1. The ScEIS 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.

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 ScEIS should be rejected.

3. The discussion of the impact of the proposed parallel vascule bridge over the Montlake cut is inadequate. The ScEIS 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 ScEIS 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 ScEIS is inadequate.

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 ScEIS is inadequate.

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 ScEIS 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.
Parking mitigation is not described in the SdEIS. Road damage is not assessed. 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.

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 addressed. Noise and vibration mitigation measures are not adequately analyzed. 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 needs to be added to the SdEIS.

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 construction-related problems will be addressed if the City of Seattle does not issue a construction variance.

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 slightly 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.

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 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
From: Dick Burkhart [mailto:dickburkhart@comcast.net]  
Sent: Saturday, January 23, 2010 11:29 PM  
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS  
Subject: Comment on the 520 SDEIS

The 520 SDEIS is deeply flawed on a critical point. As a consequence, it does not consider some options that will both save money and improve future mobility.

The flaw is that future traffic is highly unlikely to match extrapolations from past trends. The reasons are the two unmentioned elephants in the living room: (1) Peak Oil and (2) Climate Change.

Because of Peak Oil, SOV-type daily commutes will rapidly become unaffordable for much of the middle class over medium to longer distances. This will be one aspect of a long term economic contraction that will likely continue, with ups and downs, until alternatives to fossil fuels become more affordable on a mass scale. Thus a more realistic scenario for 2030 would project decreased traffic, not increased.

Mandates to address Climate Change will just reinforce this economic trend. In other words, extrapolations cannot take into account paradigm shifts. What are needed are different scenarios that do take these into account, thereby also better capturing the true level of uncertainty that civilization is facing.

One consequence is that the two HOV lanes should be designed as exclusive transit lanes from the beginning, including building in rails for future light rail, or at least designing to make this very easy to do in the future. With congestion-price type tolling, there will be strong incentives for carpools even without carpool lanes. Meanwhile barrier-separated transit lanes won’t slow to a crawl during rush hour, as do current HOV lanes, providing far more reliable service, hence getting many more people out of their cars. In fact, by 2030, after skyrocketing oil prices and economic contraction, we might find that a 4 lane configuration would work just fine, so this should be studied as well.

We should also just say no to the Arboretum on and off ramps in the A+ option and go for the simpler A option. These ramps will do nothing to encourage transit or carpooling, quite the opposite, while preventing restoration of the Arboretum.

However, we should say yes to the transit flyer stops omitted by all the options.

Dick Burkhart  
4802 S. Othello St.  
Seattle, WA 98118-3851  
206-721-5672 (home) 206-851-0027 (cell)  
dickburkhart@comcast.net
From: LisaAnneSC@comcast.net [mailto:LisaAnneSC@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, January 23, 2010 1:31 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject:

My daughter goes to college at seattle university. Will there be a student discount? Lisa Cowdin
From: John Gowdy [mailto:john@thegowdys.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 24, 2010 4:36 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Tolls

How can automated tolls work as the only means to collect the tolls when there are many non-local vehicles that won’t have access to a transponder & some vehicles that don’t have a front license plate?

If it is the rear license plate that is photographed, how do you collect from out of state or out of country vehicles?

This may not be the correct forum for this question, but please pass it on to the appropriate agency.

John Gowdy

john@thegowdys.com
From: John Hutchinson [mailto:jhutch@packetvelocity.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2010 7:56 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: comments re 520 plan

Dear WDot;

I trust this is the forum for comments about the current plan for 520, and if so here are a few thoughts from someone who has lived in Montlake and the Hamlin/Shelby neighborhood for years.

First I appreciate the recent e mail with the details of the plan. It was well laid out and easy to read.

It will be a huge disruption to the neighborhood for many years, and anything that can be done to mitigate the noise, traffic, etc will be most appreciated by those of us who live here.

Hopefully the end result will be good for the neighborhood with lids across the freeway, parks, a bike path across 520, etc.

I would hope the plan allows for the eventual addition of rapid transit across the 520 bridge.

I strongly support your choice of the A+ plan. It is the least expensive. It creates the least destruction of the wetlands, animal habitat, and pristine views and access to Portage Bay. The area around the south side of Portage Bay is a unique wild beautiful area, home to many animals, and a wonderful refuge for human visitors amid an urban setting. Please preserve it.

