware of all the logistical reasons this project does not work but I thought it was important to marry a human story with the tragic story of the 520.

I-291-007

I am also emailing this to Mr. Steve Ballmer so that he can better understand the harm that was done by one of his employees who lacks the understanding of this project and ignited an “us vs. them” scenario. Please see attached. I believe Mr. Smith is using his position to unfairly sway the masses to advocate for an unjust plan.

This letter comes to you in order to illustrate the health risks that are eminent and potentially deadly for 1 of your youngest constituents. For what it’s worth, my husband is a police officer and puts on a uniform everyday to serve and protect you, Mr. Ballmer, and the people of our state. I look forward to hearing from you on how you will uphold your oath to serve and protect us.

However dire our situation is, I understand that your job is to make decisions that benefit the majority. So please review with renewed concern how most aspects of Plan A are not only harmful to my family, but to the rest of my community. I would hate to see Montlake ravaged by an ill conceived plan and a short-sighted government. I would hope you feel the same.

Best regards,

Michele Love- Kane
1879 East Hamlin St.
Seattle, WA 98112

From: Brad Smith (LCA) His email is: bradsmi@microsoft.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2010 10:11 AM
To: All Employees of MS in Puget Sound
Subject: Replacing the 520 Bridge

Only rarely do we reach out to employees and provide information on public policy issues, but in this instance we felt it was appropriate to do so.

One of Microsoft's top public policy priorities during the current legislative session in Washington State is the timely replacement and expansion of the SR-520 bridge across Lake Washington. More than 5,000 Microsoft employees use this bridge to commute to and from work each day. The current bridge is almost 50 years old, has twice as many vehicles using it as intended, and is overdue in its need to be replaced.

During the next couple of weeks lawmakers in Olympia will decide whether to continue to move forward with the work to construct a new bridge. Three years ago, the legislature approved a replacement design calling for a six-lane span – four general purpose and two HOV lanes – funded in part by state revenue and in part by tolls. Now the legislature will decide whether to start construction. While some work still must be

done to finalize a compromise on the span's western configuration, we believe it's important to keep the project on track.

Because the issue is at a critical juncture, we're taking the unusual step of asking for your help in encouraging the legislature to keep the 520 bridge project moving forward. And even if you have a different view, as always we encourage everyone to share their views with their elected representatives. To learn more about the issue and how you can follow up, please click here: (http://520bridge.posterous.com)
Thanks.
Brad Smith
Senior Vice President and General Counsel

From: oppa3@aol.com [mailto:oppa3@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 10:22 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Social and Cultural Issues

I-291-008 The SDEIS does not address the impact of the proposed 520 Bridge on traditional cultural and social events such as the Annual Easter Egg hunt on the lawn of the Seattle Yacht Club.

Picture these pictures with a wider, nosier and closer Portage Bay Viaduct

*** eSafe2 scanned this email for malicious content ***
*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***

From: Jonathan Miller [mailto:jamiller93@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 10:52 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: SR 520 bridge EIS comments

To Whom It May Concern:

I-292-001 I live next to the Arboretum in Seattle, within easy walking distance of the 520 bridge. Regarding the SR 520 EIS, I wanted to express strong support for the following:

1) The 3rd lane from the westbound 520 Montlake on ramp to I-5. The current forced merge followed by the immediate exit to I-5 is hazardous, and causes large backups.

I-292-002 2) Preserve an exit into and from the Arboretum onto Lake Washington Blvd.

I-292-003 3) Build the Pacific interchange to free the Montlake bridge from such heavy traffic.

I-292-004 4) HOV lanes should be extended to I-5 in both directions at all times.

I-292-005 5) The current design should not be modified in any way to accommodate Mike McGinn's light rail proposal - we need to move forward with the new bridge, and we must not waste the HOV in each direction on his plans.

Thank you for your attention to these issues.

Sincerely,

Jonathan

--

_____

Jonathan A. Miller, Ph.D.
Adjunct Professor, Biology
Seattle Community Colleges
jamiller@sccd.ctc.edu

From: quasarandnemesis@comcast.net
[mailto:quasarandnemesis@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 10:40 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Cc: quasarandnemesis@comcast.net
Subject: 520 bridge EIS comments

I-293-001 After reviewing the SR 520 EIS, I wanted to express strong support for the following:

1) The 3rd lane from the west bound 520 Montlake on ramp to I-5. The current forced merge followed by the immediate exit to I-5 is hazardous, and causes large backups.

I-293-002 2) That an exit into and from the Arboretum onto Lake Washington Blvd be preserved.

I-293-003 3) That the Pacific interchange be built to free the Montlake bridge from such heavy traffic.

I-293-004 4) Though I did not see this option anywhere, the HOV lanes should be extended to I-5 in both directions at all times.

I-293-005 5) The current design should not be modified in any way to accommodate Mike McGinn's light rail proposal.

Thank you,
Ken

--
Dr. Kenneth E Miller
RPPL, University of Washington
14700 NE 95th St, Suite 100
Redmond WA 98052
p 425-881-7706
c 206-491-4576
f 425 882 9137

From: stixrood@comcast.net [mailto:stixrood@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 9:43 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: SR520 SDEIS Comment

April 14, 2010

I-294-001 This is to supplement comments submitted previously by me and my wife Annie. This comment supplement is provided in response to additional information gained through further review of the SDEIS, review of the March 2010 Nelson Nygard Report and after listening to testimony at two City of Seattle hearings.

1. I support letters sent by representatives of the Fuhrman and Boyer Neighborhood Improvement Association and the Portage Bayshore Condominium.

I-294-002 2. The project seems quite costly with little benefit in terms of reduced congestion or travel times. I request a cost benefit analysis be provided comparing the A+ option to an option that provides light rail. Light rail might improve the benefit vs cost aspects of the project because of the increased number of trips accomodated.

