

Online Comment by User: pdbphoto

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 6:23:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-1

Address: ,, 98033

Comment:

I have a few thoughts on this bridge and its replacement which I would like to share.

First, the current 4 lanes is not enough to handle current traffic. The bridge must be at least 6 lanes, with one lane each way for carpool, mass transit, etc.

Second, walkers and bikers should be able to use the bridge. This will require some type of bike and walking lane.

Third, the current bridge is old and outdated. While I respect the concerns of others we have to look at the safety issues involved. If this bridge were to fail while commuters were on it, there would obviously be many deaths. Are we going to delay and delay until somebody dies? Do we want to take that risk?

Failure of the current bridge would cause a major disruption to transportation in our area. And the environmental impacts of having to route many vehicles to the I-90 corridor and well as those that roads that travel North and South of Lake Washington would be extremely negative.

I-0785-001

I-0785-002

Online Comment by User: pdstrong

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 8:02:00 AM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-1

Address: ,, 98117

Comment:

I-0786-001 |

Build as many lanes as possible. Replacing the existing structure with the same number of lanes is short term thinking. Think to the Future!

Online Comment by User: Peggy Gloth

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 6:22:00 AM

Comment Category: Parks and Recreation

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98103

Comment:

Expanding over our precious Arboretum steals another treasure to provide access to the city. I have lived in the Seattle area most of my life. I understand the traffic dilemma. But continuing to expand our highways and damage our environment to accomodate more people is an endless problem. We have less and less left to protect. We must THINK.

I-0787-001

Online Comment by User: peggybr

Submitted on: 9/20/2006 11:03:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

I strongly support the Pacific Interchange option.

I-0788-001 |

Online Comment by User: peggylev

Submitted on: 10/11/2006 12:11:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

I support the Pacific Street interchange option over all other options.

It fixes the Montlake Bridge bottleneck, which is the type of problem no well-run transportation system should ignore. The standing cars, backed up both directions, waste energy, pollute our air unnecessarily, and detract from urban livability in the affected neighborhoods.

It reconnects the Montlake neighborhood, which has been adversely affected by SR520-related traffic congestion for years. It prevents further degradation of this historic neighborhood.

It considers at the broader transportation picture, linking buses and light rail at UW, which is a sensible approach to maximizing the effectiveness of these multibillion-dollar projects.

I also support including bike paths as part of the 520 project, while protecting the woodland buffer of Burke-Gilman trail as much as possible. I support continuing the SR 520 bicycle path all the way west to the Montlake lid park, a trail on the Union Bay Bridge, and a bicycle trail link from the 520 bicycle trail to Madison Park at 43rd Avenue East.

Thank you!

Peggy Levin

Online Comment by User: pehling

Submitted on: 9/18/2006 9:46:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

My family supports the Pacific Interchange Option.

The Pehlings

Montlake

I-0790-001 |

Online Comment by User: petefarmer

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:08:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

The current 520 traffic overwhelms local neighborhoods and turns short trips into excessively long ones. The UW needs to assume more of this burden as a high % of traffic is to/from the UW.

Pacific Interchange is the preferred alternative.

I-0791-001

Online Comment by User: PeterStoner

Submitted on: 9/15/2006 9:17:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

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

Comment:

I would like to support the Pacific Interchange Option. It offers the best solution for a connection for north-south- east-west transit which is essential to the region's future. It also makes the most sense for the Arboretum. Please vote for this option. Thank you, Peter Stoner

I-0792-001

Online Comment by User: Phillip Jordan

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 5:28:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 1636 Shenadoah Dr. E., Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

All of the plans currently proposed by the WSDOT are bad. We must scrap the idea of rebuilding the SR 520 bridge until the Seattle approach utilizes a shallow tunnel design from the western high-rise to the junction with I-5.

When the original 520 bridge was built in the 1960's, two beautiful city neighborhoods (Montlake and North Broadway), two irreplaceable urban lakes (Portage Bay and Union Bay), and one of the most beautiful urban parks and wetlands in the United States (the Arboretum, Foster Island, and surrounding channels and streams) were destroyed. God gave Seattle some of the most spectacular scenery in the world on which to build a city. It is time we stop ruining what we have been given and in which we are so fortunate to live. We must stop the short-sighted urban "planning" that plagues our region and, instead, build an urban infrastructure that we can be proud of a hundred or more years from now.

Both of the designs proposed by the WSDOT are obscenities that need to be rejected NOW! Instead of improving the local areas, they will further destroy them. Of the two, the so-called Pacific interchange approach is especially odious - not only does it perpetuate the rape of the existing Montlake/ Arboretum areas but now it also destroys the priceless waterfront parklands of the University of Washington on the north shore of the Ship Canal. This design MUST be declared DEAD ON ARRIVAL NOW!

A shallow tunnel for the western end of the 520 bridge is by far the best solution for joining the bridge to Seattle and I-5. There are no engineering reasons why such an approach cannot work and we must insist that the WSDOT take this approach.

Like the tunnel proposed by Mayor Nickels to replace the Alaskan Way Viaduct, which also should be supported, a tunnel for the west end of the 520 bridge would produce incalculable benefits for our city. Properly conceived, a tunnel would permit the easy and free flow of regional traffic through the affected neighborhoods to the link with I-5. Foster Island, Portage Bay, and Union Bay can be restored to their pre-1960's beauty, the Montlake and North Broadway neighborhoods will no longer have to deal with traffic noise and vehicle pollution, and new urban parks and lakeshores will be created. We will leave a priceless and timeless gift for our children and their children, indeed for all future generations lucky enough to live in our beautiful city.

A tunnel will be more expensive than the hideous viaducts now proposed for the Seattle piece of a new 520 bridge. But the added cost is easily justified by the improvement in the quality of life of our city, especially when that added cost is amortized over the probable life of a tunnel. Unlike viaducts and bridges that are exposed to the elements and require constant and costly maintenance and, even then, seem to rarely be able to last more than 50 years without being replaced, well-designed and properly constructed tunnels essentially

I-0793-001

I-0793-001 | have indefinite lives, with normal maintenance typically limited to servicing ventilation equipment and renewing road surfaces.

We understand that there are other regional transportation needs that might be more urgent than a new 520 bridge and we feel that those needs should be first addressed. For this reason, we suggest postponing any re-build of the 520 bridge until such time that the Seattle end can utilize a modern shallow tunnel design. Also, no new 520 bridge can be seriously considered that does not, at a minimum, include two rail lines as well as dedicated carpool and bus lanes.

Online Comment by User: pingram

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 12:50:00 PM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-1

Address: , , 98115

Comment:

Outside of the basic No Change, 4 Lane or 6 Lane options, the alternatives don't appear to consider opportunities to minimize impacts on the Arboretum.

Regardless of the alternatives, the DEIS appears to state a presumption that certain minimum widths and standards are required for the structure without question. For example, why would a new 4-lane bridge, performing largely the same as the old bridge, need to be 60 feet wider as it passes through Portage Bay? Obviously, the existing bridge demonstrates that it is possible to construct a functional facility at a narrower width. While I would agree that some increased width may be appropriate to increase efficiency and safety, how can increase in 60 feet be justified? (Two eight foot shoulders and one ten foot bike lane and divider only add up to 26 feet.) Increases in the facility width and footprint to meet "standards" should not be assumed. To minimize environmental impacts, we should look at ways to reduce those increases as much as possible.

The modifications proposed for I-90 so that it can accommodate light rail will result in reduced lane and shoulder width. Why can't we apply similar reduced land and shoulder widths for SR-520 (which would probably be wider than what's there today)?

DOT should consider 4 and 6 lane replacement options that more closely resemble the current structure's width and footprint.

Comment Category: Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-1

Comment:

What is being done to make SR-520 attractive? Both the 4 and 6 lane alternatives show large, ugly concrete superstructures with no attempt to be small, slim or attractive in any way. Seek opportunities to limit the amount of concrete. Avoid sound walls, except where essential. Avoid increases in width and footprint, except where essential. Avoid lighting impacts. Create opportunities for natural buffering with replanted vegetation. Create a viewing platform that is part of the ped/bike lane.

Comment Category: Transportation and Traffic

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-1

Comment:

The 6 lane option should direct the HOV lanes directly to the proposed light rail station.

The Mountlake interchange should be replaced with a Pacific/Stadium bridge and interchange, allowing a reduction in impacts in the Mountlake area and improved traffic connections.

Comment Category: Ecosystems

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-5

I-0794-001

I-0794-002

I-0794-003

I-0794-004

Comment:

Why does the 4 lane alternative need to be so much wider than the No Change option? The benefits of additional width at this location (in the Arboretum) aren't worth the impact. The greatest need for additional shoulder space is out in the middle of the bridge where a disabled vehicle doesn't have any place to go. There, the bridge could be wider with little environmental impact. Through the Arboretum, there are several existing shoulder/pull off areas that can usually be used by disabled vehicles. Only increase the width where it is absolutely needed.

Why is the 6 lane alternative 30 feet wider through the Arboretum than the 4 lane alternative. At most, each lane is 12 feet, which adds up to 24 feet for the two additional lanes. Why would the 6 lane configuration need more width than that for the two lanes? Add functionality, but minimize footprint expansion as much as possible.

Online Comment by User: Pinot999

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 12:18:00 AM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98105

Comment:

I think the Pacific Interchange Bridge option is a weak idea. You're proposing to distroy one of Seattle's greatest natural resources at great tax payer expense. For the last 5 years my daily commute has taken me along Montlake to Pacific Ave. The issue is not so much Montlake, it's 520. If you're so concerned about Montlake, why not just re-do the bridge and add a few more lanes. Yes, there would be some houses (perhaps 6) displaced, but that would certainly be cheaper than the 110 ft. bridge.

Thanks,

Peter

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Comment:

I think the Pacific Interchange Bridge option is a weak idea. You're proposing to distroy one of Seattle's greatest natural resources at great tax payer expense. For the last 5 years my daily commute has taken me along Montlake to Pacific Ave. The issue is not so much Montlake, it's 520. If you're so concerned about Montlake, why not just re-do the bridge and add a few more lanes. Yes, there would be some houses (perhaps 6) displaced, but that would certainly be cheaper than the 110 ft. bridge.

Thanks,

Peter

I-0795-001

Online Comment by User: PKenefick

Submitted on: 9/10/2006 10:54:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2449 E Interlaken Blvd, seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

I strongly support the Pacific Interchange Plan.

I believe this is the ONLY option that will preserve the integrity of the Montlake Neighborhood as well as create new bus service routes, eliminate backups on Montlake Blvd and create a new and important transit hub at UW.

The Base Six option would be disastrous for our healthy, vibrant neighborhood. There is a superior alternative and it is the PACIFIC INTERCHANGE PLAN.

Signed,

Polly Kenefick (Montlake resident)
2449 E Interlaken Blvd

I-0796-001

Online Comment by User: PointsDr

Submitted on: 9/20/2006 9:32:00 PM

Comment Category: Transportation and Traffic

Comment Location: Chapter-9, Page-10

Address: 9030 points drive, bellevue, WA 98004

Comment:

It is a bad idea to eliminate any transit stations. The benefits to the local neighborhoods are great, and the transit stops should be retained at equally convenient areas, not moved "somewhere east." Many people use the flyer stops, and not everyone likes to or needs to use park and rides. GET THEM OUT OF THEIR CARS ALTOGETHER!!! The only way to do this is to make transit stops easy to access in the neighborhoods where the people live. Deleting the evergreen point stop won't help, unless you just move it to 84th. But it should be retained as long as the neighborhood (which also funds rapid transit and the bridge) wants it.

It is ridiculous that there is not more analysis of the transit stations on the EASTside. What about the S Kirkland P&R. Will that also create a flyer stop? If so, Great. The riders do not need to be tied to only those buses that stop at their P&R. That could also create a little espresso stand business for someone.

Comment Category: Transportation and Traffic

Comment Location: Chapter-9, Page-11

Comment:

The signal at 92nd offramp is ridiculous idea. Traffic does not back up there at any time. Higher freeway volumes would not necessarily increase number of vehicles at that intersection. Signal is unnecessary. Main problem is trucks use that offramp for staging in morning, and wait there for construction call for neighborhood work. They won't have a place to park if lid is there, and narrower freeway offramp.

The south side of 520 at 92nd must incorporate the Points Loop Trail, at points east of 92nd. That is necessary for neighborhood, and should be planned with new structure.

Because of offramps and onramps, the lid should be located primarily to west of 92nd.

The grade of 520 over hill at 92nd should be lowered. That will make lid less obtrusive, and will lessen environmental impact of vehicles in going up and down hill. Without hill, trucks, motorcycles, and other vehicles won't need as much power, and won't make as much noise. Loud motorcycles are major source of noise late at night, especially in summer with windows open for air. In addition, walls will not need to be as obtrusive in neighborhood, and the vehicles will save gas by removing the grade. Dropping grade at 92nd will also ease bridge issues at 92nd, as well as the lid issues.

To lessen issues at 92nd, all major on and off ramps should be consolidated at 84th. This would lessen neighborhood traffic, and would minimize impact on neighborhood in general. Land is available at 84th, and it just makes sense. It is different, but neighborhood should consider it since it would be better in long haul.

Onramp and offramps for Points Area should be consolidated area

I-0797-001

I-0797-001

Comment Category: Transportation and Traffic

Comment Location: Chapter-9, Page-18

Comment:

Where is the lid for 92nd Ave?? That is a critical lid in the scheme of things. Also, picture C shows a bike path on the south side, but not near the freeway. What is this? The lid at 92nd., along with the freeway bus stop, are madatory improvements.

Comment Category: Transportation and Traffic

Comment Location: Chapter-9, Page-6

Comment:

Why no lids on 4 lane alternative? They should still be built. Also, the trail buffer for the 6 lane is larger than for the four lane, accordinging to pictures. Why is this, when the foot print for 6 lane is bigger?

Comment Category: Neighborhood Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-9, Page-7

Comment:

I am concerned about effect on me and my neighborhood. I live near 520, and have great concerns about noise. I need assurances that sound walls and lids will be utilized to maximum amount in order to reduce noise. I also prefer 6 lane alternative, so that bus and car pool lanes are available, along with a bike lane and walking path. Along with noise mitigation, it is necessary to retain existing bus stops for neighborhood residents in Yarrow Point and surrounding area. If only one stop is located in area, it must be at 84th, not at evergreen point Road or at 92nd. That is the only way, and would allow for some parking at area. The Lids should be longer than 500 feet, and it is critical that noise not be directed from tunnel like a megaphone. Walls near ends of tunnels must be greater. Also, low noise pavement should be used. WE noticed dramatic change in noise when low noise asphalt was replaced on 520 several years back. It works. Please make it nice.

Comment Category: Transportation and Traffic

Comment Location: Chapter-9, Page-8

Comment:

The signaal at 92nd offramp is ridiculous idea. Traffic does not back up there at any time. Higher freeway volumes would not necessarily increase number of vehicles at that intersection. Signal is unnecessary. Main problem is trucks use that offramp for staging in morning, and wait there for contruction call for neighborhood work. They won't have a place to park if lid is there, and narrower freesay offramp.