Would it not be simpler, better for traffic flow, and more esthetically pleasing to replace the current Montlake bridge with a single new bridge of 6 lanes, the right lanes each way of which could be dedicated at least during rush hour to exit from and entrance on to 520? Surely a new bridge could be built to look very similar to the current structure, which is probably antiquated and in need of modernization.

Thanks for your interest. John Hutchinson 2158 E. Shelby St.
From: Clark Frazier [mailto:ClarkFrazier@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2010 11:58 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Comments on the 520 I-5 Junction Options; The I-5 Interchange Design Options Are Unacceptable

Comments on the 520 I-5 Junction Options; The I-5 Interchange Design Options Are Unacceptable:

I have taken a quick look at your user unfriendly on-line PDF document describing a summary of the I-5 interchange options. Rebuilding the interchange in its present configuration is a complete waste of money because it would simply replicate a major traffic hazard, especially for drivers attempting to navigate to the Mercer Mess off ramp. Unfortunately, the extra southbound lane that picks up on the left tempts I-5 drivers to move left in the same area where drivers exiting 520 are attempting to move right. I have seen many near misses, especially when traffic is at levels B, C or D (congested but moving, often at widely varying speeds). A properly designed left hand entrance ramp (if such a thing is possible) would add a new lane to the right and force drivers to merge in one lane with a line configuration not permitting I-5 drivers to move left into that lane. To mitigate the problem, a direct connection or exit from I-5 to the Mercer mess exit is needed. Without such a fix, I don’t believe that any work should be done on the interchange except to restripe the lanes into a slightly safer configuration.

In general I am opposed to the entire project because it does not include light rail. I often don’t go to events at the Seattle Center because of the extreme congestion on the 520 bridge and the painfully congested traffic around the Seattle Center. One thing the Metro planners don’t seem to grasp is the need to add a second entry into Seattle for light rail. Attempting to connect a 520 light rail line with the transit tunnel or the line north to the University of Washington is not really possible in a southbound direction. Instead, the transit alignment should be routed along the 520 corridor with a new interchange station and possibly a connection to the north and then call at Seattle Center before proceeding downtown on either a First Street or Third Street for a more rational connection with the existing transit tunnel. Adding bus and HOV lanes will not create service to the Seattle Center or parts of downtown remote from the existing Light Rail tunnel. With HOV and bus lanes, the high operating costs associated with buses will preclude increasing evening service to a more acceptable level of at least every 15 minutes until after 11:00 PM. Since there are no real benefits to this project for transit riders or non-carpool users, this project should be scrapped and the existing pontoons should be used to replace the floating part of the bridge and the rest of structure should be shored up enough to prevent seismic collapse and call it a day. The money would be better used elsewhere until someone with real imagination can come up with a better design.

Clark Frazier
15821 NE 96th Way
Redmond, WA 98052
From: Jean Amick [mailto:jeanseattle@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2010 6:36 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Comments

Plan A+ still has cars, buses, and trucks stuck at a drawbridge(s) to and from the North. This is not good for our environment as vehicles do not turn off their engines as advised. Also, buses cannot adhere to any schedule if the drawbridge goes up at will for a sailboat pleasure craft.

This is the 21st century and the ship canal should have a schedule for boaters to adhere to. We do not have a Navy or Coast Guard for national security, except maybe once or twice a year.

Having a regular drawbridge openings schedule would sure be a cheap way to keep traffic moving.

Thank you for asking for comments,

Jean Amick
3008 E Laurelhurst Dr NE
Seattle WA 98105
206-525-7065
jeanseattle@earthlink.net
From: Dr. Curt Nelson [mailto:drnelson@nelsonchiro.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2010 12:25 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: 520 replacement

Dear Sir or Madam,

My comment about the 520 replacement plan is that the capacity must be increased! The current plan of 2 general purpose lanes and one carpool lane in each direction is not enough! This is even more true if plans are carried out that would reduce the capacity of I-90 by transferring those carpool lanes to light rail. In the current plan for 520, while it is an improvement over the present situation, it is clearly inadequate and will be in need of update upon it’s very opening. This is a key link in the region and even more so if I-90’s capacity is reduced. It should be AT LEAST 3 general purpose lanes and one carpool lane in each direction.