I-294-003 3. The need for 6 lanes west of the Montlake interchange does not seem well established in the SDEIS. I suggest reconsideration of the need for 6 lanes west of the Montlake Interchange unless features that would increase through put benefits such as light rail or improvements to I-5 are made part of the project.

I-294-004 4. A blind person testified in front of the Seattle City Council that it was hazardous to cross roads that do not intersect at 90 degrees. It seems appropriate to consider a more pedestrian oriented design for the Montlake - SR 520 intersection.

I-294-005 5. Testimony and exhibits submitted by Mr. Connely before the Seattle City Council on April 9, 2010 clearly established the presence of a unique chain of parks in the Montlake/Portage Bay area of the project. This park system and pedestrian connections should be maintained by the project design. The SDEIS should include an analysis of the impact to the individual park sites and system of parks identified in Mr. Connely's testimony.

I-294-006 6. Please consider measures of "per household" or "per capita" rather than "per mile" when evaluating the costs and benefits the project and mitigating measures. Highway 520 passes through an unusually dense urban area. Costs per mile for construction and mitigation would be expected to be high relative to other projects to produce "per capita" costs and benefits comparable to other projects.

I-294-007 7. The area from Madison Park to North Capital Hill is a unique pedestrian oriented section of the City of Seattle with many parks, sidewalks, stairs and trails and substantial wildlife and fish habitat. It has taken over 100 years for this area to develop a rich, fine grained urban environment that is enjoyed and envied by tourists, boaters, students and business people from around the world. The attributes of this type of area

I-294-007 creates an economic benefit as evidenced by recent statistics showing property values rising in walkable Seattle while they continue to fall in areas with less walkability. The detailed design for the roadway through Seattle should be carried out with a great deal of thought given to avoiding, minimizing and mitigating the impacts created on the local economy, walkability, wildlife and fisheries, recreation and boating opportunities.

I-294-008 8. After considering the information in the SDEIS and other sources it may be more appropriate (reduce costs and improve benefits) to design the Seattle segment of SR 520 using urban arterial or parkway standard rather than interstate freeway standards.

Thank you for the opportunity to supplement my previous comments related to Pedestrian Connectivity, Silt in Portage Bay and Noise.

Carl Stixrood

From: ANNE NELSON [mailto:njonanne593@msn.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 12:18 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: SR520 Design

I-295-001 I commented online, but I'm not sure if the online form accepted my comments. So, just in case you didn't get them, here they are plus a couple things added:

The 2nd drawbridge across the Montlake cut will destroy the view of the original Montlake bridge, which is a Seattle historical landmark. The image of the Montlake bridge is a trademark of Seattle and views of it will be destroyed if a 2nd drawbridge is built. This 2nd bridge will also require the removal of some beautiful, older homes. And won't a 2nd bridge require Montlake Blvd. to be widened? There are multiple reasons why a 2nd drawbridge is terrible idea.

I-295-002 The bus connections do not work for bus riders. The existing 520 (with the flyer stops) works. It doesn't make sense to spend billions of dollars on a new 520 that will not work as well as the existing one. The new 520 design discourages people from riding the bus.

I-295-003 The interchange in Montlake is very intrusive on the Montlake area and does not solve any traffic problems. Montlake area residents, businesses, and the arboretum will be negatively affected.

I-295-004 Why are there 6 lanes? When you add lanes of highway, you add more cars. There is not enough room on I-5 and Seattle's streets for all of these additional cars. We should be trying to encourage and motivate (or compel, if necessary, via tolls) drivers to carpool or ride mass transit. The new 520 should solve transportation issues, not make things worse. What is the point of getting across the bridge faster, only to sit in traffic on I-5 or Seattle's streets? The additional traffic in Seattle will have a devastatingly negative effect on Seattle residents and businesses.

I-295-005 What about accommodating light rail? This seems to have been overlooked.

I-295-006 In general, the design for the new 520 has not been well thought out at all and does not solve our area's transportation problems. Please do not spend billions of dollars to build something that is so poorly designed. Go back to the drawing board and come up with a good design.

Thank you,
Anne E. Nelson
206-720-0095

From: Douglas Tooley [mailto:doug@motleytools.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 10:35 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Cc: 'Douglas Tooley'
Subject: 520 Supplemental Draft EIS Comments
Importance: High

I-296-001

I am writing to comment on the 520 Bridge Design Process via the Washington Department of Transportation Environmental Review. Though I am no longer a citizen of King County I likely can claim 'senior' status as a citizen involved in this process – having originally suggested the general approach in option K/L, the additional crossing of the Montlake Cut, in 1988 . Additionally, during the time the project formally got started I served as Secretary of the Madrona Community Council. I am also a 1990 Honors graduate from the University of Washington, in the field of Economics. My senior's thesis was a labor approach to economic development and education(1988), and I have also significantly studied Urban Planning and other public fields. Prior to the incidents referenced below I was employed with King County in the field of Geographic Information Systems – where I grunted out the first parcel database for the unincorporated County – and the first growth management boundaries.

My comments today are solely my own, though hopefully I do have some remaining indirect connection with many communities in King County, including the Eastside, where I have worked often in both the public and private sectors. I would also hope to have at least some remaining respect among the members of my former profession, as well as other allied arts and sciences..

A. This Supplemental Draft EIS process is invalid, $220 million spent on a process not designed to fully and fairly evaluate well designed alternatives, but instead justify a pre-determined conclusion by corrupt individuals incompetent to handle conceptual design in a long term cost sensitive manner. The real purpose of this process has been to establish control of the project in a post old boy highway network 'bi-partisan' politically correct manner which settles a conflict between the public left and the corporate right, at the expense and public safety of the non-involved, and paying, public citizenry, the customer and owner of all branches of government.

I-296-002

1. The analysis of the K/L approach has been padded with additional costs, including mitigation costs from the University of Washington, not added to other alternatives. It may well be the fact that a Montlake tunnel or bridge is too expensive, but that analysis has not been completed satisfactorily in the $220 million dollar spent to date.