The south side of 520 at 92nd must incorporate the Points Loop Trial, at points east of 92nd. That is necessary for neighborhood, and should be planned with new structure.

Because of offramps and onramps, the lid should be located primarily to west of 92nd.

The grade of 520 over hill at 92nd should be lowered. That will make lid less obtrusive, and will lessen environmental impact of vehicles in going up and down hill. Without hill, trucks, motorcycles, and other vehicles won't need as much poser, and won't make as much noise. Loud Motorcycles are major source of noise late at nigh, especially in summer with windows open for air. In addition, walls will not need to be as obtrusive in neighborhood, and the vehicles will save gas by removing the grade. Dropping grade at 92nd will also ease brridge issues at 92nd, as well as the lid issues.

I-0797-001

To lessen issues at 92nd, all major on and off ramps should be consolidated at 84th. This would lessen neighborhood traffic, and would minimize impact on neighborhood in general. Land is available at 84th, and it just makes sense. It is different, but neighborhood should consider it since it would be better in long haul.

Onramp and offramps for Poitns Area should be consolidated area

Online Comment by User: Polly Feigl

Submitted on: 10/3/2006 10:42:00 AM

Comment Category: Neighborhood Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

To: Dept of Transportation of Washington State

Re: Bike Trail and Footpath to SR520

Date: October 3, 2006

This is a NIMBY letter concerning the proposed bicycle/pedestrian ramps from the 520 bridge into Madison Park.

Parking in the entire Madison Park neighborhood North of Madison Street is very tight. We cannot accommodate extra parking from pedestrians and cyclists who will use the proposed ramp to go to the University and the future stadium subway station.. This will start with "park and bike/hike" to University athletic events and progress to daily usage.

School Children attending McGilvra grade school will be endangered by cars cruising for parking places.

Both the 37th Avenue and 43rd Avenue options are unacceptable for Madison Park. Please do not try to "divide and conquer" our neighborhood.

The main function of a bicycle lane on the 520 bridge will be to connect to the Burke Gilman trail at the University. Madison Park does not connect to any bike trail so the proposed ramp will not be useful for most cyclists.

Inevitably Madison Park will suffer increased noise and air pollution from the enlarged bridge. Please do not add the unnecessary burden of heavier traffic to our neighborhood -- Save a few million dollars.

Thanks.

Sincerely,

Eric and Polly Feigl
2360 43rd Ave East
Seattle WA 98112

I-0798-001

Online Comment by User: Pratt

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 1:17:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98105

Comment:

I-0799-001 |

Unacceptable--Pacific Interchange--this represents shoving the Montlake disruption north the the UW, U Village and Laurelhurst

Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Comment:

I-0799-002 |

Since we have to rebuild this is the best choice acceptable.

Online Comment by User: priddle

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 12:51:00 PM

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-2

Address: 12114 NE 171st Pl F203, Bothell, WA 98011

Comment:

I'm interested in the 6 lane option with a Pacific Street Interchange.

I-0800-001 |

Online Comment by User: purpleaster

Submitted on: 10/26/2006 5:28:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98115

Comment:

The pacific interchange option attempts to avoid community concerns by imposing the impact of 520 expansion on land (and water) and water that is shared by all of us. To satisfy the desires of individual home owners to improve on their investment (particularly in Montlake), the Pacific Interchange Option imposes the costs of the construction on the shared waterfront, Arboretum, and the University. In addition, the costs of the option are significantly higher than other options, even before the costs of additional mitigation is determined. It is an unacceptable alternative.

I-0801-001

Online Comment by User: pvanvoast

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

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98102

Comment:

It is impossible to pave your way out of our traffic mess. Our only hope is for more people to use alternatives. Traffic on Arboretum Drive is already an intrusion and it is just wrong to sacrifice more of one of the jewels of Seattle.

I-0802-001 |

Online Comment by User: pwhayden

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 1:01:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 1836 E Hamlin Street, , 98112

Comment:

As a 47year homeowner next to the 520 corridor I strongly favor the Pacific Interchange option. It will improve the nearly intolerable traffic condition that now exists north and south the Montlake Bridge. I would think the University would favor any improvement in transit to and from the campus.

Patricia Hayden
1836 E Hamlin
Seattle WA 98112

I-0803-001

Online Comment by User: pwokelley2

Submitted on: 10/25/2006 8:19:00 PM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-2

Address: , , 98115

Comment:

Whichever model is followed, I believe it is crucial that a bike lane be included. As a recreational cyclist and Microsoft employee, I have discovered that the ride to Microsoft is very tolerable from most areas in Seattle...but for the bridge. Waiting for buses makes the commute very unpredictable, especially (ironically) on days with good weather.

Many of my fellow bike/bus commuters have had the experience--especially on our return trips to Seattle when there are not so many "Back to Base" buses--of being stuck at the Evergreen Point or Yarrow Point bus stop for an hour or more as bus after bus passes with a full bike rack.

People who might not otherwise bike to work try it out when the skies are clear. But they soon discover that all of the bike racks are full and they become anxious, waiting in line for a bus to see if it might have a space on its rack.

I have seen bus drivers and cyclist get into heated arguments about allowing bikes on an otherwise partially full bus that has a loaded (3 bike) rack.

Not surprisingly, all but the hardcore cyclists give up biking to work as a regular practice.

It is probably difficult to gauge the actual bike traffic to and from Microsoft that might occur if not for this problem (especially on sunny days).

I, for one, have given up trying to cycle as a commuting practice. I only bring my bike if I know I don't have a morning meeting or a specific time I need to be home.

I would be happy to help in any efforts to make this project more bike friendly! I think the Netherlands (or even Portland) is a great model.

I-0804-001

Online Comment by User: q

Submitted on: 9/12/2006 8:24:00 AM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Address: , , 98011

Comment:

We need 8 lanes, not 6. Four is right out.

If we are going to do this, do it right, think and build for the future, not for 30 years ago.

I-0805-001 |

Online Comment by User: R L Johnson

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 2:06:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98239

Comment:

Dear Sirs.

I-0806-001 | I recognize the need to relieve traffic agony, but I am not sure building more roads is the cure. More roads seem to equal more cars and trucks and the traffic hardly improves. Living in Coupeville, we rarely see traffic congestion except when we come into Seattle. Perhaps it seems worse to us by comparison. I am just not convinced we can build our way out of the problem, especially when it costs so much. Cost in tax dollars, and cost to the environment. Being a regular Husky football game attendee, yes, the traffic is difficult, but it is working. I would not want to see the apparent negative impacts a six lane road would do to the Arboretum and south UW campus.

I-0806-002 | If the existing bridge needs fixing, then do it, but does it really mean we have to build it out to six lanes, and put in new interchanges? Why are we not looking at elevated light rail above the existing road path? Both Vancouver and Portland seem to have worked out a better solution. Not perfect, but at least not more roads and vehicles on them.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my viewpoint.

Bob Johnson
Coupeville, WA

Online Comment by User: R.J. DelMissier

Submitted on: 10/6/2006 9:20:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-8

Address: ,, 98040

Comment:

THE PACIFIC INTERCHANGE OPTION IS THE ONLY ONE THAT ELIMINATES SEVERE CONGESTION.

I-0807-001 |

Online Comment by User: r2larson

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 9:17:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 22628 7th Dr. SE, Bothell, WA 98021

Comment:

Please Please Please find a way to build the 6 lane alternative!

To me, replacing the current 520 bridge with the same number of lanes is insanity and cruel and unusual punishment to those of us commuting by car-pool and bus. When we replace the 520 bridge, it absolutely must have added HOV lanes to encourage car-pool and bus use and reduce the number of cars on the road. I would gladly pay for large tax increases if it meant we would go forward with the 6-lane alternative rather than the 4 lane alternative. In fact I would like to revive the 8 lane alternative and go ahead and widen I-5 and 405 to match if we could find a way to build it.

Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-6

Comment:

To 520 project evaluation committee:

To me, replacing the 520 bridge with the same number of lanes is insanity and cruel and unusual punishment to those of us commuting by car-pool and bus. When we replace the 520 bridge, it absolutely must have added HOV lanes to encourage car-pool and bus use and reduce the number of cars on the road. I would gladly pay for large tax increases if it meant we would go forward with the 6-lane alternative rather than the 4 lane alternative. In fact I would like to revive the 8 lane alternative and go ahead and widen I-5 and 405 to match if we could find a way to build it.

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-6

Comment:

Please Please Please find a way to build the 6 lane alternative!

To me, replacing the current 520 bridge with the same number of lanes is insanity and cruel and unusual punishment to those of us commuting by car-pool and bus. When we replace the 520 bridge, it absolutely must have added HOV lanes to encourage car-pool and bus use and reduce the number of cars on the road. I would gladly pay for large tax increases if it meant we would go forward with the 6-lane alternative rather than the 4 lane alternative. In fact I would like to revive the 8 lane alternative and go ahead and widen I-5 and 405 to match if we could find a way to build it.

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Comment:

This shows the main reason to build the 6 lane alternative rather than the 4-lane or no build. Please PLEASE DO IT! I will gladly pay the tolls and increased taxes and urge my friends and family to support it. I will scrape and grovel for it!

None of the alternatives will meet the demand, so it makes sense to use the one that comes closest, the 6-lane. Plus it will produce the highest occupancy per vehicle: 2.26 per vehicle

I-0808-001

I-0808-001 | instead of 2.18 or 1.9. This is the greatest efficiency at the same time as satisfying the transportation needs of more people. How can we go with any other alternative!

Richard R. Larson

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-10

Comment:

I-0808-002 | I support the Pacific Interchange alternative as the best way to relieve Montlake Ave. congestion.

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-11

Comment:

I-0808-003 | By all means, we must fund increased transit trips to meet the demand in the most efficient way.

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-13

Comment:

I-0808-004 | Here we go again. The 6-lane alternative would provide much better connection service to the light rail link, and increase its benefit as well

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-15

Comment:

And here we go yet again. The 6-lane alternative provides the most bike paths across the highway as well as the bike lane across the lake. The 6-lane alternative is better in every way except cost and pavement area, and it's worth triple every penny of its cost, and it's a very small proportion of the area of the lake.

Comment Category: Transportation and Traffic

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-18

Comment:

Here yet again is an advantage for the 6-lane alternative: better air quality with vehicles moving faster and more people using the busses and car pools, which would be much faster, and bikes which don't produce pollution. Why would we choose any other alternative in our right mind?

Online Comment by User: Rachel Nathanson

Submitted on: 10/4/2006 9:33:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2581 NE 85th St, Seattle, WA 98115

Comment:

I heartily support the proposal for the 6-lane alternative. I realize the cost is high and the impact to local neighborhoods is regrettable, however, if we are to do anything, please pursue the longer-term improvement, not the limited improvement concept such as the 4-lane alternative. I drive through the Montlake cut on a daily basis and know that any alternative will have its' impacts during construction. I hope to see the 6-lane alternative chosen as it will provide the greatest relief and service to this corridor. To do anything less than this is a huge mistake and inadequate use of public resources. Please pursue the 6-lane alternative.

Thank you,
Rachel Nathanson
2581 NE 85th St
Seattle, WA 98115

I-0809-001

Online Comment by User: rachelbeda

Submitted on: 9/18/2006 12:01:00 PM

Comment Category: Neighborhood Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2437 E Lake Washington Blvd, Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

Neighborhood effects:

I live on Lake Wash. Blvd overlooking 520 and I strongly support the Pacific Interchange Option. Please help congestion in Montlake and help reunite a fragmented community.

Rachel Beda

2437 E Lake Washington Blvd

I-0810-001

Online Comment by User: rachelcvandemark

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:20:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 3268 McClintock Avenue S, Seattle, Washington 98144

Comment:

Dear Policymakers,

As a Seattle resident and mother I implore you to protect our valuable and irreplaceable resources: the flora of the Arboreteum, the wetlands around the current 520 bridge, and the Olmstead Legacy park.

The proposal to widen 520 and put the interchange over Marsh Island is unacceptable. The benefits of preserving the existing wetlands for recreation, wildlife and research are far to important to ignore.

Any changes to 520 should consider the adverse impacts of a 6 lane highway on an already fragile area.

People, including myself, live in King County because of its natural beauty. If the opportunities to enjoy nature in the city are lost people will move, taking with them their tax dollars.

My young daughter turns two tomorrow. I hope for her sake that the wetlands around the Arboretum are protected for future generations and not marred by an even larger structure.

Most respectfully,

Rachel VanDeMark, RN, BSN

I-0811-001

Online Comment by User: randolph urmston

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:20:00 PM

Comment Category: Parks and Recreation

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 1906 14th Ave. E., Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

The current alternatives, especially the Pacific Street Interchange, are too large and have unacceptable impacts on the Arboretum and Lake Washington Blvd. A four lane alternative that includes transit and HOV access with lidding should be considered. Furthermore, other creative solutions such as the Arboretum Bypass Plan, which addresses some of the above concerns should be studied in a Supplemental Draft EIS.

I-0812-001

Online Comment by User: Randy Pratt

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 5:46:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-9

Address: , , 98105

Comment:

I don't feel that either the 6 lane or the Pacific offramp alternatives are acceptable. Both cover too much precious park or water. Both versions would negatively impact large stretches of greenland as Lake Washington Boulevard, the Arboretum, and the bird preserve at the Horticultural Center. Both of these options would pave large parts of the Arboretum and cover a large section of Union Bay.

I think further study should be done. I think none of these are the solution. For instance: why are we increasing roadway size instead of making puplic transit more efficient and accessible. This bridge remodel will be obsolete before it is finished.

I am dissappointed that these are viewed as acceptable alternatives because they sacrifice what is of most value in the urban environment: open space, green belts, and water.

I-0813-001

Online Comment by User: Randy Rowlee

Submitted on: 10/5/2006 11:20:00 AM

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative Options

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 10785 Willows Road, Redmond, 98052 98052

Comment:

I just wanted to give my input that anything less than a 6 lane bridge is foolish. Traffic in the Puget Sound area is getting worse by the day. A 4 lane bridge would be undersized from the day it opens. This impacts surrounding areas as well, not just cross-lake commuters. Thanks. Randy

I-0814-001

Online Comment by User: rauent

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 1:04:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-48

Address: ,, 98178

Comment:

In the crowded area that Seattle (and the surrounding areas) has become, it is more and more important to maintain and grow the areas that we have that are nature's preserve. The arboretum harbors unique habitats within our city. We should not project any plan or action that would disturb any part of this area.

I-0815-001

Online Comment by User: Raymond Larson

Submitted on: 9/21/2006 8:28:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-13

Address: 11526 Alton Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98125

Comment:

I-0816-001 | The picture of the Pacific Interchange option is pretty misleading since it doesn't show the offramp termini of the bridge portions--which are just outside the pictured area. The visual impact on the area shown is spread over a much wider area than the existing view of the Pacific Interchange. The PI alternative would dramatically alter the portions over water to the immediate east of this view as well as the Pacific Street--important considerations.