Curt Nelson
16250 NE 80th St
Redmond, WA 98052
425-867-1119
-----Original Message-----
From: Sherman w Bushnell [mailto:swbushy1@juno.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 04, 2010 2:04 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Noise Walls

I live on Portage Bay. For years we have suffered from the nosie of the 520 freeway. The new bridge with its expanded traffic will compound the noise. It is extremely important that there be noise walls all the way through Portage Bay.

Sherman Bushnell
1214 E. Hamlin, #4
Seattle, WA. 98102
From: Ted Nelson [mailto:tedandderby@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2010 8:01 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: One question before we spend all this money

The following is not a guess. It is a fact. All major automakers have recently announced publicly that within two years we will have affordable cars getting 60 miles to the gallon on our roads. This is also a key component and promise of our President. It will happen. How will this impact the money we are planning to spend. How will this impact HOV, bus transportation, car usage, rail usage and how many more cars, and hours of usage per driver do you anticipate, and have written into current plans? And how are our plans flexible to account for this upcoming impact. How do you account for these small new commuter cars? The public deserve to have the impacts evaluated, and deserve answers. We just want to know if your plans are for the future that is coming, or do you have plans that make invalid assumptions, and as such, allude to a future that will not be. These questions are extremely valid, specially in Washington, where we had a governor that built nuclear power plants that were going out of style. In essence, we have a long history of not thinking ahead, and when it comes to spending big time public money, not thinking at all. Please respond. Is your evaluation looking at the future, or looking at a present that is highly likely not to be our future?

Ted Nelson
Queen Anne
From: Alan Rosebrock [mailto:aroseybeast@verizon.net]
Sent: Friday, January 22, 2010 7:16 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: East side 520 corridor

To whom it may concern,
I want to add my support for the bridge replacement program.
I am very supportive of the additional lane, the bike lane and the lids that will greatly reduce the noise levels. The lids will also serve to connect the neighborhoods on the north and south sides of 520.
I live in Kirkland and plan to make regular use of the bike lane AND the HOV lane by using the bus.
I look forward to using the light rail as well when it comes to the eastside on my commute to work.
Keep improving the transportation system in NW Washington!
Sincerely,

Alan Rosebrock
Kirkland, WA
425-922-1258
-----Original Message-----
From: HQ Customer Service
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2010 2:16 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge Replacement & HOV Project
Subject: Dustin Collings - WSDOT Feedback form: comments about effects of widening project on SR 520

I believe this e-mail is for your project team...

Please have the appropriate person respond to the e-mail below with a cc to HQ Customer Service.

Thank you.

Kimberly Colburn
HQ Customer Service
360-705-7438

-----Original Message-----
From: dustinocollein@yahoo.com [mailto:dustinocollein@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2010 12:43 PM
To: HQ Customer Service
Subject: WSDOT Feedback form

The following is the contents of a form submitted on 2/18/2010 12:42:49 PM

=====My Contact information===== 
Name: Dustin Collings
E-mail: dustinocollein@yahoo.com
Phone: 206-547-1253
Street Address: 4111-11th Avenue NE
City: Seattle
State: WA
Zip Code: 98105-6305

====== My Question/Comment/Complaint ======

We, I, are concerned about please do not widen the "ditch" SR520 is in in the Montlake area. It is pretty and we don't want to lose houses, mansions, streets, or trees in the Washington Park area to any kind of widening project.

Dustin Collings
Seattle, Washington
February 18th, 2010

=================================

*** Browser Type ***
Browser: Mozilla/4.0 (compatible; MSIE 8.0; Windows NT 5.1; Trident/4.0; GTB6.3; .NET CLR 1.1.4322; InfoPath.1
From: Buster Simpson [mailto:buster@bustersimpson.net]
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2010 5:06 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: transit is the way.