I-296-003

2. The analysis of preferred option A+ is not complete, most notably in transit enhancements. This is certain to be an area for planned cost overruns.

I-296-004

3. Given the flaws in analysis a cost aware review of these environmental costs is not possible.

I-296-005

B. Public relations efforts have been made to portray the neighborhood approach as stereotypically 'Nimby', or "Not In My Back Yard", and obstructive. The Montlake neighborhood K/L approach is constructive – even if there are a few individuals who would be happy to delay the project forever. The design process is under the control of the State of Washington and they have consciously chosen to implicitly politically attack the legal, constitutional, right of citizens to comment on their government. This is but one example of a broader strategy toward this end, which have also included indirect "Duke LaCrosse Players/Nifong" takeover of the University of Washington via an agent of the Abramoff Lobbying Firm Preston Gates and Ellis, via their agent Professor William Beyers, using this citizen as patsy(1994). Responsibility for any delay is on the hands of those who have controlled the review process.

This review process is in fact a direct Corporate attack against our constitutional system of government with the full collaboration of Governor Christine Gregoire, her appointees, her former staff employees in the Attorney General's Office, and the environmental review profession, once nobly led by Gregoire as head of the Department of Ecology during the original implementation of the State EIS process. Microsoft Counsel Brad Smith's recent statements about the effort prove this conclusively, especially given the very recent shilling the firms outside Counsel, the post Abramoff firm of K & L Gates, has engaged in concerning the controversial "Citizens United" Supreme Court decision.

In attacking public involvement via a variety of legal strategies that include falsely accusing responsible citizens, including this commenter, of abusive harassment for insisting on government and corporate accountability these "elite" individuals have themselves engaged in the behavior they claim to condemn. Correctly, the King County Courts, with it's "officers", have engaged in an unwritten common law practice of assigning 'second-class' citizenship to abusers. This standard needs to be applied to the true abusers, and their assets used to reimburse the public for the abuses to date.

I-296-006

Personally, I believe Mayor McGinn's calling for immediate transit only usage for the third lane is premature. However the need to plan for the eventual conversion of this bridge to light rail is necessary. McGinn's negotiating position addresses this need in a completely professional fashion which greatly exceeds the ability of the so-called Downtown Business community. The community of the greater Montlake area, Seattle, King County, the Puget Sound Regional Council, Washington State would be better off served starting from scratch with the leadership of McGinn and the leaders of the Montlake neighborhood. The general approach of alternatives K/L/M is superior to light rail for eventual conversion to light rail. The omission of this fact is a fatal flaw in the WSDOT led effort.

I-296-007

Given similar abuses on a national level this action is imperative. The real opportunity with this project is to re-invent corporate and governmental America. Jumping onto the soapbox for a moment, I'd like to see a private college of the Harvard/Stanford rank built on the eastern shores of Lake Washington – perhaps a useful place to put the remaining confiscated wealth of the Microsoft Executive 'gang'. Ironically, these actions would be a 'just' inheritance from Bill Gates, Sr, the former family law lawyer with Preston Gates and Ellis, to his son, the CEO of Microsoft, for their abuses at the University of Washington and, subsequently, the remainder of the Region and State.

The law is the law, and as former City Attorney Mark Sidran noted, little things matter, else they turn into big problems – as evidenced in this case. I sincerely hope and trust that all good people, upon being properly informed of these problems by the press, legislature, and Seattle Council, will turn away from this corruption – and stop our significant local contributions to corporate and governmental decay.

-Douglas Tooley
766 Alpine Forest Drive,
Bayfield, CO 81122 (still a Washington/Pierce county resident)

970 672 0052

Jorgen Bader
6536 -- 29th Ave. N.E.
Seattle, WA 98115

April 7, 2010

Seattle City Conncil
The City of Seattle
Seattle City Council, Floor 2
600 -- 4th Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104

Received
APR 15 2010
SR520 Document Control

RE: Nelson/Nygaard Report
on SR 520

Honorable Members:

I-297-001 This letter comments on the Nelson/Nygaard Project Enhansement, Draft Report, dated March 2010, as supplemented by its presentation to the City Council on April 5, 2010 (the "Report"). The Report culminates in "System Package 5 - Balance B" (Pages 50-54 of the text, and Slide 58 of the Presentation. It highlights eight changes to the Alternative A+ design recommended by the Legislative Workgroup for the new SR 520.

Of the eight, three adhere in Alternative A/A+ and the changes relate to implementation:

1) Building a bridge parallel to the historic Montlake Bridge with three lanes in each direction;
2) An at-grade crossing of Montlake Boulevard East and North East Pacific Street by University Hospital and Husky Stadium; and
3) Traffic management on SR 520 (and on the adjoining streets).

I-297-002 Three proposals require caution and more study if adoption is considered:

4) Widening the pedestrian/bicycle pathway on the south bound to westbound ramp to the Portage Bay Bridge by the NOAA Fisheries Center. NOAA is already very concerned about the extent of the taking from its property for SR 520 and would probably not agree to accommodate more taking from it.

I-297-003 5) Changing the curved off-ramp from SR 520 west bound to north hound Montlake Boulevard East and the curved right hand on-ramp south bound on Montlake Boulevard to the Portage Bay Bridge into a 90° stop intersection. This would reduce the through put at the intersection. It might slow down the traffic movement at the intersection and perhaps cause back-ups on SR 520 ramps; and to limit that effect, the Washington State Department of Transportation ("WSDOT") through its control of the traffic signals may set

I-297-003

the phases to the detriment of north-south local traffic.

6) Making Montlake Boulevard a continuous median from the Montlake Cut to SR 520 would require residents and visitors to make right-in and right-out turns. Report, p. 43. This would have significant adverse impacts on travel to the Seattle Yacht Club and the NOAA Fisheries Center from the east and south†.

I-297-004

Two proposals are ill-advised:

7) Keeping the Arboretum ramps that connect SR 520 and Lake Washington Boulevard; and

8) Slimming the Portage Bay Bridge by eliminating the auxiliary lane.