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-18

Comment:

I-0816-002 | It would also be accurate to say that other residents are concerned about the traffic flow effects of the Pacific Interchange option on other parts of the corridor adjacent to the Montlake-Shelby & Hamlin St. area. I'm concerned, as are others, that this option will significantly increase traffic through Lake Washington Blvd. an area that cannot be easily engineered to improve traffic flow to and from the Pacific Interchange bridge over Union Bay. I feel that traffic for the interchange will simply be pushed out to adjacent areas, such as the on ramps to the PI bridge, Montlake Blvd. up to University Village, Lake Washington Blvd. through the Arboretum and between the offramps and Montlake Blvd. and Pacific Street itself. These are concerns that need to be addressed or explained much more clearly.

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-14

Comment:

I-0816-003 | The congestion discussion here is very misleading in regards to the Lake Washington Blvd/SR 520 ramp area. The congestion at the ramps themselves would likely improve--however, the congestion leading to the ramps, especially on northbound Lake WA Blvd in the Arboretum would still be very heavy, and probably drastically so. With the addition of higher capacity for cars that this report cites under the 6-lane alternatives it seems likely that more commuters, and likely most all of them from south of SR520 and east of Montlake Blvd, would access SR520 through Lake WA Blvd, rather than going to Montlake and then going north of the Montlake Cut to access the Pacific Interchange on ramps. How can Lake WA Blvd possibly handle more traffic to SR520? It seems like this basically turns Lake WA Blvd into one giant on ramp for SR520. While Lake WA Blvd is not a "state" road or highway, this issue must be addressed as a potential impact of building a new bridge with MORE capacity.

Online Comment by User: rayray

Submitted on: 10/6/2006 9:13:00 AM**Comment Category: General Comments****Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-1****Address: , Gig Harbor, Wa 98335****Comment:**

Hello,

I believe that this project as is the Narrows Bridge project necessary for improvement of traffic flow.

My comment is the rationale and political justification that was forced on us for the Narrows Bridge, the new 520 project MUST ALSO BE A TOLL ROAD and the actual users must pay for it just as the Narrows Bridge users must. To create additional state-wide taxes to pay for 520 while forcing the Narrows Bridge users to BOTH pay for the Narrows Bridge via tolls and 520 via INCREASED TAXES is UNFAIR and perhaps justification for litigation or tax abatements.

Ray Peirce

I-0817-001

Online Comment by User: rbarnea

Submitted on: 10/27/2006 12:15:00 PM**Comment Category: General Comments****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: , , 98105****Comment:**

The Pacific Street Interchange will have a terribly adverse effect on UW recreational activities in Union Bay. For generations now, UW students, faculty, staff and alumni have enjoyed myriad waterfront activities that will have to take place in the shadow of 520 if this horrible plan comes to fruition.

Please do not let 520 expand to the other side of the Montlake Cut. The ecological, social, and aesthetic cost is too great (not to mention how much more expensive this option is compared with the alternatives).

I-0818-001

Online Comment by User: rbutz

Submitted on: 9/7/2006 9:20:00 PM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98033

Comment:

I prefer the 4 lane alternative for the following reasons:

1) I believe that motor fuel will become increasingly scarce, more likely sooner than later. This will continue to drive up the price, leading people to select alternatives to the automobile. People will want to live closer to their workplaces. This will reduce the traffic on our highways.

2) The DEIS states that 520 bus service has actually been reduced over the last 10 years. My wife does not like to ride the bus from Kirkland to the UW because it's over-crowded, the schedules are not convenient for her travel times, and the bus interiors stink because they are not maintained properly. I would much prefer that transit is improved rather than adding more freeway lanes.

3) Make the bike/pedestrian trail as user-friendly as possible. Use grade-separation to speed commutes and improve safety. This idea would really get people thinking about getting out of their cars:

<http://www.biketrams.com/index.html>

Online Comment by User: reclipe

Submitted on: 10/23/2006 4:42:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98115

Comment:

I vote for the Pacific St. Interchange. thanks

I-0820-001 |

Online Comment by User: rhianlombard

Submitted on: 9/11/2006 11:19:00 AM

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98112

Comment:

Please follow through with the Pacific Interchange plan. Montlake is a wonderful neighborhood with a lot of families. It does not need more congestion. Montlake needs to be put back together, not taken further a part.

I-0821-001 |

Online Comment by User: rthomson

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 5:05:00 PM**Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange****Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-6****Address: ,, 98104****Comment:**

I-0822-001 | The option for placing an underground connection between the freeway and the Montlake/Pacific intersection area was not given adequate consideration and should be analyzed as an alternative within the EIS. The text alludes to severe impacts of such an option. However, similar impacts -- possibly even more severe --- are identified in the EIS under the Pacific Interchange bridge option; these should be directly compared to an underground connection that accomplishes roughly the same operational objectives.

I-0822-002 | The text also states that such a connection could be expensive, and implies that it could cost upwards of \$8 billion. I don't believe that this is correct; it would be extraordinarily high for such a facility. The reader should not be left with this misconception of cost and a more accurate figure should be provided and compared to the Pacific Interchange bridge option within the Alternatives section.

Online Comment by User: Richard Frisch

Submitted on: 10/26/2006 12:31:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 15018 SE 47th St., Bellevue, WA 98006

Comment:

Dear sir, I am writing to you to let you know that I am totally opposed to any project that will expand the SR 520 Bridge. There would be no long term benefit from this endeavour, and will cost taxpayers needless billions. My opinion is the "no build option".

Thank you for reading this.

Sincerely,

Richard Frisch
Bellevue, 98006

I-0823-001

Online Comment by User: Richard

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

Comment Category: Comments on Construction Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-9, Page-15

Address: 3265 103rd pl ne, bellevue, wa 98004

Comment:

Regarding the environmental impact statement for the expanded 520 bridge, please note my following objections/comments.

Very, very, very little information and research have been done in regards to the area around the Bellevue Way exit. This area, where eastbound 520 exits onto Bellevue Way, is the area that will have the most re-work and expansion done. Yet, there are no photos in the statement of how this will affect the residents around this area, nor are there any concrete reliable data as to how this additional noise will affect the residents in this region.

Specifically, I am thinking of the 40 or 30 or so residents who are in and around 103rd place NE, and 103rd Ave NE, who will be the MOST impacted residents on the entire project. Almost no time was given to them in the impact statement.

In addition, there is a large population located right after the exit who will also be affected. No information on them is shown at all.

The environmental impact statement hardly mentions these areas of 100's of residences, yet it goes on continuously about Yarrows Point, bicycles, Medina and park and rides.

1) Reduce the amount and size of the lanes called for in the exit area around Bellevue Way.

2) Alternatives to the expansion (widening) of the highway in 1 direction, (south towards Bellevue), need to be looked at. The widening of 520 south, towards Bellevue needs to be reduced and consideration made to widening the road northward in addition to southward. Specifically, there needs to be less widening of the highway in the area before the Bellevue Way exit as well as at the Bellevue Way exit. This area currently is home to a large and vibrant wildlife and their habitat needs to be preserved.

3) Better, more, or any research on how the highway traffic will affect traffic on Bellevue Way needs to be done.

4) Reliable noise analysis needs to be made taking into account car noise, exhaust noise, and noise at other than peak times as well as in different weather. The noise models made do not reflect actual sound experienced in the various locations. Noise measurements at 3 pm do not accurately reflect the sounds experienced throughout the day.

6) The exit ramps onto the highway, westbound, need to be designed and set up so the late night exhaust noise of "racers", cars trying to race onto the highway, will be reduced or eliminated.

I-0824-001

I-0824-001

7) Research into late night car noise needs to be done and how the current project will affect residences around the Bellevue Way exit.

8) If necessary, higher sound walls may be needed

9) In your environmental Impact statement, Chapter 7, page 15, you mention "the only location where noise levels would not improve is in Bellevue, north of State Road 520 and east of 405". Please confirm this location as I think you are referring to Bellevue Way.

There is a large group of residents living in and around the area on either side of the Bellevue Way exit and more research needs to be done as to alternatives to sound need to be produced for these people.

Online Comment by User: RichardBorkowski

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:58:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98102

Comment:

I-0825-001 | The 6-lane alternative is not needed, not affordable and it would make the whole traffic situation worse. I-5 cannot accommodate the extra traffic that would be generated by the 6 lane alternative. The Aborertum is also protected by Section 4(f) of the Federal code, which prohibits the use of parks for highway projects.

I-0825-002 | A new 4-lane bridge with wider lanes and bike lanes will accommodate more traffic if the lanes are widened and the bridge is straightened.

I-0825-003 | Regarding the Pacific Interchange option, the transit options are poorly thought through. It makes alot of assumptions about transit operations that simply are not true. The transit operations need to be thought through better as well.

I-0825-004 | In summary look more closely at the 4-lane option. It makes more sense than a 4 or 6 lane bridge.

Richard Borkowski

Online Comment by User: rksandaas

Submitted on: 10/24/2006 2:57:00 PM**Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: 12453 Holmes Point Drive, Kirkland, WA 98034****Comment:**

The alternatives fail to recognize a need for capacity improvements which will serve us for the next 75 years. Simply put, three general purpose lanes plus a transit/HOV lane in each direction is the obvious choice and this should have been included as an alternative. Political pressure has prevented a realistic appraisal of this alternative but this should not be the reason for exclusion of this alternative. Common sense and the practical reality of building for the future supports this alternative.

I-0826-001

Online Comment by User: rmb

Submitted on: 9/17/2006 7:59:00 PM**Comment Category: General Comments****Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-1****Address: , , 98112****Comment:**

I strongly support the option with the Pacific Interchange. My understanding is that this will provide much better traffic flows on both the north and south sides of the Montlake Cut. It is also logical to create a connection with the future light rail station. As a resident of Montlake, I will have light rail tunnel going under my house and significant disruption to our community. I think the Pacific Interchange will allow for better mitigation of impacts to the Seattle neighborhoods affected by the 520 bridge project, both from an environmental standpoint and a improved local transportation system for cars, buses, bikes, and light rail. Ultimately it seems that the Pacific Interchange is a better choice not just for our immediate neighborhood, but the transportation needs of the whole region. Thank you.

I-0827-001

Online Comment by User: rmetzger

Submitted on: 9/25/2006 7:22:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

I-0828-001 | The Pacific Interchange is the best solution to the traffic mess through Montlake. It resolves traffic by directly taking cars from where they gather (UW) to where they want to go (520). The new interchange will greatly improve access to and between neighborhoods both north and south of the ship canal.

I like the idea of the land serving the current parking lot south of Husky Stadium becoming a transportation hub that serves much much more than just the cars that park there. This is a real opportunity to do something positive with that public land.

Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Comment:

I-0828-002 | The 4-lane alternative does not improve anything but the structure of the bridge. Let's not go through the work of building a new bridge without improving traffic as well!

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Comment:

I-0828-003 | The Pacific Interchange is the only option that improves traffic flow for everyone. A second Montlake bridge only creates another bottle neck while destroying people's homes. Bike lanes and future expansion for light rail should also be a part of any design.

Online Comment by User: Robert D. Warner

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:39:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98115

Comment:

I-0829-001 | I am vigorously opposed to any of the six lane options for the 520 bridge. The impact of such a bridge on the beauty, environment, vegetation, wildlife, and tranquility of the Washington Park Arboretum would be devastating. The Arboretum is a priceless asset to our community and must not be threatened or destroyed by such a mindless idea.

In my opinion, there are two aspects to this issue:

I-0829-002 | (1) Certainly, DOT needs to be concerned and plan for the repairs, maintenance, and possible reconstruction of the current four lane bridge. I agree that the bridge is old and must be brought up to current and necessary standards of safety. This should be the goal of any 520 improvements.

I-0829-003 | (2) The six lane option would not only destroy/damage priceless assets of the Washington Park Arboretum, but would encourage more traffic, noise, pollution, and other problems associated with this "growth and development" syndrome currently being promoted by special interests both inside and outside of Seattle. I oppose projects such as this that encourage such growth and destruction!!

Repair and maintain a four lane 520 bridge in a safe condition, but a firm NO, or HELL NO, to the stupid and short sided six lane option!

Sincerely,

Robert D. Warner
9800 Roosevelt Way N.E.
Seattle, Wa 98115

and

888 Monroe Street
Ketchikan, Ak 99901

Online Comment by User: Robert Hayden

Submitted on: 9/12/2006 9:36:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-12

Address: , , 98112-2006

Comment:

The Pacific Street Interchange is clearly the best choice as it will greatly reduce the gridlock that exists on Montlake Blvd. I have lived in Montlake for over 40 years and have continued to watch the traffic get worse and worse as time goes by. The Pacific Interchange will help alleviate the traffic congestion from the UVillage to Capital Hill. Plus it will finally connect our other forms of transportation into a true system. Bikers will be able to go directly from the Burke Gilman trail onto the new bridge and cross to the east side, or board a bus or light rail all at one intersection. Plus the traffic whether car or bus will not get caught by the Montlake Bridge openings if they desire to either go onto the Evergreen Bridge or take the Portage Bay Viaduct to I-5.

The Pacific Interchange will also reduce congestion from Husky stadium to the UVillage, which has to be one of the worst corridors in Washington State. It is currently faster for me to drive around Portage Bay to Montlake if I have been shopping in the UVillage, then it is to drive down Montlake Blvd and cross the Montlake Bridge. This is really sad and has been the case for the past 10 years. Adding another Montlake Bridge (which opens) and adding more lanes and off ramps at the current Montlake Blvd./SR 520 will do nothing to improve the traffic flow, but will instead exacerbate both the gridlock and the smog as we idle in stop and go traffic (mostly stop) for the next 40 years.

I-0830-001

Online Comment by User: Robert Sheppard

Submitted on: 8/28/2006 8:11:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98105

Comment:

I strongly support the Pacific Interchange option. Not only is this the most effective and least impactful on the neighborhood(s), in addition it allows these improvements to occur while increasing productivity of those of us who need to use 25th as our main corridor of transportation to and from work. A workable solution, that is also attractive to the area, which enables productivity will have a positive impact on the Seattle/Region economy.

Once again I strongly support the Pacific Interchange Option!

I-0831-001

Online Comment by User: roberta

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 1:26:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange Option with noise lids for neighborhoods on both sides of the lake and quiet pavement. This includes the raised section of 520 that passes through and over Montlake. This option is the only viable alternative that does not further impact one of Seattle's great neighborhoods. The Pacific interchange adds much needed access to 520 north of the Montlake Bridge.

The Pacific Interchange Option has the following positive impacts:

No more major backups between the University Village and Montlake.

A new park and greenbelt to connect Portage Bay and the Arboretum

A bike link to the eastside and the Burke-Gillman Trail

A connection for buses and light-rail at UW

HOV lanes

Thanks

I-0832-001

Online Comment by User: RobertBlumberg

Submitted on: 10/4/2006 9:57:00 AM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2235 Fairview Ave E #13, Seattle, 98102 98102

Comment:

I wish to voice my very strong opposition to the 6-lane design of the 520 bridge. This is a watershed issue for me: are you in favor of Seattle livability, lower pollution, and public transportation? If so, the four-lane alternative is the better choice.

Even though I travel to Bellevue and back to Seattle each day during rush hour traffic over this bridge, I still believe that the 4-lane alternative is better for the local neighborhoods and the city as a whole. I am willing to personally be impacted by the fewer lanes for the greater good of Seattle!