I think the seattle mayor has a point about designing the bridge for transit. cars will choke the city physically and respiratory, please realign your premises. thank you

Buster Simpson
901 Yakima Ave S, Seattle, WA 98144  206.328.6212
buster@bustersimpson.net
www.bustersimpson.net
***
From: Storb, Rainer F [mailto:rstorb@fhcrc.org]  
Sent: Sunday, January 24, 2010 2:14 PM  
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS  
Subject: SR 520 Bridge Plan

I have been both living (Madison Park) and working (UW Medical School and Hutchinson Cancer Research Center) in the 43rd District for more than 4 decades. Given that, I am writing to let you know of my concerns about the new Plan A+ for rebuilding the SR 520 bridge, which has been recommended by the legislative work group. Plan A+ ignores the work by the mediation group, which had the support by the Bay Area communities. It eliminates the tunnel under the Montlake Cut and, instead, adds a new drawbridge over the Cut, which may necessitate removal of several residences. A new drawbridge shares the problem of the current drawbridge, which is opening and closing approximately 90 times daily and creating remarkable traffic backups. Further, Plan A+ proposes to place the highway 30 - 40 feet above the water rather than keeping it at the current level of 4 feet. This would be architectural insensitivity akin to moving Alaskan Way Viaduct from Elliott Bay to Union Bay and to Lake Washington and repeat that major city-planning blunder from the 1950's. Also, while not an engineer, I wonder about susceptibility of such an elevated, floating structure to high winds.

While any bridge floating on Lake Washington and cutting through unique, precious wetlands abutting Foster Island is like a scar, Plan K (now Plan M), supported by the Bay Area communities, minimized the bridge's impact. It kept the bridge at its current height, included tunnels east of the Museum of History and Industry and under the Montlake Cut, had a Foster Island lid, moved the interchange and, importantly, required noise abatement.

I strongly urge you to drop Plan A+ and, instead, to implement Plan M (formerly K) as developed by the mediation group and supported by the Bay Area communities. Repeating the Alaskan Viaduct desaster from the 1950's along with ruining irreplaceable wetlands per Plan A+ would make our children, grandchildren and their children wonder what we were thinking of.

Sincerely yours,

Rainer Storb

Rainer Storb, MD  
Head & Member, Transplantation Biology Program,  
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center  
Professor of Medicine,  
University of Washington  
TEL: 206-667-4407  
FAX: 206-667-6124  
rstorb@fhcrc.org

This electronic message transmission contains information which may be confidential or privileged. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify us by telephone at (206) 667-4409 or by electronic reply, and delete this message.
From: Carl Stork [mailto:carl@ciconiaco.com]
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2010 9:30 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Questions about Montlake/520 Interchange

I have some questions regarding the traffic flow and ramps at Montlake Blvd and the 520 interchange in Option A. Who can I call to get answers to my questions?

Carl Stork
(425) 467-0981 ext 101
carl@ciconiaco.com
-----Original Message-----
From: Brenda Greger [mailto:brendagreger@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2010 8:22 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: sundays should be free

I hope those in charge of the project will seriously consider having Sundays be complimentary pass days (no toll) on the 520. I strongly feel that kids going to SPU and the UW should be able to go home and visit their families for a Sunday dinner or go to church on the Eastside without being penalized. Speaking as a parent, while I may have enough money to pay for my kid to cross the bridge, it is in nobody's best interest to have to consistently teach these kids that mom and dad can pay for everything. We are encouraging and preparing our sons to be their own men, pay for their own way, and learn to do things on their own. I know, however, that a financial charge every Sunday to go home and visit would make that a difficult decision.

Also, there are churches on the Eastside that many college students visit on Sundays. A financial burden is not an asset to encouraging this behavior and improving their moral compass which is very important in this time of their life.

I propose that allowing Sunday to be a "free pass" day will be seen as a "gift" to the citizens of this area, possibly easing the financial and mental burden that the new toll will bring with its resurrection.

Thanks for your consideration!

Brenda Greger
From: Kath or Mike Wagner [mailto:mewagner5@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2010 3:44 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: other needs

Could southbound exit to 520 be changed to a right lane configuration rather than left lane. This would cause a smoother transition rather than all the lane changing that goes on now. kathleen Wagner
From: Corinna Bolender [mailto:Corinna.Bolender@microsoft.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2010 1:43 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Comments

I had heard that the two carpool lanes might be converted to transit only leaving just four lanes for regular traffic, just as the bridge exists currently, is this correct information? It really doesn’t seem like that would help the flow of traffic. I also think the carpool lane should be 2+ drivers vs. 3+ drivers as it currently exists, the same as on all other state highways to ensure optimum throughput.