This letter focuses on the last two.

I-297-005

Lake Washington Boulevard Ramps

Six North East Seattle Community Associations sent in a comment letter on the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement in support of Alternative A+ with the Arboretum ramps removed (copy attached). The letter points out that the Arboretum is a priceless heritage and internationally recognized; that removing the SR 520 ramps from the Arboretum entirely allows the entire area to revert to Arboretum use as the Olmsted Plan had envisioned; and that it would redirect SR 520 traffic out of the Arboretum to other City arterials.

The Arboretum ramps would open Lake Washington Boulevard to west bound traffic and thereby expand its usage. It would violate state law. The Nelson/Nygaard Report nowhere mentions state law or state policy, nor call out the Union Bay wetlands and their utility for salmon fingerlings or bull trout, which are endangered species.

The Arboretum ramps take up more than an acre of wetland. Those wetlands are "shorelands of statewide significance" under the Shoreline Management Act, RCW Chapter 90.58. RCW 90.58.020 (extract attached) states in part as follows:

> "The legislature declares that the interest of all of the people shall be paramount in the management of shorelines of statewide significance. The department ... and local government ... shall give preference to uses in the following order of preference which:

†This would have a major impact on the NOAA Fishes Center and the Seattle Yacht Club. The right-in and right-out would require motorists coming from the east and from the south to make a circular turn at the UW triangle garage north of the Lake Washington Ship Canal. The only approach by roadway would be from the north. Convenience of access is important to business and agencies, and affects the choice of location of events and meetings. At an earlier hearing, the representative of a the Seattle Yacht Club testified that it makes a substantial part of its income to sustain the Club from catering to events, such as wedding receptions, dances, reunions, and parties. It might be disconcerting to visitors or service personnel to the residents, who would have to make a long trip around if there were no parking spaces ahead. An aid car would have a "U" Turn roundabout trip to University Hospital from westside residences

I-297-005

(1) Recognize and protect the statewide interest over local interest;
(2) Preserve the natural character of the shoreline;
(3) Result in long term over short term benefit;
(4) Protect the resources and ecology of the shoreline..."

Transportation, particularly local traffic, is further down the line. RCW 90.58.020 mandates preservation of the shoreline to the "greatest extent feasible" and requires that permitted uses .. be designed and conducted in a manner to minimize, insofar as practical, any resultant damage to the ecology and environment of the shoreline area..."

The Growth Management Act supplements the Shoreline Management Act in RCW 36.70A.172 (extract attached) by requiring counties and cities to "give special consideration to conservation or protection measures necessary to preserve or enhance anadromous fisheries."

The new SR 520 bridge takes up Union Bay wetlands on the north side. The only replacement available is the lagoon in the Arboretum occupied by the Arboretum ramps. None of the replacements suggested by the SDEIS are available or comparable. Under Initiative 42, the City has the duty to replace park land taken by eminent domain from it with comparable property equivalent in utility, size, and purpose in the neighborhood. The City can only comply by yanking out the Arboretum ramps entirely and securing a reversion of the entire area from East Montlake Park/McCurdy Park easterly into a consolidated park. The park would be enhanced by retaining the lid over SR 520 by East Montlake/McCurdy Park. (The proponents of A/A+ are agreeable to extending that lid further west; WSDOT said that it would not be practical.)

The Nelson/Nygaard Report and its presentation suggests that a Traffic Management Plan ("TMP") in the Arboretum could accomplish the same ends as removing the ramps. The opinion errs:

- The TMP does not protect the wetlands or provide park land;
- The TMP would leave pedestrians crossing between Azalea Way in the Arboretum and the Japanese Tea Garden dodging traffic as currently. It would not be as helpful as a pedestrian overpass.
- The TMP would involve administrative expense and monitoring which removal of the Arboretum ramps entirely avoids. To control volumes, would the TMP use rationing, such as stickers for preferred neighborhoods, users, or tolls; and if so, where does city government get any statutory authority to make such distinctions among its citizenry or impose tolls?
- A TMP may supplement removal of the Arboretum ramps. If lower traffic volumes from removal of the ramps result in higher speeds, traffic calming would be available.

The removal of the Arboretum ramps would cause motorists to

I-297-005

use the Montlake Boulevard ramps, which are very close. Motorists approaching from the east to go east bound across the Lake Washington Floating Bridge would travel an extra 1/3rd of a mile and those going west bound on SR 520 and after exiting going eastbound would go an extra 1/5th of a mile. It would add to the traffic at the Montlake Boulevard intersection with SR 520. The impact needs to be put in perspective:

- The Nelson/Nygaard Report offers suggestions to protect the Shelby/Hamlin area of Montlake that cause much, much greater congestion there, e.g. substituting a 90° "urban intersection" for the curves that now provide easy right turns for merging traffic; removing the auxiliary lane westbound ramp the Poetage Bay Bridge; and extending the median to close all cross-street roadways between the Montlake Cut and SR 520.

- The Nelson/Nygaard Presentation, p. 26, states that the "Intersection of 23rd and Madison [is] likely to be more congested." The SDEIS p. 5-14 and 5-15, showing intersections impacted by Alternative A does not show any south of Montlake Boulevard and Lake Washington Boulevard on 23rd Avenue East nor does the text identify any. The Nelson/Nygaard Report, Issue # 3, states:

> " The SDEIS did not evaluate the impact on the intersection of 23rd Avenue and Madison, but there is **speculation** [that] this intersection would also operate at a lower level of service and would likely require improvement to address the congestion." (emphasis supplied)

"Speculation" means guesswork.

A WSDOT travel model for 2030 using a weighted average travel time for 24 key routes (both on and off SR 520) in the Montlake Interchange Area, presented to the Legislative Workgroup on November 24, 2009, showed at travel time of 10 minutes for Option A without the Lake Washington Boulevard and 7½ minutes with them --- a difference of 2½ minutes. A WSDOT study of transit times at its October 8, 2009 meeting found no significant difference in the area between McGraw St. and the Montlake Triangle during the 2030 P.M. peak travel period.