In addition, the Arboretum is an urban jewel and any impact to it degrades the quality of life in this ever more intensely urban environment.

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-12, Page-1

Comment:

I wish to voice my very strong opposition to the 6-lane design of the 520 bridge. This is a watershed issue for me: are you in favor of Seattle livability, lower pollution, and public transportation? If so, the four-lane alternative is the better choice.

Even though I travel to Bellevue and back to Seattle each day during rush hour traffic over this bridge, I still believe that the 4-lane alternative is better for the local neighborhoods and the city as a whole. I am willing to personally be impacted by the fewer lanes for the greater good of Seattle!

In addition, the Arboretum is an urban jewel and any impact to it degrades the quality of life in this ever more intensely urban environment.

I-0833-001

I-0833-002

Online Comment by User: robertlo9

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:01:00 PM

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-1

Address: , , WA 98074

Comment:

I-0834-001 | Please widen this road. This really must be done. I strongly urge you to do this because the eastside needs better access to Seattle and the current situation is intolerable. Please be reasonable and focus on how much we need this. I would much rather you consider 8 lanes because 6 lanes are inadequate, but this leaders in this state often do not plan ahead. At least leave room for additional lanes in the future. Do something now. Don't let this problem continue.

Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Comment:

I-0834-002 | This is unacceptable. Don't even consider doing this. The problem will still remain if you build a new but obsolete freeway.

Online Comment by User: Robin Duda

Submitted on: 10/23/2006 12:23:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98106

Comment:

Please forward as appropriate (I couldn't find a link to comment on the financing of the project)

Toll road! Those who use it pay for it. I haven't crossed 520 for over 10 years, so why should I pay to improve it? On the other hand, I drive on the Hwy 99 viaduct into downtown Seattle every day and would be glad to pay a toll so that those who don't use it, don't pay for it.

I-0835-001

Online Comment by User: robthom2001

Submitted on: 10/23/2006 10:38:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , redmond, wa 98052

Comment:

If we are going to upgrade the 520 corridor it needs to be a six lane project to allow for future growth in traffic so we don't have to redo the bridge again in the near future!

I-0836-001 |

Online Comment by User: roby

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 12:54:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-8

Address: ,, 98115

Comment:

My comment is on the Pacific Street Interchange option. I travel over the Montlake bridge on a daily basis. I only travel at selected times due to the gridlock on Montlake over a substantial part of the day. I find the concept of adding traffic to this intersection without doing major work on the surface streets of Pacific and Montlake bordering on lunacy.

I resent the use of my tax money to even entertain this option and the waste of time and resources to bring it as far as it has.

Have any of the people involved in this planning even seen ther congestion on Montlake?

If this is the quality of planning, I am inclined to vote against any changes to the current structure.

Jerry Robichaud

I-0837-001

Online Comment by User: Ron Bailey

Submitted on: 10/3/2006 12:22:00 PM**Comment Category: General Comments****Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-7****Address: ,, 98033****Comment:**

I want the WDOT to build a 6 lane bridge, the 6 lane alternative. We are 15 years behind any reasonable time line in getting this bridge expansion started and it needs to progress ASAP!! I don't have a problem with a lane dedicated to HOVs and busses, but I have a real problem dedicating a lane to light rail. Keep light rail off the 520 bridge! Also we have needed a bicycle path across 520 for at least a decade and I'm glad that you are including that in this expansion. I have never understood why one couldn't have been cantilevered out over the sides of the existing bridge, but it will be good to finally get one when this expansion is completed. Just GET ON WITH IT! You have been studying this far too long. Its long past time to start work!

Ron Bailey
98033

I-0838-001

Online Comment by User: Ron Norton

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:04:00 AM

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-11, Page-1

Address: 23670 NE 135th Way, Redmond, Wa. 98053

Comment:

I-0839-001 | We definitely need to replace with a larger bridge. I lived above 520 for 25 yrs. and saw the traffic patterns change to more car from Seattle than from the eastside. We should use "quiet pavement" and cover alot from bridge deck to Bellevue Way..
Alot of noise migrate west from the tunnel effect from 405.

I-0839-002 | Build at least a 6 lane structure with exit to Pacific St.

Online Comment by User: ronald stenkamp

Submitted on: 9/21/2006 10:07:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2445 E. Lake Washington Blvd., Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange option. It'll solve many traffic problems, both new and old, in this part of Seattle. The other options will only make traffic worse.

I-0840-001 |

Online Comment by User: ronha

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 1:05:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98144

Comment:

My wife and I are against any expanding of the 520 bridge.

I-0841-001 |

Online Comment by User: rsb

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 2:41:00 PM

Comment Category: Parks and Recreation

Comment Location: Chapter-11, Page-4

Address: , , 98004

Comment:

I-0842-001 | In order to minimize the increase in impervious surfaces, has DOT considered installing pervious concrete surfaces on the replacement trails, bike paths, and walkways not subject to oil contamination from vehicular traffic?

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-9, Page-12

Comment:

I-0842-002 | As the home owner pictured above that will supposedly benefit from the sound walls in the 4-Lane and 6-Lane Alternatives, I am much more concerned with addressing the articulation of the sound walls to improve the aesthetic aspects of 18 foot high slabs of concrete plunked down next to my house, than I am of the possible sound impacts from the widened freeway alternatives. The EIS claims that initially traffic levels are projected to go down in the short term, due to the effects of tolls driving commuters to use other alternatives. None of the illustrations and plans I have seen so far have made an effort to show affected property owners sufficient detail as to proposed sound wall location, illustrate any sound mitigating surface treatments to the wall itself, sensitivity to minimizing views lost by varying wall heights to in certain locations, serious discussion of using sound absorbing wall and roadway surface materials, or how stormwater runoff projects affecting adjacent properties will be handled.

Online Comment by User: rsoules

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:54:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Address: , Newcastle, Washington 98056

Comment:

I prefer this option.

I-0843-001 |

Online Comment by User: Ruth Saks

Submitted on: 9/11/2006 10:26:00 AM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2202 E. Calhoun ST , Seattle , WA 98112

Comment:

As a long time Montlake resident I have seen many proposals for bridge alternatives. The Pacific Interchange Plan, is the first proposal that seems to work. I strongly support this plan and urge the State to select this option.

I also want to add that I strongly oppose the "Base_Six" plan. I feel it will add to the problems we have been living with for many years.

Please support The Pacific Interchange Plan!!! Thank you.

I-0844-001

Online Comment by User: Sally Little

Submitted on: 9/17/2006 5:22:00 PM

Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

I strongly support the Pacific Interchange plan. The Base six plan will essentially be an airstrip size cement gash through the middle of a neighborhood. It will result in major traffic congestion on Montlake Blvd. Then to alleviate that it will result in further destruction of the Montlake neighborhood. A bridge (or tunnel) connecting 520 directly to the U of W just makes the best traffic pattern and leaves a neighborhood mostly intact. Don't make a bad traffic situation into a worse one.

I-0845-001

Online Comment by User: samirchudgar64@yahoo.com

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:43:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 16230 NE 25th St, Bellevue, Washington 98008

Comment:

SR520 Project,

Have you evaluated using steel pontoons for the floating bridge?

While steel may be an expensive material compared to concrete in raw costs, steel pontoons will likely be smaller in size (depth) and are also easier to construct. There is no curing time associated with steel that would greatly reduce the construction period.

Samir Chudgar, PE, SE
Chudgar Engineering Company
16230 NE 25th Street
Bellevue WA 98008

I-0846-001

Online Comment by User: sandywe

Submitted on: 8/27/2006 9:43:00 AM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Address: ,, 98102

Comment:

I-0847-001 | First I would like to say that I like being able to review all of the plans online. This is a great service.

I-0847-002 | Second, after reading thru the material I still think the Pacific Interchange plan would be the best (and perhaps most expensive) for my neighborhood.

Sandy Weil (a Portage Bay resident and daily 520 driver)

Online Comment by User: Sara Billey

Submitted on: 9/18/2006 1:21:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2217 22nd Ave. E, Seattle, WA 98195

Comment:

I believe the 520 is an important transportation issue in our city. I also believe we need to preserve the beauty of Seattle for future generations and to insure our economic viability.

Therefore, I believe the Pacific Interchange is the only option which improve our city while improving transportation. No money should be spent on single occupancy car transportation without giving something back to the community. We need exceptional public transportation along this cooridoor. We need bicycle lanes. We need to preserve the Montlake neighborhood, the Madison Park neighborhood, the Arboritum and the land near our university. We understand there must be some changes but there should also be some improvements to this land.

I give my strong support to the Pacific Interchange plan. I hope to vote for it soon.

Best regards,
Sara Billey
Associate Professor of Mathematics
University of Washington

I-0848-001

Online Comment by User: Sarah Reichard

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 2:11:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98117

Comment:

I am one of the many people who use the Washington Park Arboretum to teach students. In my case it is University of Washington students, but teachers from every community college in the area, as well as other educational institutions use it. We teach plant identification, horticulture, soils, recreation, and many other subjects.

One of the difficulties in teaching in this wonderful resource is the amount of traffic through on Lake Washington Blvd. This road was designed by the famous Olmsted Brothers firm for carriages. It is a beautiful road, but cars drive much faster than carriages and there are few safe places to cross it. Adding traffic to it, as the Pacific Interchange alternative would do, increases the danger. Furthermore, it is extremely difficult to teach when one has to compete with the noise from traffic.

On behalf of all of us who use this regional public garden for education, please do not add traffic to Lake Washington Blvd. You would be serving this state to find ways to get traffic OFF of it! Education is a top priority in this state and is linked to increased state revenue, selection of the region by companies, individual health, and a quality standard of life. Facilitate that, don't hinder it!

Finally, I have been involved with the American Public Garden Association for many years. In that capacity I have had the good fortune to visit public gardens (botanic gardens and arboreta) all over the world. I can say that in all honesty, the Washington Park Arboretum is one of the most beautiful in the world, with a very fine collection of many groups of species. For several groups of plants it has the best collection in North America; these collections are important for teaching, research, and conservation. The structures that have been projected will decrease the aesthetics of this beautiful garden and the increased pollution will be harmful to many of the plants. I believe WSDOT is aware of the affects of automobile pollution on plants because that is a criteria in roadside plant selection.

I strongly encourage you to not recommend the 6 lane bridge with the Pacific Interchange. This will be a disaster for the Washington Park Arboretum and an embarrassment to the state and to WSDOT. Already I have had conversations with people from all over the country who have heard about it and are incredulous that something so unbelievably short-sighted could even be considered. Is this what you want future generations to believe of this state?

I-0849-001

I-0849-002

Online Comment by User: sarah

Submitted on: 9/12/2006 10:57:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-1

Address: 1821 E McGraw St, Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

I strongly favor the pacific interchange option. I think it will improve greatly the traffic patterns in the Montlake and University areas, allow better access to mass transit, and have the least impact on the surrounding areas.

Sarah Hauschka

I-0850-001 |

Online Comment by User: sawarren

Submitted on: 10/29/2006 8:24:00 PM

Comment Category: Ecosystems

Comment Location: Chapter-12, Page-1

Address: ,, 98112

Comment:

I'd rather you bulldoze my house in the middle of the night without my permission than I'd have you build a road through, or over, Foster Island in the manner that the Pacific Interchange alternative proposes.

It's can't trust the Pacific Interchange proposal not to overbias cars through the Arboretum.

And all that concrete hanging out over Union Bay would mar an aesthetic that is truley Seattle: the recreation/boating channel east of Montlake Bridge.

Again, though, it is the vitality of a unique and rare wetlands ecosystem that I worry most about in this 520 upgrade decision.

I favor a 6-lane proposal with major emphasis on protecting wetlands and catering to public transit, bicycles and pedestrians.

Anything other than the Pacific Interchange option.

Thank You,

Sam Warren, MD
1001 25th Ave E

I-0851-001

Online Comment by User: sayahoy

Submitted on: 8/21/2006 12:27:00 PM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98115

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange Option. I live in the U. Village area and work in Redmond.

I-0852-001 |

Online Comment by User: scali

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 6:05:00 PM**Comment Category: Other Environmental Effects****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: 1523 4th Avenue North, Seattle, WA 98109****Comment:**

Are you folks living in a cave? Ever heard of global warming, loss of the environment, degradation of the environment. How about cost overruns. For heaven sakes get the idea of 6 lane bridge your bridge.

Comment Category: Other Environmental Effects**Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Comment:**

Are you folks living in a cave? Ever heard of global warming, loss of the environment, degradation of the environment. How about cost overruns. For heaven sakes get the idea of 6 lane bridge your bridge. How about alternative means of transportation.

I-0853-001

Online Comment by User: sclark

Submitted on: 9/25/2006 9:30:00 PM

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-1

Address: 2548 Medina Circle, Medina, WA 98039

Comment:

I-0854-001 | Thank you for the hard work that has gone into this. As a Medina resident living very close to 520 I would like to voice my support for the current 6 lane option. Growth in this region and the stress on this point in particular demands we build as much capacity as we can. Funding the 6 lane version now will future proof, to some extent the investment we are making.

I-0854-002 | Further, I would like to see more referenced regarding noise mitigation. It is very important that those of taking the brunt of this expansion not have to suffer with added noise pollution. I agree we must replace 520, but let's do the right thing and ensure noise is reduced not increaed.

Online Comment by User: Scott Coughlin

Submitted on: 9/7/2006 7:30:00 AM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 1903 East Calhoun Street, Seattle, 98112

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange Option, and the many advantages it offers over the alternatives. You know what they are, and I don't need to list them here.

Anyone who has to contend with the "Montlake Mess" already understands how quickly things have gone from bad, to worse, to downright horrible and unworkable. As a former ambulance crewman, I shudder every time I see or hear a medic unit approaching the current interchange on its way to University Hospital or Children's, because I know that seconds count, and the current gridlock is costing lives.

Thank you,

Scott Coughlin

I-0855-001

Online Comment by User: Scott Gilson

Submitted on: 9/27/2006 10:34:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98004

Comment:

I strongly recommend the "Pacific Interchange" alternative.
Scott Gilson 9-27-2006

I-0856-001 |

Online Comment by User: scott graham

Submitted on: 9/25/2006 3:50:00 PM**Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: 5143 NE Laurelcres Lane, Seattle, WA 98105****Comment:**

The Pacific Street Interchange seems to be the only alternative that effectively addresses the "Montlake Mess." Please implement this aspect of the SR520 replacement project. I live in Laurelhurst in NE Seattle, and have been very unhappy with proposals that do not address Montlake traffic impact.

Note also that there are many in Laurelhurst like me that feel that the Laurelhurst Community Club is run by a vocal minority that does not represent the interests of the majority of Laurelhurst residents. Their opposition to the Pacific Street Interchange, and their support of a 4 lane alternative, should be discounted or ignored.