Also, any light rail options they install in the Seattle area should be similar to Vancouver where they have a skytrain (elevated or underneath) that is significantly faster than taking your vehicle and doesn’t cause additional traffic jams or potential collisions, with vehicle, people or animals. The on the road train systems are hazards that just further congest things.
From: Reber, Richard L. (DOC) [mailto:rreber@DOC1.WA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 9:36 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: NO TOLLS

NO TOLLS
From: Sandberg, John [mailto:john.sandberg@wsl.com]
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 10:13 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: 520 bridge replacement

Build the replacement 520 bridge with 4 general purpose lanes and 2 HOV lanes. We are shorted only building 6 lanes, I wish we'd build additional SOV capacity, but our leadership has different views.
From: jim.schnitzius [mailto:jim.schnitzius@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, February 13, 2010 11:25 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Input to SR 520 bridge project

My two cents…

The goals of the 520 project is to:
1) Reduce congestion by moving more people in the shortest amount of time possible
2) Reduce the impact to the surrounding environment
3) Don’t break the bank

I’d like to comment on #1 goal only as I am not aware of all the environmental and cost implications, though some suggestions are meant to reduce environmental impact.

Congestion is caused by traffic having to slow down or stop.
Traffic slows down or stops because:
1) Draw bridges
2) Traffic lights
3) Poor road system design
4) Too many vehicles for road capacity

So the more of the above items you can eliminate, the more successful you will be in meeting the goal.
Assumptions:
➢ Populations will continue to increase and therefore the need to transport people will continue.
➢ Light rail to Eastside will be via I-90.

#1) Draw bridge solution:
Use tunnel or tube solution for Pacific/Montlake area for traffic going to SR520 only. Keep Montlake bridge for traffic going N. & S. on Montlake.

#2) Traffic lights solutions:
Via special “exit only lanes”, traffic traveling to or from Pacific or Montlake (via tunnel/tube) do not stop at the Pacific & Montlake intersection. I can give you more information on what this design would look like.

#3) Poor road system design solution:
Flow from westbound SR520 to southbound I-5 needs to be improved. Keep current ramp design for transit/carpool, but build a single lane ramp that enters I-5 on the far right side. This will eliminate traffic needing to cut across all lanes of I-5 to exit at Mercer.

#4) Too many vehicles for road capacity solutions:
Increase the use of transit and smaller/narrower vehicles.
Requirements: Bridge must accommodate buses/carpool and slow moving vehicles (i.e. bicycles (both manual and electric) and scooters) in both directions. (Pedestrian traffic is not required))

We need to encourage people to get out of their single occupancy cars and take the bus, carpool or ride a scooter or bike. But to make these appealing we need to make special accommodations for them. Unlike I-5, rush hour is heavy in both directions, so a dedicated carpool lane is needed in both directions, one that you can’t buy your way on to.

New electric bicycles are coming to the market that are a great alternative to cars and can travel at 20mph. But nobody will buy them if there are not paths to drive them on. So a dedicated lane for bikes and scooters is needed and since these don’t mix with pedestrians very well, pedestrians should not be allowed on the same lane. Ideally Eastbound bike/scooter traffic should be separated from Westbound in some way to avoid head on collisions.

Since bike/scooter lanes can be narrower than car/truck lanes, bike/scooter lanes could be located on the same level as the cars or tucked under elevated sections of the bridge. A third option would be to elevate it over the center of the main bridge deck with an option to have a roof overhead. This elevated section would not need to be as strong as one for the light rail system since the bike and scooter traffic would not have nearly the mass or weight. This elevated option would allow the footprint of the bridge to stay the same. If the bridge continues to be a floating bridge, then where the bike/scooter lanes go could be a combination of all three with the lane being on the side or under the deck at elevated sections and then elevating the bike/scooter lane when the bridge deck is at lake level.

So in summary:

- Six lane bridge option with dedicated transit/carpool lane, plus accommodations for 10mph min to 30mph max bike/scooter lanes.
- Tunnel/tube in parallel with current draw bridge at Montlake
- No stop interchange at Pacific & Montlake to and from tunnel/tube.
- 2 ramps from SR520 to I-5 Southbound, carpool ramp that enters I-5 on far left lane and the another on the far right.

If you would like to talk or meet with me on any of these ideas, please let me know.

Thanks,
Jim Schnitzius
Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement
SDEIS Comment Form

Please use this form to share your comments on the content provided in the Supplemental Draft EIS document. WSDOT will consider all comments received between Jan. 22 and March 8, 2010 in making its final decision in the environmental review process. Thank you for your comments.