A WSDOT Handout from 2008 showed the difference in travel time for local traffic northbound from Lake Washington Boulevard to N.E. Pacific St. at its intersection with N.E. Pacific Place by University Hospital was two minutes more with the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps removed at 2030 peak hour and from 24th Avenue East and East Boyer Avenue to be 7 minutes more. (The southbound data is outdated by addition of auxiliary lane.) During mediation, WSDOT estimated that the time differential during off peak hours would be substantially less.

The Nelson/Nygaard Report anticipates that congestion on 23rd Avenue would "encourage cut through traffic from Lake Washington Boulevard on Boyer and Imterlaken." Traffic already uses this route coming from or to the west attracted by the Arboretum on and off ramps. Usage is particularly heavy during events at Husky Stadium and in the Bank of America Arena (Hec Edmunson Pavilion). Closing the Arboretum ramps ends the west flow and offsets the anticipated added traffic from Madison Park and Madison Valley.

I-297-006

Auxiliary Lane

The six North East Seattle communities favor retention of the auxiliary lane on the Portage Bay Bridge westbound. It provides a much smoother entry and exit for motorists with very real safety advantages. It relieves congestion on Montlake Boulevard that would otherwise occur and assists local transit travel. Removing that lane would encourage traffic that should use the Portage Bay Bridge to travel to I-5 on N.E. Pacific St. or N.E. 45th St. instead. The additional paving for the auxiliary lane is in the midst of the SR 520 bridge and does not affect homes, park lands, or moorages.

I-297-007

Conclusion

Alternative A/A+ is a balanced design developed over a two year period during mediation by WSDOT in consultation with multiple representatives of diverse interests considering, among other factors: environmental values and impacts; assisting public transit; impacts on parks (especially the Arboretum and the wetlands), the UW campus, and the neighborhoods; minimizing energy consumption and greenhouse gases; the needs of freight mobility and motorists; local traffic; construction and maintenance costs; and applicable laws and permitting. It is superior to the Nelson/Nygaard model called Balanced B.

Any City recommendation should be accompanied by a Corridor Management Agreement as explained in earlier letters from proponents of Alternative A/A+.

Yours truly

Jorgen Bader

Jorgen Bader

cc NOAA
WSDOT
ABGC

North East Seattle Community Organizations

MARCH 2010

Paula Hammond
Secretary of Transportation
Attention: Jenifer Young
Environmental Manager
SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
SR 520 Project Office
600 Stewart Street, Sutie 520
Seattle, WA 98101

RE: Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement
SR 520, I-5 to Medina Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

Dear Secretary Hammond and Environmental Manager Young:

I-297-008 After considering the alternatives presented, we favor Alternative A+ without any ramps connecting SR 520 and Lake Washington Boulevard East.

I-297-009 Alternative A+ can move the project forward. It is the only design within the statutory budget of $ 4.65 Billion Dollars; it does the least damage to the Arboretum and Seattle parks, the Union Bay wetlands, the University Campus and the surrounding neighborhoods; it is friendly to transit; and it mitigates its impact to the Montlake and Roanoke Park neighborhoods by adding lids at strategic locations.

I-297-010 The Arboretum is a priceless heritage and internationally recognized. Removing SR 520 ramps from the Arboretum entirely allows the entire area to revert to Arboretum use as the Olmsted plan had envisioned. The return of all the area now occupied by ramps would provide WSDOT with replacement in kind for wetlands taken for the mainline bridge on the north of the Arboretum and would redirect SR 520 traffic out of the Arboretum to other City arterials. This would assist getting the needed permits for the project.

I-297-011 WSDOT recommended the auxiliary lane on Portage Bay as smoothing the entry and exit of vehicles on to the Portage Bay bridge and assisting the flow of traffic on Montlake Boulevard East. The traffic analysis bears out this recommendation.

Yours truly

Nicolette Bromberg
Belvedere Terrace Community Council

Ryan Rockwell
President, Hawthorne Hills Community Council

Jody Chatalas
President, Ravenna-Bryant Community Council

Matt Fox
President, University District Community Council

Kent Wills
President, University Park Community Club

Lynn Ferguson
President, Windermere North Community Association

JUDICIAL DECISIONS

ANALYSIS

Hearing board
Purpose
—Rezoning

Hearing board.
The Shorelines Hearing Board is subject to RCW 34.04, the Administrative Procedure Act. Department of Hwys. v. King County Chapter, Wash. Envtl. Council, 82 Wn.2d 280, 510 P.2d 216 (1973).

Purpose.
The purpose of the Shoreline Management Act of 1971 is not to totally prohibit future development along state shorelines and waters, but rather to ensure that such development be carefully carried out in keeping with the public interest. State Dep't of Ecology v. Ballard Elks Lodge No. 827, 84 Wn.2d 551, 527 P.2d 1121 (1974).

—Rezoning.
Rezoning of an area lying on or near a shoreline is an administrative action which does not involve either a physical alteration of the land or an irrevocable commitment to permit such an alteration, and is not a development within the terms of this act. Narrowsview Preservation Ass'n v. City of Tacoma, 84 Wn.2d 416, 526 P.2d 897 (1974), overruled on other grounds, Norway Hill Preservation & Protection Ass'n v. King County Council, 87 Wn.2d 267, 552 P.2d 674 (1976).

OPINIONS OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Rulemaking authority.
Limited authority of Department of Ecology to adopt wetlands rules. 89 Att'y Gen. Op. No. 21.

RESEARCH REFERENCES

Univ. of Puget Sound Law Review.
Regulatory taking doctrine in Washington: now you see it, now you don't. 12 U. Puget Sound L. Rev. 339.