I-0857-001

Online Comment by User: Scott Meyer

Submitted on: 10/30/2006 10:51:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 3612 S. Spokane St., Seattle, WA 98144

Comment:

I oppose any option that would damage the Arboretum or its wetlands. I am particularly against the Pacific Interchange option, which would ruin views from just about every part of the wetlands and would fill the serene area with vehicle noise. I frequently kayak and take nature walks through the Arboretum wetlands with friends, family and out of town visitors. They marvel at the Arboretum and wetlands. The area is an amazing gem - a unique piece of nature and tranquility in the middle of a hectic city. It is an huge asset to the citizenry of Seattle and to the environment. Shading it with a huge bridge over Marsh Island, destroying views and disrupting the peace of this lovely natural area is unconscionable. Furthermore, the Pacific Interchange - the biggest misnomer in ages, as there will be nothing pacific about it - is too expensive, costing \$500 million more than the next alternative. Do we really need to spend an extra half billion dollars to ruin this priceless place? I don't think so.

I-0858-001

I-0858-002

Online Comment by User: Scottjenni

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

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-17

Address: 825 Skyline, 10900 NE 4th Street, Bellevue, WA 98004

Comment:

I am writing in support of the six lane alternative with the Pacific Street interchange incorporated into the project. It is ridiculous to the point of idiocy to even consider a 4 lane replacement of the current bridge. I did not read everything in the package, but would be interested to know if a study has been done to determine the amount of current I-90 traffic that might utilize the new 520 bridge. I know that in my business that requires a number of trips/week, during all times of the day across the lake from Bellevue to Seattle, I will 90% of the time use I-90 and fight my traffic battles in Seattle rather than put up with the inevitable traffic jam on 520. 520 is a key link between the Eastside's employment centers and Seattle's tech savvy residents who, for some strange reason, choose to live in Seattle and commute to the Eastside. By moving forward with a 6 lane alternative that supports future transit development and helps to dissipate traffic jams in and around the UW/Montlake corridor, the State will be effectively be meeting the future needs of both sides of Lake Washington, which is critical.

I-0859-001

Online Comment by User: scotton22

Submitted on: 8/26/2006 9:30:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-1

Address: ,, 98115

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange option. It seems to solve more problems than the other proposals.

I-0860-001 |

Online Comment by User: sculpturearts

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 7:08:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98122

Comment:

Replace it with a four lane bridge with bike lanes. Adding a bridge with more lanes won't relieve Puget Sound traffic congestion. The proposed replacement options are too big and hurt Neighborhoods. Where is all the new traffic on the bridge going to go once it gets to I-5? This is a big mistake. Think local.

If you want to add capacity, build the light rail across the I-90 bridge to Redmond.

I'd prefer the do nothing option to what is proposed.

I-0861-001

Online Comment by User: sean.horner

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 12:33:00 PM

Comment Category: Transportation and Traffic

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98105

Comment:

I support the Pacific Street Interchange. Addressing the traffic bottleneck on 520 is long overdue. With better public transportation infrastructure, the use of cars between Redmond and Seattle will become a less desirable option, will cut down on car emissions, etc. This is well worth the investment.

I-0862-001

Online Comment by User: seanmodious

Submitted on: 9/19/2006 9:05:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

I-0863-001 | 1) I got the letter inviting me to the September 18th public meeting on September 18th at 4pm. This is insulting and negligent.

I-0863-002 | 2) After hearing about an immersed tube/tunnel proposal for over a year now I am stunned that it has not made it into the DEIS. If it is so easily dismissed then why not document the issues in the DEIS so that it can be ruled out. I would like to see an independent consultant with international recognition in the field of immersed tube/tunnel design do a feasibility study to determine if a tube option would work. The proposal that I have seen I do not support however, I also do not support either of the gargantuan structures that you plan to build.

I-0863-003 | 3) I served on the Citizens Advisory Group that reviewed the Madison Park Bike/Pedestrian connection and I was stunned to see in the DEIS that drivers in the area are used to see pedestrian crossing Madison Street. There does not appear to have been any communication with David Allen from SDOT who ran the CAG. The intersection of McGilvra Boulevard East and East Madison Street is the least used by pedestrian precisely because it is the most dangerous. It is a canterd 5 way intersection with 2 marked crosswalks and 3 unmarked crosswalks and has a turn lane to boot. The east bound traffic on Madison is coming down a hill with a speed limit of 35mph and entering a business district with a speed limit of 25mph. The west bound traffic has seen the light at the end of the tunnel per se and is now accelerating to the speed limit of 35mph.

Sean Smith
Madison Park Community Council

Online Comment by User: sehanson

Submitted on: 9/13/2006 11:21:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

I am writing to express my strongest possible support for the Pacific Interchange Option for the SR 520 reconstruction project. As a resident of Montlake who commutes daily to the UW, where I am a professor, I know first-hand just how bad the traffic congestion on Montlake Blvd. can get--not only at rush hour, but at almost anytime of day. Building a huge, multilane freeway right through the Portage Bay area will not only substantially degrade our quality of life in the Montlake neighborhood, with adverse impacts on wetlands and wildlife in the vicinity as well, but it will also make the congestion on Montlake Blvd. itself far worse than before, as an even greater number of cars fan out over our neighborhood each day. The only options for dealing with this new "Montlake mess" will involve turning Montlake Blvd. itself into a kind of mini-highway--and that, in turn, will necessitate the sacrifice of the lovely, historic Montlake drawbridge.

The Pacific Interchange Option, in contrast, will funnel cars to and from the areas around the UW precisely where traffic now builds up; it will greatly facilitate travel to Husky Stadium and the new UW Light Rail station; it will allow traffic from I-5 to travel more smoothly and safely onto the new 520 bridge (and vice versa); and it will preserve the historic Montlake neighborhood with its many parks, cultural resources, and natural areas.

Thank you for considering my feedback on this important issue.

Sincerely,
Stephen E. Hanson
2102 22nd Ave. E
Seattle, WA 98112

I-0864-001

Online Comment by User: semyan

Submitted on: 9/24/2006 10:09:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-6

Address: ,, 98105

Comment:

I feel that a 6 lane bridge (with one lane on each side reserved for transit/light rail use) is the best alternative. We need a pedestrian/bicycle lane. But the option to build a bridge over to the Husky Stadium (the Pacific Street Interchange Option) would be a huge expense, an eyesore, and would disrupt the aboretum wetland.

I-0865-001

I-0865-002

Online Comment by User: Seth Shotwell

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 5:34:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2200 196th St SE #18, Bothell, Washington 98012

Comment:

Let me say this much ...

The Arboretum is one of the most beautiful and precious locations in the state. It is a treasure to be preserved and revered.

I will fight ANY attempt to launch ANY plan to expand SR520 that will negatively impact that park in ANY way. I will hire attorneys and sue. I will vote out any politician that supports such a project. I will be loud I will be public and I will drum up trouble in spades.

I'm so sick of this State destroying our environment to pander to the rich and privileged. Expand the bridge out in the other direction. Displace some UW land. Displace the rich, privileged and elite bastards in Medina. Make them sacrifice for a change! Or better yet, tear the damn thing down. I don't care. I'd rather sit in traffic for three hours than use and support the distruction of what little real environment we have left in this area.

Beware of my vote if this goes through.

I-0866-001

Online Comment by User: Seven Dunsmore

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 1:27:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-9

Address: , , 98070

Comment:

I can appreciate the tremendous amount of work and intention that went into evaluating the various options for the expansion of 520. As a social worker who works in Seattle and drives to the Monroe penitentiary weekly, I have an active interest in this development in particular and have sat in lines many, many times over the past few years.

It is quite frankly shocking to me, however, that the alternatives which have been proposed all contain some destruction of the wetland of the Arboretum. This is not just a 520 problem, this is an issue for society as a whole. Unfortunately, I expect more of Seattle and feel ashamed by the lack of technology and insight into the long-term effects of catering to automobiles.

Won't we be riding in bullet trains (or something even more exciting) within the next 50 years, particularly since fossil fuels will be extinct and the population will be impossible to move by then, using existing modes of transportation? And if we need to get out of our cars and into trains/buses in order for the planet to survive, why are we building an infrastructure for an obsolete technology? This is such a massive waste of money, and the interim effects of harming plants, waterways and wildlife is unethical and dismal.

I-0867-001

Online Comment by User: shageman

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 5:40:00 PM**Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: , , 98072****Comment:**

We need a six lane version with bike lanes and ped. access. Anything less would be a waste of taxpayer dollars and would do nothing to improve the situation. One lane each way should be HOV with two general purpose lanes. Thanks,

Comment Category: General Comments**Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Comment:**

We need a six lane bridge and we need to get started on it ASAP. No more processing it to death. Let's get it built and tolls are ok. If Seattle cannot move forward with an option for the Viaduct, we should put the money from the legislature earmarked for it into the 520 corridor. It is only going to cost more the longer we wait to make a plan and implement it.

Comment Category: General Comments**Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-1****Comment:**

We need a six lane version with bike lanes and ped. access. Anything less would be a waste of taxpayer dollars and would do nothing to improve the situation. One lane each way should be HOV with two general purpose lanes. Thanks,

I-0868-001

Online Comment by User: Sharon Ellard

Submitted on: 10/23/2006 11:02:00 AM

Comment Category: Ecosystems

Comment Location: Chapter-11, Page-4

Address: , , 98102

Comment:

As a frequent visitor to the area between the Husky Stadium and the Urban Horticultural Center, I have become aware of an area where there is an enormous diversity of wildlife, especially birds. These creatures depend upon an area of marshlands and riparian habitat unique to this area. Second only in number of bird species to Discovery Park, this area contains species found nowhere else in the Seattle area. For example, this spring I saw a Bullock's Oriole in this area, an American pipit and just missed a Common Snipe in addition to the 30 or so different species seen at each short visit. Many shorebirds visit this area. Should this Montlake Fill area be impacted, even indirectly through habitat loss, Seattle would be just as poor as if it had lost the opera or the symphony. Whatever the final choice is for the bridge it must take into account preservation of animal and plant habitat or the quality of life in our region will be seriously downgraded.

I-0869-001

Online Comment by User: sharona

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 9:25:00 AM

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98019

Comment:

I-0870-001 | It is clear to all that SR520 needs to be replaced and expanded, and it needs to happen soon. Because the communities have grown up so much around it, it is inevitable that there are going to be some changes to all areas next to the highway system. However, any impact and changes that occur near the Arboretum MUST be minimized. The Arboretum is truly Seattle's treasure. In fact, it is of national and historical importance. The Arboretum is an oasis within the city, a place for peace, to study water fowl and horticulture, to learn about the nature around us. 100+ foot tall spans over the Arboretum will destroy this, not to mention the disturbance by the footprint of the support structures. Once it is lost, it can not be regained.

I have lived in areas that have grown from rural and quiet to urban and loud. All the noise barriers in the world won't make the birds come back when their habitat is destroyed. Unnatural growing conditions will kill ancient plants. At a time when we need to reduce greenhouse gases, disturbing an historical green space should not be first on the list of actions we are going to take. I've seen the map, and I know that in an aerial view it appears that the interchange is a minimal impact on a larger green space. But the reality is, critical areas will be disturbed and the impact will have repercussions throughout the green space.

I-0870-002 | I recognize that the Montlake neighborhood holds both political and financial sway on this project. They have, of course, supported the proposal that impacts their neighborhood the least, but a too high a cost. Other neighborhoods will lose homes and structures. It is not right that in Montlake they will lose the Arboretum instead of man made buildings.

I agree that there is a need for 6 lanes. I often rail against the study and then study again mentality that seems to permeate Seattle and the WSDOT, but I have to recommend that this be studied again or at least a redesign option provided. The Pacific Interchange is not the solution at the west end of the bridge.

Online Comment by User: Shawna

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 1:46:00 PM**Comment Category:** Ecosystems**Comment Location:** Chapter-2, Page-1**Address:** , , 98107**Comment:**

To Whom it May Concern:

The 6-lane only and 6-lane with Pacific Interchange alternative for 520 expansion are not acceptable. For one, the EIS statement has failed to offer real solutions to support the increased traffic surrounding the floating bridge expansion. What will happen to traffic in the Montlake, Capitol Hill, University District, Madison Valley during construction for 7+ years? There is no viable plan in place for construction and post-construction for the surrounding infrastructure of this expansion.

Secondly, I am deeply concerned about the large amount of concrete that will be visible from all directions including the Arboretum and Union Bay Natural Area, both originally designed to be respites from city life and preserved areas for wildlife, youth and higher education. Noise will be at a higher volume and travel farther which will effect the quality of educational opportunities at this rich botanic garden. 5,000 + youth participate in education programs at the Arboretum. They are the future stewards of this place, what kind of example is it to leave them with a less than perfect bridge plan for their future? How is this in-line with the conservation and sustainable direction we are headed as a city and a state?

The UW Botanic Gardens is a gem in the state of Washington and I would hate to see anything short of sustainable, well-planned, long term transportation options being constructed in this valuable and fragile area. I support doing a feasibility study of the tunnel tube option so the public has something to compare to what's offered in the EIS.

I support encouraging more use of mass transit and less cars. Don't we have better options than this? Let's follow the examples of other successful cities and consider tunnels, light rail, trolley and other ways to get around instead of more cars and more concrete.

Thank you,

Concerned Citizen

I-0871-001

Online Comment by User: shawnsax

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 12:05:00 PM**Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives****Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1****Address: ,, 98115****Comment:**

I am a firm believe that if you build more lanes then they will fill up with more cars. We will have to build more parking lot's and gas stations. It is the car the is killing the sealife in the sound. It is the car that is causing problems in Lake Washington. To add more lanes for more cars is a bad idea.

Thank you for listening

I-0872-001

Online Comment by User: Shelley

Submitted on: 10/6/2006 9:52:00 AM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

I am opposed to the 6 lane proposal for SR 520.

I am mostly opposed for the negative environmental impact the additional lanes of 520 will bring to the wetlands and surrounding neighborhoods. Additionally I oppose the degedation of the landscape Olmstead intended for the Arboretum.

Have the council leaders who favor the expansion forgotten that this is a historical site that will be forever lost if the proposal to expand 520 goes through?

It would be a terrible loss to our beautiful city to degrade this park even further than it already has been with the initial phase of 520 running right through it.

As a 3rd generation Seattleite, I must stand up for every last bastion of the fine and uniquely beautiful city this was and should continue to be.

Thank you for your kind support.

Shelley Hightower

Online Comment by User: Shelli Vacca

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:26:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98118

Comment:

A new bridge needs to include:

Light rail

Bike path

Reduce congestion, not create more, including in the University and Montlake

Neighborhoods

A new bridge should not in anyway effect the Arboretum or wetlands surrounding the Arboretum and Mountlake Cut.

I believe it is possible to have both and it's important to the quality of life in Seattle and Bellvue to protect Arboretum. I believe it's worth spending more money on the project and do it right than to compromise and ruin the Arboretum or not provide public transportation options on the Bridge.

Sincerely,
Shelli Vacca

I-0874-001

Online Comment by User: sheril

Submitted on: 9/5/2006 10:53:00 AM

Comment Category: Transportation and Traffic

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98052

Comment:

I-0875-001 | After thoroughly studying all alternatives for the new 520 bridge, of course, the only conclusion I have is: The Pacific Interchange planned by citizens for a better bridge design is superior to all the state/federal considerations.