You can provide comments through one of the following methods:

- **Complete this form** and place it in the comment box. Please write clearly.
- **Mail** your comments to Jenifer Young, SR 520, I-5 to Medina Environmental Manager, Washington State Department of Transportation, 600 Stewart Street, Suite 520, Seattle, WA 98101.
- **E-mail** your comments to SR520Bridge_SDEIS@wsdot.wa.gov.
- **Visit the Web page** at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge.

Name
Audrey Foss

Address
4916 40th Ave NE

City
Seattle
State
WA
Zip
98105

These comments will become part of the public record for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Personal information is voluntary and will become part of the public record if provided. The Washington State Department of Transportation is a public agency and is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Therefore, meeting comments may be made available to anyone requesting them for non-commercial purposes.

Do you have any comments on the Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

The A+ option has been fully evaluated and is the only acceptable option. The K/L/K is a diversification option, and the others were not considered. All are barely affordable options.

No doing a in 4 lane replacement, etc. etc. etc. etc. etc. etc. etc. etc.
Do you have any comments on the Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement? (continued from page 1)

These points have not been made many times but the small questions are not often timed. I believe the certain public officials have been very casual in their support of the C/D project and have suppressed the broader public view. At least six major neighborhood groups have sent numerous letters regarding their support for a project that supports 20k to 60k vehicles per day.
Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement
SDEIS Comment Form

Please use this form to share your comments on the content provided in the Supplemental Draft EIS document. WSDOT will consider all comments received between Jan. 22 and March 8, 2010 in making its final decision in the environmental review process. Thank you for your comments.

You can provide comments through one of the following methods:

- **Complete this form** and place it in the comment box. Please write clearly.
- **Mail** your comments to Jenifer Young, SR 520, I-5 to Medina Environmental Manager, Washington State Department of Transportation, 600 Stewart Street, Suite 520, Seattle, WA 98101.
- **E-mail** your comments to SR520Bridge_SDEIS@wsdot.wa.gov.
- **Visit the Web page** at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge.

Name **BILL LARSEN**
E-mail **BL3538@gmail.com**
Address **10208 21st Ave SW**
City **SEATTLE**
State **WA**
Zip **98146**

These comments will become part of the public record for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Personal information is voluntary and will become part of the public record if provided. The Washington State Department of Transportation is a public agency and is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Therefore, meeting comments may be made available to anyone requesting them for non-commercial purposes.

Do you have any comments on the Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

**USE AMERICAN MADE MATERIALS!**

**USE AMERICAN WORKERS!**

**USE UNION LABOR!**

**KEEP AMERICA STRONG!!**

**VOTE DEMOCRAT**
Do you have any comments on the Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement? (continued from page 1)
Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement
SDEIS Comment Form

Please use this form to share your comments on the content provided in the Supplemental Draft EIS document. WSDOT will consider all comments received between Jan. 22 and March 8, 2010 in making its final decision in the environmental review process. Thank you for your comments.

You can provide comments through one of the following methods:

- **Complete this form** and place it in the comment box. Please write clearly.
- **Mail** your comments to Jenifer Young, SR 520, I-5 to Medina Environmental Manager, Washington State Department of Transportation, 600 Stewart Street, Suite 520, Seattle, WA 98101.
- **E-mail** your comments to SR520Bridge_SDEIS@wsdot.wa.gov.
- **Visit the Web page** at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge.

Name

Address

City

State

Zip

E-mail

These comments will become part of the public record for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Personal information is voluntary and will become part of the public record if provided. The Washington State Department of Transportation is a public agency and is subject to the State of Washington’s Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Therefore, meeting comments may be made available to anyone requesting them for non-commercial purposes.

Do you have any comments on the Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

*Light Rail must be a priority*

*All products used to construct bridge should be U.S. made*

*Labor should be 1) union labor 2) all U.S. citizens*
Do you have any comments on the Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement? (continued from page 1)
Dear Folks ---

I like Option A, but I don't like traffic going through the Arboretum.

I think that all bridge traffic should go to Montlake and spread out unless it's going on to I-5.

The Arboretum should be a sanctuary for nature.