Washington Law Review.
For note and comment, "Wake-up Call: Using the Washington Shoreline Management Act to Protect the Shorelines of Puget Sound From High-Speed-Vessel Wake Wash," see 75 Wash. L. Rev. 519 (2000).

90.58.020. Legislative findings — State policy enunciated — Use preference.

The legislature finds that the shorelines of the state are among the most valuable and fragile of its natural resources and that there is great concern throughout the state relating to their utilization, protection, restoration, and preservation. In addition it finds that ever increasing pressures of additional uses are being placed on the shorelines necessitating increased coordination in the management and development of the shorelines of the state. The legislature further finds that much of the shorelines of the state and the uplands adjacent thereto are in private ownership; that unrestricted construction on the privately owned or publicly owned shorelines of the state is not in the best public interest; and therefore, coordinated planning is necessary in order to protect the public interest associated with the shorelines of the state while, at the same time, recognizing and protecting private property rights consistent with the public interest. There is, therefor, a clear and urgent demand for a planned, rational, and concerted effort, jointly performed by federal, state, and local governments, to prevent the inherent harm in an uncoordinated and piecemeal development of the state's shorelines.

It is the policy of the state to provide for the management of the shorelines of the state by planning for and fostering all reasonable and appropriate uses. This policy is designed to insure the development of these shorelines in a manner which, while allowing for limited reduction of rights of the public in the navigable waters, will promote and enhance the public interest. This policy contemplates protecting against adverse effects to the public health, the land and its vegetation and wildlife, and the waters of the state and their aquatic life, while protecting generally public rights of navigation and corollary rights incidental thereto.

The legislature declares that the interest of all of the people shall be paramount in the management of shorelines of statewide significance. The department, in adopting guidelines for shorelines of statewide significance, and local government, in developing master programs for shorelines of statewide significance, shall give preference to uses in the following order of preference which:

(1) Recognize and protect the statewide interest over local interest;
(2) Preserve the natural character of the shoreline;
(3) Result in long term over short term benefit;
(4) Protect the resources and ecology of the shoreline;
(5) Increase public access to publicly owned areas of the shorelines;
(6) Increase recreational opportunities for the public in the shoreline;
(7) Provide for any other element as defined in RCW 90.58.100 deemed appropriate or necessary.

In the implementation of this policy the public's opportunity to enjoy the physical and aesthetic qualities of natural shorelines of the state shall be preserved to the greatest extent feasible consistent with the overall best interest of the state and the people generally. To this end uses shall be preferred which are consistent with control of pollution and prevention of damage to the natural environment, or are unique to or dependent upon use of the state's shoreline. Alterations of the natural condition of the shorelines of the state, in those limited instances when authorized, shall be given priority for single family residences and their appurtenant structures, ports, shoreline recreational uses including but not limited to parks, marinas, piers, and other improvements facilitating public access to shorelines of the state, industrial and commercial developments which are particularly dependent on their location on or use of the shorelines of the state and other development that will provide an opportunity for substantial numbers of the people to enjoy the shorelines of the state. Alterations of the natural condition of the shorelines and shorelands of the state shall be recognized by the department. Shorelines and shorelands of the state shall be appropriately classified and these classifications shall be revised when circumstances warrant regardless of whether the change in circumstances occurs through man-made causes or natural causes. Any areas resulting from alterations of the natural condition of the shorelines and shorelands of the state no longer meeting the definition of "shorelines of the state" shall not be subject to the provisions of chapter 90.58 RCW.

Permitted uses in the shorelines of the state shall be designed and conducted in a manner to minimize, insofar as practical, any resultant damage to the ecology and environment of the shoreline area and any interference with the public's use of the water. [1995 c 347 § 301; 1992 c 105 § 1; 1982 1st ex.s. c 13 § 1; 1971 ex.s. c 286 § 2.]

Finding — Severability — Part headings and table of contents not law — 1995 c 347: See notes following RCW 36.70A.470.

JUDICIAL DECISIONS

ANALYSIS

Compatibility analysis
Department of fisheries
Dredging
Jurisdiction
Local permits
Non-conforming uses
Other element
Public access requirements
Public benefit doctrine
Public trust doctrine
Sovereign immunity
Statewide significance
Taking of property
Use
Voluntary setback

Compatibility analysis.
Because the shorelines hearings board, when doing its compatibility analysis, focused to a large degree on the project's compatibility with the bay as a whole rather than on its impact on the area immediately adjacent to the proposed site, the findings did not support the SHB's determination that Seattle Yacht Club (SYC's) proposed outstation complied with Shoreline Management Act (SMA), county's master program, and did not result in severe degradation of the pre-existing lifestyle in the area. Jefferson County v. Seattle Yacht Club, 73 Wn. App. 576, 870 P.2d 987, review denied, 124 Wn.2d 1029, 883 P.2d 326 (1994).

Department of fisheries.
Department of fisheries does not have control over harvesting of shellfish to exclusion of shorelines hearings board. English Bay Enters., Ltd. v. Island County, 89 Wn.2d 16, 568 P.2d 783 (1977).

Dredging.
Washington's Shoreline Management Act regulates and controls dredging and water quality within Washington's shoreline area. Friends of Earth v. United States Navy, 841 F.2d 927 (9th Cir.), modified on other grounds, 850 F.2d 599 (9th Cir. 1988).

The dredging and water quality regulations of the Shoreline Management Act and the Navy's permit apply to the Navy's construction of the Everett homeport, regardless of whether that activity occurs

on federal
United St
on other g

Jurisdict
Departm
under the
governme
after it h
shoreline
is not enti
by bringin
the proper
147 Wn.2c

Local per
Board p
permit for
where suc
Tacoma S
Dep't of
(1998).
The Sho
local gove
for shoreli
as defined
Skagit Co
Comme
permit req
not a "sub
of the Sh
Shacks of
743 P.2d 2
A condi
activity ev
the Shorel
Inc. v. Ska
(1986), aff
Board p
fill where
sufficient
P.2d 1038

Non-conf
Noncon
uses. A fi
tially base
the area ir
Club, 73 V
124 Wn.2c
The sho
the nonco
could only
tion of the
proposed
County v.
P.2d 987, r
(1994).