Are the engineers for the state the same ones who made possible onramps and offramps on the same lane? Or took 4 years to design the West Seattle Bridge and took 7 years to construct it and did a horrid design?

I-0875-002 | We who bike to work to U District have only one alternative which is slow, and often the buses all ready have two bikes and I wait and am late for work. Do you want me to continue to rise at 5am to be to work by 8? The new proposal for the 520 is superior.

This needs not be a battle among us and them---please do the superior design and choose Pacific Interchange.

Sheril Bechard
Redmond, Wa.

Online Comment by User: shirley lampkin

Submitted on: 11/1/2006 12:11:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2206 E. Louisa St, Seattle, WA 908112-2232

Comment:

(1) Please, no more than 6 lanes through Montlake.

(2) Tunnel under the ship canal, rather than build another high bridge to the Pacific interchange.

Jacob Hildebrandt

I-0876-001

Online Comment by User: sjwastvedt

Submitted on: 9/19/2006 7:53:00 PM**Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives****Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-2****Address: , , 98112****Comment:**

The Pacific Interchange appears by far to be the best option. My only hesitation would be the impact to the Arboretum. Please consider limiting the exit ramp to the South through the Arboretum. The Arboretum is THE PEARL of Seattle...what a tragedy it would be to run a freeway through it. Also, more lanes for autos is just putting a BandAid on a fast growing tumor. What we really need is a Light Rail system that connects all points in the Metropolitan area. Please give us an alternative to single-occupancy automobiles.

I-0877-001

Online Comment by User: SK

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 5:07:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98102

Comment:

The four lane alternative for the new 520 bridge is the only acceptable one for my wife and myself. We cannot afford the noise, air pollution, money, environmental damage, and new traffic any other alternative will bring. We should be instituting a toll right now for 520 to start paying for it as the project is several years off. This will tell us if drivers want to use the bridge and start now to raise the funds for it. thanks. S. Kedelsky, J. Zegree, Seattle, WA.

I-0878-001

I-0878-002

Online Comment by User: skeatts

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 12:56:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-1

Address: , Seattle, WA 98115

Comment:

The problem with this comment process is that only people who have negative comments will reply. So they're likely to be weighted against this proposal, especially given the sob piece in today's Seattle PI. I'm hereby commenting to please get on with the process of building the 6-lane SR-520 option. I'm all for it!

I-0879-001

Online Comment by User: sleepymon

Submitted on: 10/23/2006 6:46:00 AM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98105

Comment:

The Pacific interchange option is the only option that makes sense for commuters.

As a health care professional living in North Seattle with on call responsibilities, returning to the hospital can be very problematic when trying to get back to the hospital. Not only are we dealing with 520 Bridge congestion, very often southbound Montlake Avenue is backed up past University Village because of congestion caused by the Montlake bridge. The Pacific interchange option would deal with Montlake congestion by creating access to SR520 north and south of the Montlake bridge.

Please make plans for light rail and bicycle lane support across the 520 bridge--The current concept of bike racks on buses is not reliable as frequently the racks are full when trying to commute across during busy hours--that is why we need light rail like Portland, where many bikes can be transported simultaneously on hanging racks. And please build a bike lane across the bridge! The Pacific interchange option is the best plan and I would gladly pay my share to bring this design to fruition.

I-0880-001

Online Comment by User: sloryder

Submitted on: 8/23/2006 6:13:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 6047 37th Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98115

Comment:

The Pacific Interchange plan (as outlined at betterbridge.org) makes a lot of sense to me. As a regular user of Montlake/Pacific and someone who would LOVE to use more convenient mass transit options to commute to Microsoft, that plan alone serves my needs in a way which will allow me to do so.

I-0881-001

Online Comment by User: sm woods

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 4:28:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98144

Comment:

Re: Public comment on the SR-520 DEIS - Note my comments pertain only to the Seattle side of the SR-520 DEIS; submitted electronically 31 - Oct - 2006.

I-0882-001

Process: Perhaps WSDOT had found in the past that working toward negotiated options with a large stakeholder group produced no results. However, taking the opposite course could equally produce no results. It appears that WSDOT was working almost exclusively with the Montlake group "Better Bridge" in developing the Pacific Street Interchange (PSI) option. I question if this option can be supported by the community of Seattle citizens as a whole, as it appears to be a betterment to the Montlake neighborhood at the expense of taxpayers, i.e., reducing the level of local/regional traffic in the neighborhood (even from today's volumes) and creating a park-like setting with lids.

The process did not include the major stakeholders that would bear the brunt of the impacts for the proposed PSI option, primarily the Arboretum and its visitors and the University of Washington and its visitors, students and faculty. To my knowledge, based upon reviewing the DEIS and the proposed non-motorized facility, non-motorized groups were not included as well.

I am certain that if representatives of U of W, Arboretum, environmental and non-motorized advocates were involved during the scoping process, we would not be reviewing the plans in the DEIS as presented.

I-0882-002

Regional Policies: The Pacific Northwest has many attributes that make it stand out as a unique place on the planet. It is a natural wonder and I'm proud to live in the Northwest. The policies that have been enacted to preserve this region range from recycling programs to the Mayor's policies on global warming. The added capacity on SR-520 ONLY perpetuates sprawl, auto dependence and a degradation of the environment, i.e., more green house gases and the destruction of a unique natural environment. If we continue to improve SOV capacity, people will continue to drive as the economics of cost/time do not outweigh the other factors that encourage alternative modes or more simply housing/job location choices.

To quote Peter Steinbrueck, Seattle City Council: "Looming over all of our decisions about transportation in the Seattle area is the scary reality of climate change. The scientific evidence is irrefutable — global warming is real. In Seattle, nearly 50 percent of the emissions that contribute to climate change come from burning fossil fuels for our transportation system."

I-0882-003

The best solution would involve a 4 lane option in which one lane serves general purpose traffic and the other high capacity traffic. I support the infrastructure for future light rail. This is the preferred "6-lane" option. If we are to have a successful high capacity transit system, this is a critical step.

I-0882-004 | Cost: For each of the 3 options, the true costs are not reflected in the estimates, as the mitigation costs are not included. In fact, it is likely the PSI option will have the largest mitigation costs, especially as it affects the arboretum/wetland and U of W. The U of W impacts are significant. The PSI option proposes lowering the roadway and creating a grade separation to reduce the exposure of pedestrians getting hit as significantly more vehicular traffic is directed to a high pedestrian/bicycle intersection. This option also includes reconstructing the bridges over Montlake Blvd NE. There is the issue of a parking structure to mitigate loss of on-site parking at Husky Stadium. What about the costs associated with wetland mitigation? Please present true costs to the public.

I-0882-005 | Non-motorized: It also appears that in an effort to reduce costs, although the project presents a unique opportunity to construct a regional, separated, multi-use trail, each option falls short of providing such a facility. Under no circumstances should any facility be constructed without complete access for bicyclists and pedestrians. The need is great in this area with the highest bicycle usage in the City. The project should create non-motorized connections that provide the most level and direct access. The PSI option directs bicyclists up and over the cut at a 7%+ grade. This is simply a discouragement to bicyclists, especially those south of the cut.

I-0882-006 | Environmental: The Olmsted designed Arboretum and the unique wetland habitat is not only unique, it is an incredible learning environment that is accessible to citizens of Seattle. On a recent visit, there were many elementary school field trips observing nature at its most splendid. The boardwalk would be almost entirely shaded and noisy with the PSI option. Noise levels truly impact ones experience in a natural environment as the sounds would be drowned out by the roar of traffic. Every effort should be made to minimize these impacts, as once this resource is lost, it is lost forever.

I-0882-007 | As a minimum, NO connection for motorized vehicles should be directed through the Arboretum. This is especially a concern with the PSI option where motorists would have a direct link from the intersection of Montlake Bl NE and NE Pacific ST via the SR-520 ramps to the Arboretum, essentially creating a bypass for the Montlake Bridge. This link appears to be beyond the scope of the SR-520 project. What benefit does this provide other than appeasing the group in Montlake at the expense of the experience in the Arboretum? PLEASE evaluate the validity of directing more vehicles (at a significant project cost) through the Arboretum by analyzing the existing capacity particularly at the signalized intersection of E Lake Washington Blvd and E Madison ST.

I-0882-008 | Transportation Modeling: PLEASE model the need with tolls on both the SR-520 and I-90 bridges. If automobile costs increase, mass transit is a more attractive alternative. The laws of economic dictate the \$3.50 toll per crossing would significantly reduce demand and thus the need for the 6-lane options. The beneficial impacts of taking people out of their SOV are significant for the region.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
SM Woods

Online Comment by User: smithme

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

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98102

Comment:

I-0883-001 | I live in the Montlake area of Seattle and work in downtown Seattle.

I have asked both at the public comment meetings and as a comment on this website to see the study that was done on the Tunnel alternative. You have yet to provide that to me. We keep being told that the tunnel alternative is off the table and not an option because of the expense and because of the fill it would sit on, yet you fail to provide any documentation of an actual study that documents that. Why?

You may disagree with the tunnel alternative and that's fine. Let me have access to the data that led you to your conclusion. Better yet, put it on your website.

That said, I don't believe that any of the alternatives that you have put forth are acceptable, and here's why.

I-0883-002 | The six lane alternative would have an extremely negative impact on the arboretum, wetlands, the environment, as well as neighborhoods and surface roads. These are cherished resources. Also, it is being touted as a quieter alternative to the four lane because it has noise mitigation that the four lane does not have. This is a transparent and manipulative argument. Also, I thought the point was to move traffic in an environmentally sound way, and to reduce greenhouse gasses and fossil fuel use. We should be looking at ways to get people out of their cars rather than trying to accommodate more of them.

I-0883-003 | The Pacific Street Interchange is a misnomer and totally unacceptable. It should be called the "Arboretum" Interchange or the "Union Bay" interchange because that is what it really is. It will increase traffic on surface streets north of the Montlake area. No wonder the Montlake and Capital Hill area residents and Better Bridge support it. It's the most obvious case of NIMBYism. Defer the cars away from my neighborhood, and push them on to someone else's.

I-0883-004 | Please rebuild the 4 lane bridge, and charge tolls for any single or double occupancy vehicle. I don't understand why this hasn't been implemented already. Get the people out of their cars and into public transportation or carpools. Pay for our new bridge with those revenues. Make a bridge that is seismically sound and will last longer than 40 years. Design one we can all be proud of, that is functional as well as aesthetically pleasing and blends in better with the natural environment and beauty we are so fortunate to live in. It's why we're all here, in the Seattle area. Don't let the "decision must be made soon", make the decision. Sometimes cheap is more expensive. The cost of a bad decision far outweighs the added expense of one well thought out, and perhaps by some new sets of eyes and engineers and designers. Don't let the "experts" become so invested in their position that they fail to see the merit in other alternatives. I fear that these folks have studied this for so long that they

I-0883-004 | are tired of studying it, and that is no reason to build anything that will impact all of us for generations to come. Please don't let that be your legacy. That Seattle and its millionaires can spend so much money on their sports stadiums and pet projects without taking responsibility for their impacts on our environment is mind-boggling to me. Can we just take the high road for once?

Megan Smith

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Comment:

I-0883-005 | I have asked to see the data from the DEIS as it relates to the Tube Tunnel option on SR520 over Lake Washington and have yet to receive it. Please send it to me. Thank you.

Online Comment by User: soneill

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 6:17:00 PM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-5

Address: , , 98007

Comment:

I-0884-001 | This is precisely where the politicians failed. The ENTIRE point of replacing this bridge is nothing more than creating additional, new capacity for vehicles to transit the north end of the lake. The fact that the 8 lane alternative would provide under-utilized capacity is PRECISELY THE GOAL! Anything less than this is not stepping up to the need.

Nowhere is it mentioned that the separate I-5 study could provide the necessary relief through an independent mechanism, and at a different point in time, to make advantage and utilize the extra capacity provided by the extra lanes. Likewise, nowhere is it mentioned that the independent I-405 study could provide the same future relief for congestion on it's corridor.

I-0884-002 | The statement that single occupant vehicles are contrary to regional and local policies encouraging greater use of transit and HOV's is also horribly mis-guided. Such policies were never meant to further the use of mass transit at the cost of single occupant vehicles, but rather to augment the use of single occupant vehicles. The public in Washington State have clearly voted the single occupant vehicle to be the vehicle of choice, as more people in this state use this means of transportation, by far, than all others means combined.

This is a clear failure of our politicians to provide for the future capacity needs of our area in a comprehensive manner.

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-6

Comment:

I-0884-003 | The decision to eliminate the tunnel was the right decision. This option did nothing to add capacity to the bridge, and came at a prohibitive cost.

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-6

Comment:

I-0884-004 | The 6-Lane alternative is the only viable alternative, after the 8-lane alternative was eliminated. This is because the only viable reason for replacing this bridge is to add capacity. It would be unthinkable to spend the money to replace this bridge, and not add the capacity required for our current and future traffic needs.

Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-8

Comment:

The 4-lane alternative is worthless, and should have been thrown out first. There is absolutely no point whatsoever in spending the money to rebuild this bridge without addressing the needs of our community for traffic flow improvements.

Online Comment by User: soniavt

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

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-16

Address: 2276 NE 61st Street, Seattle, WA 98115

Comment:

I support the 6-lane alternative with a permanent, continuous HOV lane and a bike lane. These are the sort of changes we should be making to encourage alternative transportation and enable sound transit to not get bogged down by cars. I do not support the Pacific Interchange or second Montlake bridge.

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-9, Page-1

Comment:

I do not support the Pacific Street Interchange, it will act as a wider pipe trying to feed into small neighborhoods that do not have the streets to support the traffic. It will clog up our already crowded neighborhoods and will create new problems for the surrounding areas. While I understand why the Montlake residents want to create this alternative route, devastating all the surrounding neighborhoods is not a fair resolution to their problems.

I-0885-001
I-0885-002

Online Comment by User: sorscher

Submitted on: 10/1/2006 3:16:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 3716 ne 43rd st, seattle, wa 98105

Comment:

The Pacific Interchange alternative can transform patterns of daily traffic by creating a transit hub at the UW stadium location. Commuters will not get out of the personal vehicles unless they have easy access to major destinations. The Pacific Interchange option would connect eastside bus routes to the light rail train station at Husky Stadium. Eastside bus traffic can terminate there, instead of continuing into downtown Seattle.

Metro must be included in the planning, since bus service at the triangle at Pacific Avenue will be a key factor - to shuttle UW students and staff to campus, and to move eastside commuters west and north.

Planners have made excellent progress since the flying bridge was introduced. I look forward to more improvements to deal with environmental effects, Montlake Ave widening and scale issues passing through Montlake.

UW should think of this alternative as supporting its own options for future growth. University traffic already dominates the area. This alternative is consistent with UW's obligations as a good neighbor in a congested mixed-use area.