Joan

Jennifer Young
SR 520 Office
600 Stewart St.
Seattle, WA 98101
From: Roger Kuykendall [mailto:rkuykendall@g-o.com]  
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2010 8:25 AM  
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS  
Subject: Comments on SR520 Bridge

I moved to the Seattle area in 1986 and for the last 24 years have experienced the constant construction on Interstate 405, with bridges and travel lanes being ripped apart and widened 5-6 feet, and then ripped apart again to add another 8-10 feet, then ripped apart again to move the lanes over, or to accommodate a new off ramp, or bus lane/pullout. I do not understand why the state cannot plan for future traffic demands, and construct the infrastructure necessary to accommodate that growth in an organized, cost-effective manner. Frankly, it’s embarrassing.

Regarding the new SR 520 Bridge project, I have no objections to tolls, but please construct a bridge, roadway, and access ramps for the FUTURE needs of the traveling public. Two general purpose lanes and one bus lane, with options for a bike lane and/or light rail is not enough capacity for the year 2060. No matter how much social engineering you try to force, Americans love driving their cars, especially with bus routes being more expensive, inconvenient, and time consuming than driving my own car. Unless/until limited access highways are constructed to go around Lake Washington, or another bridge is added, the bridges across the Lake need to be constructed with the next 50 years of growth considered. The way the county has developed over the last 40 years makes having a high density of growth on the eastside near impossible, so it should be expected that growth will continue to spread east, requiring a higher capacity bridge (and connecting roads) – 2 lanes is not enough!

As for the people living at either bridge ends, and their complaints about the noise and pollution – they knew this was coming, so they accepted any “loss” of property value or quality of life when they purchased their property. Noise and pollution can be easily mitigated. The state has been discussing the bridge replacement at least since I arrived in the area in 1986, so certainly anyone who has purchased property since then did it knowing that one day the bridge would be expanded/ replaced. The same growth and “progress” that has made them fortunate enough to purchase waterfront property is what requires the bridge to be expanded, so in a sense they have caused the bridge to be replaced, while benefiting from the wealth they obtained during the economic growth in the area. They have enjoyed living next to the lake and SR 520 corridor since the bridge was constructed. Without the bridge (enabling them to work and play in Seattle), the lake front property would not be as desirable. In fact, since all of the waterfront property has been developed, its value has been reduced by the fact that so many homes are crowded on the shores – their property values and quality of life have been negatively affected more by their neighbors than any bridge could ever cause. We all grow together – there are no special privileges just because you have money and live next to a major traffic corridor. What alternative solutions have they brought to the table?

Roger Kuykendall, P.E.  
10620 NE 154th Place  
Bothell, Washington 98011
From: Hellriegel, John [mailto:john.hellriegel@boeing.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2010 12:18 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: 520 bridge

My bias is always towards preserving green space or creating more of it. I use that area for recreation on a regular basis and the time spent there increases in the summer!

Options A and K seem to be the ones that best preserve the green space while addressing the traffic issues. I would support either one.

Cheers-

John Hellriegel
From: Nathan Sikes [mailto:nsikes@abbae.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2010 10:40 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: 520 opinion

I think it is sick and wrong to attempt to make the bridge larger just for cars. We need dedicated mass transit at every possible route in this city. That would drastically reduce traffic and provide a clear alternative to sitting in traffic.

Thanks,

Nathan Sikes, B.L. Arch.

This communication constitutes an electronic communication within the meaning of the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 19 USC 2510, and its disclosure is strictly limited to the recipient intended by the sender of this message. This communication may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient and the disclosure to anyone other than the intended recipient does not constitute a loss of the confidential or privileged nature of the communication. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by return electronic mail and delete all copies of this communication. Please check for any defects or viruses before opening or using any attachments. There is no warranty that this e-mail is virus free or without error. Allana Buick & Bers, Inc. is not liable if an attachment is altered without its written consent. Thank you.
From: Sue and Bryan Cairns [mailto:bscairns@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2010 3:21 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Comments

We have spent years determining the design of the bridge structure, from the 4 lane Seattle put to the 8 lane East side initial preference. After years of debate the rather obvious 6 lane configuration with lane designations has been adopted. It is my understanding that things are now moving ahead with the contract for the pontoons let. The East side configuration is largely in place I understand with the West side the outstanding issue.

As a region we need to move ahead and not be sidetracked by notions from Seattle City Hall and an endless debate on West side connections. Studies have been made, viable options exist let us set firm dates to finalize the designs and move ahead. Bryan Cairns