Other ele
Residen
this act. R
it was prol
time the l
ance and
Buechel v.
P.2d 910 (

Public ac
The Sho
calculatio

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
2010 SDEIS Comments and Responses - Comments Only
For Internal Use Only -- 05/26/2011 14:11 PM
Page 1708

(b) Forest lands that are not already characterized by urban growth and that have long-term significance for the commercial production of timber;

(c) Mineral resource lands that are not already characterized by urban growth and that have long-term significance for the extraction of minerals; and

(d) Critical areas.

(2) In making the designations required by this section, counties and cities shall consider the guidelines established pursuant to RCW 36.70A.050. [1990 1st ex.s. c 17 § 17.]

Editor's Notes.

The amendment by 1995 c 402 § 4, which added "and shall make such designations so that they are consistent with the comprehensive flood control management plan adopted by the county under RCW 86.26.105" at the end in (2), failed to become law. See 1995 c 402 § 28.

JUDICIAL DECISIONS

ANALYSIS

Construction
Agricultural lands

Construction.

Actions involving resource lands under RCW 36.70A.060 and this section are not considered to be moratoriums or interim zoning controls for the purposes of RCW 36.70A.390. Matson v. Clark County Bd. of Comm'rs, 79 Wn. App. 641, 904 P.2d 317 (1995).

Agricultural lands.

Amendments to a county's comprehensive plan and zoning code which allowed active recreational uses on properties located within a designated agricultural area violated the Growth Management Act, and the land in question did not qualify for innovative zoning techniques under RCW 36.70A.177. King County v. Central Puget Sound Growth Mgt. Hearings Bd., 142 Wn.2d 543, 14 P.3d 133 (2000).

36.70A.172. Critical areas — Designation and protection — Best available science to be used.

(1) In designating and protecting critical areas under this chapter, counties and cities shall include the best available science in developing policies and development regulations to protect the functions and values of critical areas. In addition, counties and cities shall give special consideration to conservation or protection measures necessary to preserve or enhance anadromous fisheries.

(2) If it determines that advice from scientific or other experts is necessary or will be of substantial assistance in reaching its decision, a growth management hearings board may retain scientific or other expert advice to assist in reviewing a petition under RCW 36.70A.290 that involves critical areas. [1995 c 347 § 105.]

Finding — Severability — Part headings and table of contents not law — 1995 c 347: See notes following RCW 36.70A.470.

JUDICIAL DECISIONS

Review of policies.

If a city or county chooses to adopt critical areas policies, the board has jurisdiction, pursuant to RCW 36.70A.280, to review such policies, but only for purpose of determining whether the policies are in compliance with the requirement of this section to include the best available science in the process of developing a policy. Honesty in Envtl. Analysis & Legislation v. Central Puget Sound Growth Mgt. Hearings Bd., 96 Wn. App. 522, 979 P.2d 864 (1999).

Wetlands regulated under de
shall be delineated in accordan
to RCW 90.58.380. [1995 c 382

36.70A.177. Agricultural lands —

(1) A county or a city may use
designated as agricultural lands
36.70A.170. The innovative zoning
tural lands and encourage the agric
nonagricultural uses to be limited to
agricultural purposes.

(2) Innovative zoning techniques
limited to:

(a) Agricultural zoning, which lim
prohibits nonfarm uses of agricultura

(b) Cluster zoning, which allows ne
the remainder in agricultural or oper

(c) Large lot zoning, which establi
necessary to achieve a successful farm

(d) Quarter/quarter zoning, which
minimum lot for each one-sixteenth o

(e) Sliding scale zoning, which allo
purposes with a minimum lot size of o
acreage increases. [1997 c 429 § 23.]

Severability — 1997 c 429: See note follo
RCW 36.70A.3201.

JUDI

ANALYSIS

Construction
Applicability

Construction.

In order to constitute an innovative zoning t
nique consistent with the overall meaning of
Growth Management Act, a development regula
must satisfy the mandate under RCW 36.70A.02
36.70A.060, and 36.70A.170 to conserve agricultu

36.70A.180. Report on planning pro

(1) It is the intent of the legislature
comprehensive plan under RCW 36.70A
before July 1, 1990, including but not
conserving agricultural, forest, and min
considering the modification or adoption
ment regulations implementing the comp
the legislature that funds be made availal
to assist them in meeting the requireme

Received
APR 15 2010
SR520 Document Control

A Note From
Mr. J. Bader

Here are my comments to the City Council on the Nelson/Nygaard Report. It's clear from the City Council hearing that few of the speakers realize what removing the auxiliary lane and a 90° turn at Montlake for the on and off ramps would add to the congestion. WSDOT needs to publish data on the back-ups resulting so that the public is informed, especially freight mobility people, and users of the ramps.

Jozsef Bader
4/8/2010

A Note From
Mr. J. Bader

From: Sullivan, Joseph M [mailto:joseph.m.sullivan@boeing.com]
Sent: Friday, April 16, 2010 1:47 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Opposition to WSDOT SR 520 DEIS and Construction Option A

I-298-001 TO: WSDOT - SR 520 DEIS
Council Members,
I have made of list of my concerns and request they be acknowledged and included in our building of a new bridge:
I am requesting construction processes for noise mitigation during construction. And bridge deck evaluation of 'quiet pavement' on the bridge (vs. I-405 test) and use of sound walls or Lid.on the sides of the Portage Bay viaduct.
I am requesting a video of our current structure and mitigation for damage for dust/air quality of from bridge removal as well as vibration on our Condominiums and moorage slips and our house down the street.

I-298-002 I request mitigation of Boyer Ave. traffic impacts from heavy equipment. And any loss of renters/rent do to congestion on Boyer Ave..