I-0886-001

Online Comment by User: spenner

Submitted on: 9/20/2006 4:42:00 PM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-46

Address: , , 98004

Comment:

In general, the draft DEIS is inadequate in its discussion and analysis of the significant impact tolling plays in the project under consideration:

(1) The proposed plan will limit single vehicle HOV use. The HOV system in this state is 2+ occupants. The exception to that is the westbound portion of SR520 from 405 to the 520 bridge, which has been limited to 3+ given the shoulder configuration. The proposed plan as listed on p. 3-46 indicates that vehicles will have to have 3 or more people to travel across the bridge without charge. This is inconsistent with the purpose of HOV, i.e. to get people to share cars. Vehicles with only 2 occupants will tend to avoid 520 and travel the extra distance to I90. Anyone who spends 5 minutes watching current HOV traffic on 520 would see few 3 occupant vehicles.

(2) The stated tolls are exorbitant and are understated as they are in 2002 dollars. Why has WSDOT set the tolls so high? Further, why does the DEIS only list afternoon peak but not morning? Aren't peak tolls applicable to both?

(3) The high tolls will have a negative effect on regional businesses. Will a person in Kirkland want to travel to Seattle to shop when it will cost almost \$7 in tolls alone just to drive across the bridge? Further, 520 is not just a commuter bridge. As the DEIS shows, significant bridge travel occurs at non-rush hour times.

(4) The draft DEIS contains no discussion of the impact of tolling in the discussion of the economy. See, e.g. p. 4-21.

(5) Much of the need for tolling appears to come from the decision of the state to only fund \$500 million of the SR520 costs. In contrast, the Viaduct, which has equivalent usage (approx. 100,000 vehicles/day) is slated to get \$2.0 billion. Why is the 520 bridge being so inadequately funded by the state?

(6) WSDOT's analysis largely relies on tolling to achieve traffic flow benefits. WSDOT's analysis of traffic patterns on 520 assumes for the 4 lane and 6 lane alternates that tolls will be imposed, which will have a deterrent effect on travel. The stated benefits of these alternates therefore both depend on tolls to achieve benefits. The comparison of the alternates to the no-build option is apples and oranges. For example, if the comparison in Exhibit 4-4 were done with a no-build option that imposed tolls, the differential probably would be much less.

(7) In the discussion of the project's impact on neighborhood traffic and parking (p. 4-7), there is no discussion of the negative impacts on both Seattle and Eastside neighborhoods resulting from vehicles traveling through their neighborhoods to access the non-tolled I90 bridge.

I-0887-001

I-0887-001

(8) No provision is made for the negative economic impact on property values in neighborhoods on both sides of the lake for which the only practical way across the lake is 520. The average commuter will have to spend \$6.70 (in 2002 dollars) to drive across the lake. That equates to \$1600 a year. That will negatively impact the value of those homes.

(9) Page 4-35 states simply "we considered alternatives to using the new facility, allowing drivers to avoid the toll." However, there is no discussion of what they are and what the impact would be.

(10) Page 9-8 indicates that the tolls "could be a hardship for some lower-income people." What about people of middle class means who need to drive?

(11) Are the high tolls stated in the DEIS understated? Today (9/20) the WSDOT announced that the costs estimates for all alternates have been grossly understated. If the difference is going to come from tolls, the bridge will be an unaffordable luxury for most people.

Online Comment by User: sprice

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 2:30:00 PM

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Address: 314 NW 60th, Seattle, WA 98107

Comment:

I vote for the 6 lane alternative. Let's spend out enviornmental mitigation dollars outside of King County, where they have the biggest bang for the buck. Then let's fix the traffic here.

I-0888-001 |

Online Comment by User: sridhar

Submitted on: 9/23/2006 7:34:00 PM**Comment Category: General Comments****Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-12****Address: , , 98052****Comment:**

I-0889-001 | I would like to see WSDOT take a long term view of the 520 replacement bridge.
Specifically,

- any replacement plan **must** make provisions for /high speed light rail/ between Redmond and Seattle.
- add adequate lanes, which will be in excess of next 20 years of projected traffic growth
- do not take short cuts by cutting little \$\$\$ now to appease any dissent, I would like to see some strong leadership here (leadership is all amount change and overcoming resistance to bold initiatives)

Thanks
Regards
- Sri

Online Comment by User: ssiudmak@ix.netcom.com

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 8:59:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-11, Page-1

Address: ,, 98052

Comment:

Please do not distroy the beautiful resourse that is unique to Seattle, the Arboretum. If SR 520 is expanded to 6 lanes and destroys the marsh habitat in the process Seattle should hang it's head in shame. Not much consideration of *natural* here. A bigger bridge will just encourage more traffic rather than reducing auto traffic by providing real, efficient, and accessable mass transit.

There has to be something better than this.

I-0890-001

Online Comment by User: sstowers

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 2:02:00 PM

Comment Category: Ecosystems

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-8

Address: 3223 E Mercer st, Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

I cannot understand why anyone considers the 6 lane alternative or the Pacific option even remotely desirable in such a valuable wetland area. Having to rebuild at all is going to have a huge impact. As a lifelong resident near the Arboretum, and a frequent visitor, I will be devastated if these larger alternatives are built in such an important area. These options are just NOT acceptable!

I-0891-001

Online Comment by User: Stacy Graves

Submitted on: 10/10/2006 3:04:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98105

Comment:

We support an elevated bridge to get traffic on and off 520. Oftentimes traffic is backed up on Montlake all the way from 25th at U. Village even when the actual 520 bridge isn't busy. Something must be done to take the Montlake drawbridge out of the equation. Thanks very much from residents of Laurelhurst.

I-0892-001

Online Comment by User: StanKehl

Submitted on: 8/21/2006 6:54:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2511 25th Ave E, Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange Option. The following key benefits are some of the reasons.

1. No more backups between University Village to Montlake. Finally, a solution to the "Montlake mess"! Pacific Interchange dramatically improves local traffic circulation on arterials in Seattle. Compared with the other options for SR 520, Pacific Interchange does not differ substantially in the number of vehicles coming into any Seattle neighborhoods.
2. A continuous green belt reconnecting the playfield on Portage Bay to the Arboretum – a great new park for the whole city!
3. A direct transit connection between express bus service on SR 520 (which will quadruple to 47,000+ riders/day by 2030) and the planned Sound Transit light rail station at UW, which will be the most heavily used stop outside downtown Seattle (about 21,000 boardings/day.)
4. A direct bicycle link from the Burke-Gilman trail to the Eastside.

I-0893-001

Online Comment by User: stepcooper

Submitted on: 9/17/2006 8:44:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2217 East Newton Street, Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

Dear DOT,

I strongly support the Pacific Interchange Option for 520 and sincerely hope that you listen to the community on this one.

Thank you,

Stephanie Cooper

I-0894-001 |

Online Comment by User: Stephanie

Submitted on: 9/12/2006 11:00:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

WSDOT-

I have read everything that I can on all of the proposals put before you. As a 12 year member of the Montlake community I can not believe the traffic change. I no longer shop at University Village except between 10-1PM. There are many days that the east bound On-ramp to 520 is still metered at 11:30 AM and on again by 2:30PM. Some days it is faster for me to use I-90 because I can't get on the bridge, and when I do it crawls. Where will traffic be in 20-30 years? The whole situation is no longer acceptable with a do nothing or nearly nothing (4-lane proposal) answer.

The Pacific Interchange is the only viable solution to help the local neighborhoods and traffic, both vehicular and transit. The University gains a great connection point to light rail. The local commuters don't have to wait to get through the cut. The U's opposition is perplexing. It is much easier to get through the Montlake Cut when it is summer vacation, not a game day or the University is on break...they bear some responsibility to the congestion! For the loss in parking, more people can commute to school or to sporting events on mass transit. They will be closer to the U's parking lots on Pacific than tying up 520E waiting to get off at Montlake Blvd. The University's opposition shouldn't have any bearing on this decision.

Everyone benefits from more green space and a design that works for all neighborhoods and commuters. Does a mega-structure in excess of 400 feet across belong cutting through any neighborhood? At least over Foster island the on-ramps are away from the bulk of the houses. Please imagine living in any of the communities near the University and Montlake and finding yourself missing your child's soccer game because it took you thirty minutes to get through the Cut at 2PM. Or wanting to live in our community but you work in Redmond. Would you live here if a twenty minute commute now routinely takes you over an hour?

The interchange at Montlake Blvd./520/Cut is unbearable now, and will be unusable by 2030. I would like to think that all people will use mass transit in the future as your plans so optimistically show, but there will always be us Mom's who can't take their kid to their dance or soccer practice on light-rail...

Please make the right decision by approving the Pacific Interchange option and let both sides of the Cut start moving again!

Thank you,
Stephanie

Online Comment by User: Stephen Burns

Submitted on: 10/6/2006 6:26:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 533 18th Ave E, Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

Comments regarding "Madison Park Bicycle/Pedestrian Connection" on page 3-24:

1. This should have been placed closer to the detailed information on Bike/Pedestrian interchanges beginning on page 3-35. I wonder whether most reviewers with an interest in bike/ped access have seen it.

2. Stating that this "...is a way to improve access between the Madison Park Neighborhood and the University of Washington" is an inaccurate description of how this would improve access. This makes it sound like professors who live in Madison Park will have an easier way to get to UW. In fact, this would be the most convenient access point for cyclists and pedestrians who want to cross the lake when coming from many points to the south, e.g. Central, Leschi, Madrona. The access points near Montlake Bridge or a Pacific Interchange require traveling through some high traffic areas and detouring far to the west. Current access to the proposed Arboretum access point has similar issues. The additional benefit of having this access point is that it would facilitate the Madison Park-UW connection that is mentioned, not just as a shortcut for residents of Madison Park, but as a faster, safer route for all bike traffic heading North-South along the shore of Lake Washington. This is a major recreational route, and with a better connection between UW and points south, plus access to the East Side across the new bike lane, it will serve as an important bike commuter route as well. Since the 37th Ave E connection has the least impact, and all of the roads in that area are pleasant, flat, and have low traffic, I favor that option over 43rd Ave E.

I-0896-001

Online Comment by User: stettler

Submitted on: 9/11/2006 5:02:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Address: ,, 98112

Comment:

I consider the Pacific Interchange Plan the only acceptable alternative, minimizing the congestion in the Montlake area and linking up with the light rail.

I-0897-001 |

Online Comment by User: steve dubinsky

Submitted on: 9/11/2006 9:46:00 AM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98115

Comment:

I-0898-001 | i want to voice my support for continued analysis of the pacific interchange option. it seems to address several important points of concern, eg. links to rail, backups betw u village and the montlake bridge and the ramps and traffic that other alternatives will force into the arboretum and over portage bay.

I-0898-002 | lidding 520 through part of montlake would also make sense.

I-0898-003 | of course i'm also concerned as to where the funding for the project will come from -- this state can't simply continue on it's regressive course of sales and property taxes w/o implementing a progressive income tax to support the huge infrastructure projects which can no longer be deferred until later.

thanks for considering my pov.
best,
steve

Online Comment by User: Steve Hoffmann

Submitted on: 10/3/2006 10:29:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98056

Comment:

I would like to make my preference known for the Pacific Interchange option. From my research, this option provides the best compromise for the environment, the local neighborhoods, transportation efficiency, and local access.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,
Steve Hoffmann

I-0899-001 |

Online Comment by User: stevemur

Submitted on: 9/22/2006 5:18:00 PM

Comment Category: Noise

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 3018 E Laurelhurst Drive, Seattle, WA 98105

Comment:

Hi all,

I will be significantly impacted by any rebuild project -- we live on Webster point, facing the bridge. Overall, I do support the rebuild project, but I am VERY concerned about negative impacts to our view, property value, and noise level.

The bridge will be higher, it will be more than 300 feet closer to our property, and it will have MANY more lanes, generating a significant amount more noise, as shown by the Decibel study (we are right on the locus of one of the points in the noise study that projected a noticeable increase in noise levels).

As our property value will go down while our property taxes will go UP to pay for this, I would ask that you please, PLEASE seriously evaluate (A) Noise-reducing asphalt and (B) a design WITHOUT the "washboard" grating -- this creates a LOT of noise

I-0900-001

Online Comment by User: stuartallen

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

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2102 12th ave e, seattle, wa 98102

Comment:

I support the 4 lane option. There is no permanent solution to traffic in building new roads through urban areas. The only permanent solution to transit congestion in these areas, esp. environmentally sensitive ones, is rail transit. So please build the 4 lane bridge and put the extra money toward Sound Transit rail in the I-90 corridor.

I-0901-001

Online Comment by User: sunds

Submitted on: 10/23/2006 1:06:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98105

Comment:

I cross the Montlake bridge regularly and my husband travels between Seattle and Bellevue via 520 every day. We're all for the Montlake interchange plan!

I-0902-001 |

Online Comment by User: Susan Ehler

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:50:00 AM

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-45

Address: 1443 N. Northlake Way, Seattle, WA 98103

Comment:

I-0903-001 | In reference to disturbance of avian species, determination of timing of construction seasons should not only take into account whether the project area is critical for nesting habitat. It should also be taken into consideration that the Great Blue Heron, while not nesting at the site (rather several miles away), does use it as a foraging area. Is there enough foraging habitat nearby and away from the project area to continue to support existing heron populations? When are the most critical months for foraging use of the project area? As well, the overwintering habitat of several sensitive waterfowl species will be affected by construction activities. The significance of this disruption to their ultimate reproductive success, albeit at far-away nesting areas, should be explored.

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-7

Comment:

I-0903-002 | I think we underestimate the value of the driver and their passengers' experience of seeing the the wetlands. Many young people, passengers, have their first experiences seeing this aspect of nature through the window of a car. "Oh how pretty", or "What's that? " is the future realizing "that" is really out there. Not every school takes their students out to the Arboretum wetlands, how will they even know it is there or what it looks like if they never see it? The drivers, as well, are the taxpayers paying for the bridge and unless the decible reduction is truly significant for both wildlife and humans, a loss of much of the public's connection to this locale could prove to be a negative in the longrun.

Online Comment by User: Susan Hoffman

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

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: ,, 98105

Comment:

When I read the paper this morning and was told that the proposed changes to 520 would affect the Foster Island and the Arboretum I was appalled. I am old enough to remember in the 1960's when the Corps of Engineers wanted to drain Shaker Lakes in Cleveland and put in a freeway. Fortunately they were not successful, and I believed that those bad old days were over - but apparently not.

It shows a severe lack of imagination, and a total disregard for the heritage of natural beauty that we have in Seattle, not to mention an environmental disaster. To ruin nature for sake of cars is to lose any sense of what this city means to those who live here.

The other important issue is the lack of regional planning for transportation problems. Instead of multiple referendums, proposals, etc. there should be a region-wide plan for dealing with growth, mass transportation and preservation of our natural assets.

Please go back to the drawing board and develop more reasonable plans.