I-298-003 I am requesting you save our parks and nature walk in South Portage Bay. Original SR 520 construction affected the bay in many ways: silt build up, water quality, shoreline, native species, native plants, and fish/salmon habitat. Reclaiming South Portage Bay with removal of silt, invasive plant life, restoration of shoreline (see www.fabnia.org) and better recreational access will provide an important dimension to Seattle's urban quality of life.

I-298-004 I believe WSDOT is biased, and that local officials and agencies of government are under pressure from business interests anxious for mass cross-lake transit at any cost.
Option A & A+ ignores our concerns to mitigate highway noise. Although WSDOT convened an expert panel on noise, there is no provision in Option A/A+ for any noise-abatement systems.

I-298-005 Option A/A+ adds a second drawbridge across the Montlake cut, destroying homes (some of which may be historic). And it fails to improve transit speed or reliability and overloads the intersections on either side. WSDOT's own analysis predicts the volume of traffic able to cross the cut will not increase beyond what can cross it even if we do nothing at all.
I strongly urge 'building SR 520 right' this time.
Thanks,
Joe

I-299-001

This note contains comments and feedback to the Supplemental Draft EIS for SR520 published 1/2010. As it stands, Chapter 5 and other sections of the Supplemental draft EIS (hereafter SdEIS) are inadequate for a variety of reasons:

1. The SdEIS fails to provide critical analysis on travel times on city streets for any alternatives. Travel-time information is vital for assessing the impact of all of the SR520 designs on city residents. Additional information is necessary or Chapter 5 should be rejected.

I-299-002

2. The analysis of bicycle-pedestrian impacts on Seattle city streets and sidewalks is deficient. Option A creates additional bicycle trips on the sidewalks of Montlake Blvd between SR520 and Husky Stadium. There is no analysis of how many. The sidewalks are narrow, saturated, and dangerous for bicyclists and pedestrians at the present. These problems will be exacerbated. A far more comprehensive analysis of sidewalk use within a mile of SR520 along Montlake Blvd is essential or else the SdEIS should be rejected.

I-299-003

3. The discussion of the impact of the proposed parallel vascule bridge over the Montlake cut is inadequate. The SdEIS must provide a way to evaluate the costs and benefits of this bridge. For example, I cannot determine whether the Montlake Bridge itself is the real impediment to traffic flows and person-carrying capacity flows on Montlake Blvd. If the major impediments to traffic flow are actually nearby street lights (NE Pacific Ave, Roanoke Blvd) then adding a vascule bridge has no significant purpose. The SdEIS needs a with/without analysis of the vascule bridge on vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic. Bicycle and pedestrian travel along the east side of Montlake Blvd must be thoughtfully considered. As it stands, the SdEIS is inadequate.

I-299-004

4. It is a major goal of UW's transportation plan and its climate action plan to encourage bicycle commuting to the campus. The impact of the proposed design alternatives on bicycle travel times and corridor safety from SR520 to the main campus destinations (south campus, main campus, east campus, west campus) cannot be assessed. The SdEIS is inadequate.

I-299-005

5. The geometry assumed for hauling spoils along NE Pacific Place near the UW campus is inadequate. The city, Sound Transit, and UW are considering two very different plans for the road geometry and pedestrian crossing pathways in this area. The SdEIS is not cognizant of either.

6. We live in the 2100 block of Shelby St in Seattle. Certain design alternatives call for hauling of spoils along Shelby and nearby Hamlin streets. Estimates vary from 5 to 20 hauls per hour on downhill and uphill grades, presumably using huge, heavy, and noisy diesel trucks. The streets are old and narrow. The water mains under them are probably a century old and in need of occasional repairs. Many homes have no feasible alternative to on-street parking. There are traffic lights at the west ends of both streets.

I-299-006 Parking mitigation is not described in the SdEIS. Road damage is not assessed.
I-299-007 Noise levels of full and empty trucks on the inclined streets are not even mentioned, especially at the west end of Shelby St where large trucks must accelerate uphill when the traffic light turns green.
I-299-008 In addition, under-street repairs to water mains cannot be attempted with large trucks using the streets. Ingress and egress for large emergency vehicles are not
I-299-009 addressed. Noise and vibration mitigation measures are not adequately analyzed.
I-299-010 The safety issues related to small children who live along these two residential streets must be addressed. The impact on bicycle commuters who regularly use the streets are not analyzed. The generation of construction dust, lights, and noise
I-299-011 needs to be added to the SdEIS.
I-299-012 There is no mention of any alternative means of disposing of spoils, such as barges or temporary truck ramps to SR520. There is also no mention of how the
I-299-013 construction-related problems will be addressed if the City of Seattle does not issue a construction variance.

I-299-014 7. Property values will be affected by various road configurations. Because of its location, I would guess that our property values will decrease by 10-20% for option A (or A+), decrease by a few percent for option L and may increase sightly for option K. While property value may not be a problem taken up in the SdEIS, it has an impact on the budgets of the project options.

8. Similarly, there is no mention in the SdEIS of litigation costs that are likely to be incurred under each of the three of the alternative plans. These costs need to be added to the costs of each of the alternatives, along with an analysis of the related construction delays and their costs. Since so much of the value of my property is threatened in option A, I plan to support and join a neighborhood group to defend our property values and quality of life.

I-299-015 We oppose option A-A+ for its obvious impacts on the Lake Washington waterfront and the Arboretum. The road width is the primary problem. The quality of the Arboretum experience will be badly compromised. We also opposed A-A+ for many
I-299-016 of the reasons mentioned above, especially its lack of benefit on city residents and drivers, its possible negative impacts on bikes and pedestrians on sidewalks between the SR520 roadway and UW, and the loss of property value of my house and those of my neighbors.

We favor a 4-lane SR520 bridge that fits within the footprint of the existing SR520 right of way in Seattle. Of the designs A, K, and L, only option L is acceptable. Despite its many merits, option K is a blight.

Bruce & Della Balick
Seattle 98112
24 January 2010