I-0904-001

Online Comment by User: susan I. barnes

Submitted on: 9/28/2006 11:22:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2304 broadmoor drive e, seattle, washington 98112

Comment:

To begin I need to say, that as the closest home in my neighbor hood to the bridge, I would prefer the current bridge be kept and fixed. However, given that is not an option, I prefer the Pacific Street Interchange since it at least improves the local traffic pattern in front of the stadium. My personal objections revolve around the fact that I regularly walk to Foster Island and the Marsh trail and the increased noise will be awful. Also from my house there are two peekaboo water views, which due to the height of the new bridge will be obliterated. And lastly, I am a bird watcher and the main Bald Eagle nest is behind the golf club on Foster Island and all this work will no doubt run them off. The Opening Day fireworks were cancelled this year to accomodate the nesting going on but the birds are active there from November thru July. The same pair has two alternative nests, which are very much nearby, but both have been reduced significantly by weather in the last years and get used as perching only as far as I can tell, since I watch them all. I do appreciate all the work that has gone on to date and I know those of us closest will be most injured, but these are my comments for what they are worth. Susan Barnes

I-0905-001

I-0905-002

Online Comment by User: Susan

Submitted on: 10/30/2006 9:06:00 AM

Comment Category: Noise

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

I hope during construction that sound barriers will be put in place along the stretch of highway that goes by the community of Yarrow Point. During other highway projects these barriers seem to be going up everywhere and they must make a significant difference in the car noise that the surrounding neighborhoods are subjected to.

I-0906-001

Online Comment by User: susanalb

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 3:32:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98105

Comment:

I-0907-001 | I am opposed to all of your proposed plans for the replacement of SR520. I've read your materials and watched many of your City and County briefings on TV. I'm sickened to think of the negative environmental impacts that will be incurred should you proceed with any of these plans. It is unfortunate that this road was built in the first place, but your plan to widen it to between 2 and in some places almost 4 times the width of the current bridge, is shocking and must not be allowed to happen. As others have wisely said, this area is the equivalent of a GREEN LUNG for the Seattle area. I have fought for the preservation of places like Union Bay, recognizing its unique and critical habitat. Your plans will destroy all that is precious about the Arboretum, Foster Island, and Union Bay. Your roads are TOO WIDE, TOO HIGH, and TOO NOISY; they run across wetlands and through protected habitat -- a place where bald eagles nest, Chinook salmon run, and hundreds of bird species nest and migrate through. You have not done enough to study these and other environmental impacts. Me and my neighbors will fight this.

Comment Category: Comments on Construction Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-2

Comment:

I-0907-002 | TOO WIDE and TOO HIGH. The environmental impacts of constructing these will devastate the fragile ecosystems in the Arboretum and nearby bays. Also, the noise generated from construction and operation will ruin this area and destroy critical habitat. Not to mention, these behemoth monstrosities are an eyesore.

I-0907-003 | Added to all that, I do not see how you have adequately addressed the traffic impacts on surrounding neighborhoods during construction itself. You plan to close off Lake Washington Blvd completely for the entire duration of construction?? 5 years or more? That is insane.

I-0907-004 | You should be designing FOR light rail, but you have stated you are only designing for the "potential" for light rail. Sound Transit will use 1-90 for light rail, but there is no current plan to use 520 for light rail. This is crazy. With global warming looming and real, you have a responsibility to design to get cars off the road, get people onto public transportation, and reduce greenhouse gases. So far it looks like all you're doing is designing for MORE single occupancy vehicles. Nonsense.

Online Comment by User: susanholliday

Submitted on: 10/27/2006 8:06:00 PM

Comment Category: Other Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 3909 NE Surber Dr, Seattle, WA 98105

Comment:

Dear Mr. Krueger,

I-0908-001 | Save Union Bay Association has been in existence for over 30 years and has been instrumental in dealing with environmental issues of Union Bay. These issues include milfoil intrusion, motor boat speed, wetlands management, and the Green Lake pipeline (a plan by Seattle Parks Department to pipe water from Green Lake into Union Bay.) Because the SR520 Replacement Project will have major impact on Union Bay, we plan to be involved and work with the other environmental agencies to propose mitigation.

As mentioned in the DEIS, one of the issues with the bridge replacement and the Pacific Street interchange is the effect on salmon and other wildlife that inhabit Union Bay. A major problem with Union Bay is that it has become shallower over the years due to erosion of shorelines, UW construction projects, storm water run-off, and increased growth of aquatic weeds. In addition, the lake temperature has risen and blue green algae have increased in concentration. These factors create a toxic environment for wildlife, especially salmon and frogs. We are concerned that, because the construction will occur in the deep water part of Union Bay, salmon will be displaced into the shallow, warm water and will be less likely to survive. We believe that there are ways to mitigate the effects of construction and of the completed project.

I-0908-002 | Save Union Bay Association is acutely aware of the transportation crisis involving SR520 and we are in favor of the 6 lane alternative and the Pacific Street Interchange. We know that this option will cause great distress during construction but that the expansion of SR520 is needed to meet transportation demands in the future. It is likely that there will be modifications to the Pacific Street interchange in response to University of Washington and community needs. We do not plan to dispute issues concerning project design and land options. Our concern is the viability of Union Bay and its wildlife.

Please add us to your mailing list. We will be in contact with you as the mitigation process begins. We will also be amiling a paper copy of this letter to you.

Sincerely Yours,

Susan Holliday, Ph.D. Steve Sulzbacher Ph.D.
President Vice President
Save Union Bay Association

Online Comment by User: susanmcorwin

Submitted on: 9/27/2006 8:12:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

I strongly support the Pacific Interchange option. This gives sufficient capacity for stadium and for cross-lake traffic and reduces traffic on city streets.

I-0909-001

Online Comment by User: sustan

Submitted on: 10/3/2006 12:01:00 PM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98108

Comment:

As a Seattle resident, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the "Pacific Interchange"/"Better bridge" option for expanding SR520. I think it will have a disastrous environmental and visual impact on the Arboretum, Union Bay, and the city as a whole, and it is unnecessarily expensive.

I-0910-001

Online Comment by User: Suzanne Cali

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 5:43:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98109

Comment:

NO, NO, NO,....are you folks living in a cave? ever heard of global warming, loss of environment, degradation of the environment?....alternative means of transportation, cost overruns?....For heavens sake, get the idea for a 6-lane road covering /near/in the Arboretum off your list!!! Suzanne Cali

I-0911-001

Online Comment by User: Suzanne Olsen

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:55:00 AM

Comment Category: Cultural and Historic Resources

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98005

Comment:

I believe further studies are needed and do not want an option that will intrude on the Arboretum (specifically the Pacific option). The Arboretum is an irreplaceable regional and national treasure and scientific resource and should not be sacrificed in any way for a highway.

Thank you,
Sue Olsen

I-0912-001

Online Comment by User: suzanne wittmann

Submitted on: 9/10/2006 1:57:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 2007 e. eaton pl, , 98112

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange Option. Suzanne

I-0913-001 |

Online Comment by User: svoltz

Submitted on: 10/27/2006 11:41:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-6

Address: , , 98125

Comment:

Please do not select the Pacific Street Interchange option. Waterfront activities at the IMA docks, canoe house, etc will be severely impacted. As a member of the Washington Yacht Club I would dislike having a freeway ramp right over my head while at the docks.

Thanks for listening,

Scott Voltz

I-0914-001

Online Comment by User: swindow

Submitted on: 10/4/2006 5:23:00 PM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 091-2

Comment:

I listened to the Mayor of Bogata, Columbia speak on the radio recently about his efforts to provide sensible transportation solutions (particularly bus transportation) in his city. He was articulate and clear.

His major point was that it was impossible to support public transportation solutions AND increased capacity for private cars. It seemed so obvious, yet we continue to dither, wanting it all ways.

I concur with the statement in favor of the four-lane SR520 alternative recently provided by stakeholder communities, including the Eastlake Community Council President Carsten Stinn. I live in Eastlake. The arguments against the six-lane solution presented by the No Expansion of SR520 Citizens Coalition deserve your careful consideration and support.

Thank You.

Lewjean L. Holmes
2012 Eastlake Ave. E.
Seattle, WA 98102

I-0915-001

Online Comment by User: Sydney McComas

Submitted on: 10/30/2006 3:39:00 PM
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Address: , , 98122
Comment:

October 30, 2006

Mr. Douglas MacDonald, Secretary of Transportation
Washington State Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 47316
Olympia WA 98504-7316

Dear Mr. MacDonald,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the SR 520 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Futurewise is a statewide citizens' group that works to protect working farms and forests for this and future generations, while making cities and towns great places to live. We have members across Washington State, as well as in the Puget Sound region.

We appreciate your hard work on this issue. As you craft this package, we urge you to consider and emphasize the following priorities.

Mobility

Any alternative should aggressively maximize the use of transit, active traffic management, congestion pricing and Transportation Demand Management to move people through the 520 corridor.

- The 520 replacement should be built to accommodate future high capacity transit:
 - o Pontoons should be constructed to accommodate possible future light rail connections.
 - o Height/grade of the 520 facility should accommodate possible future light rail connections
 - o The 520 facility should be built to accommodate possible future light rail into the proposed four or six lane footprint
- A 520 Corridor Transportation Demand Management Agreement should be developed with the adjacent 520 cities and major employers to work together to decrease SOV use in the corridor.
- WSDOT should provide supplemental information on the 4-lane alternative that includes the provision of transit and HOV lanes on local arterials, a corridor design that maximizes transit use and the effects of new regional transit and light rail investments.
 - o A four-lane option with congestion-pricing should be studied.

I-0916-001

I-0916-002

I-0916-003

I-0916-003 | • WSDOT should provide supplemental information on another 4-lane option that includes a “congestion-pricing” toll that ensures free flow at rush hour for a four-lane option, to provide incentives to reduce SOV use and increase the use Transit/HOVs.

I-0916-004 | • We urge studying tolling on the I-90 bridge to reduce diversion of SR 520 users to another close-by Cross-Lake facility as well as the effect of system-wide tolling on 520 Bridge throughput.

I-0916-005 | Select the alternative that most supports good land-use. The SR 520 Bridge replacement project is an excellent opportunity to further implement the region's growth and transportation strategy done under the state's Growth Management Act. This strategy emphasizes providing multi-modal connections between and within the region's urban centers.

I-0916-006 | The selected alternative should provide great regional and local bicycle and pedestrian connectivity.

I-0916-007 | Financing

The region should contribute significantly to financing the 520 project through the Regional Transportation Investment District within its current taxing authority.

Tolls should be imposed now to start generating revenue for the project.

I-0916-008 | Protection of the Natural Environment

Reductions in global warming emissions. Climate change is no longer the subject of debate: rather, it is our most urgent environmental and social challenge. In our region, transportation is the single greatest source of global warming emissions. Supplemental information should be provided to show how we can achieve a net reduction in global warming emissions for each alternative over a 2006 baseline.

I-0916-009 | Provide adequate mitigation for impacts on plant and animal populations.

• There should be an inventory of plant and animal populations and mitigation should be made in light of this ecological assessment.

• There should be a net gain in vegetation, especially trees, and no net loss in wildlife and fish based on the inventories noted above. This is an opportunity to address habitat and breeding areas, and possibly improve fish passage and other habitats.

I-0916-010 | Protection of Human Health

Provide appropriate mitigation for impacts on human health. Specifically, the chosen alternative should ensure:

I-0916-010 | • Noise – There should be no increase in noise levels and those noise levels should comply with King County code Chapter 12.88, Seattle and Bellevue codes or be mitigated, unless waived by the community.

I-0916-011 | • Air quality – There should be no decrease in air quality from a new bridge or from bridge construction.

I-0916-012 | • Water Quality - There should be no decrease in water quality from a new bridge or from bridge construction. Water quality includes water quantity, stormwater, spill containment and wetlands.

I-0916-013 | • Health Impact Assessment should be made for the alternative chosen. Health impact assessment (HIA) is commonly defined as “a combination of procedures, methods, and tools by which a policy, program, or project may be judged as to its potential effects on the health of a population, and the distribution of those effects within the population.”

I-0916-014 | Lid options should be studied and presented to the community for all alternatives.

I-0916-015 | Protection of the Arboretum and Open Space

Any alternative should protect the Arboretum and open space. A feasible and prudent option ensures there will be:

- No net loss of publicly held parkland, open space or impairment to the plant collection and wildlife in the Arboretum.
- A limited increase of traffic traveling east/west through the Arboretum's wetlands.

I-0916-016 | Reduction of the Alternative Footprints

The footprint of each of the six-lane options should be reduced. Options should be considered that drastically limit the existing footprint including:

- Two-lane, bus and HOV-only Pacific interchange. This supports UW's neighborhood commitment to grow without increasing SOV trips.
- Reduce shoulder widths and lane widths and consider reducing design speed and vehicle speed on the bridge to ensure safety on narrower lanes as well as maximizing throughput.
- As mentioned in the above mobility section, possible future light rail should be accommodated in the proposed four-lane or six-lane footprint.

Thank you very much for considering these comments as you move forward with this project. Please feel free to contact me at (206)343-0681 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Sydney McComas

Online Comment by User: Tamara A. Turner

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

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 1931 East Calhoun Street, Seattle, Washington 98112-2644

Comment:

I-0917-001 | A month ago, I wrote in favor of the Pacific Street Interchange option for a new 520 bridge. However, I rescind that support because I do not think the Arboretum should be further invaded and this alternative appears to do that..

All the cross-lake proposals take it for granted that a bridge is needed, but not all the possibilities have been considered, e.g., a tunnel, and in-depth environmental studies been not been done to PRECISELY gauge the impact of any of the alternatives on the environment (including noise, pollution runoff, wild life, and people in the surrounding areas.

I am adamant that I do NOT want the 9-lane route through Portage Bay that was originally suggested. But until an alternative is found that will leave the Arboretum as it is (in fact, tear down the freeway that is already wrecking it), I remain undecided, and withdraw my support for the Pacific Street Interchange.

Tamara A. Turner
1931 East Calhoun Street
Seattle, WA 98112

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Comment:

Pacific Street Interchange

Thus far (August 23, 2006), the PACIFIC STREET INTERCHANGE is the only SR520 plan that makes sense to me in terms of traffic flow improvement for cars and transit through Montlake in all directions; preservation of the Arboretum, the environment, and wild life; accessibility (at last!) for bicycles and pedestrians; and overall aesthetics.

As a 34-year resident of the Montlake neighborhood, I've had to endure the major increase in backups at rush hours, during Husky games, and because of traffic jams/accidents on the current 520 bridge. It is literally impossible to get to and from University Village much of the time, which has kept me from convenient shopping options and forced me to drive to farther south of the Montlake Bridge to shop (which costs more gas and takes more time).

Except for the Pacific Street Interchange, no options for bridge replacement do anything but dramatically worsen traffic, adversely affect the environment, and offer no real alternatives to the current situation. In addition, they are phenomenally ugly expanses of concrete.

The beauty of the Pacific Street Interchange solves all the basic needs I outlined above and contributes to the area's beautiful views of lakes, mountains, and natural habitat.

In discussion with other Montlake residents, I agree that a master plan is needed for the UW transit hub that will incorporate access to the hospital and all the UW's sports facilities, as well as a rational plan for the interaction of transportation (e.g., buses, Sound transit, pedestrians, bicycles).

The under-bridge environment for wildlife and recreation must be a major factor in the design of all elevated parts of the bridge access. The Pacific Street Interchange seeks to address this.

The Arboretum is a jewel that must NOT be adversely affected by more pavement and poor planning. It is a miracle that the Arboretum survived the last egregious example of the "pave it over" mentality; removal of the hideous go-nowhere ramps is essential. The Pacific Street Interchange will create a new park as a continuous green belt between the Arboretum and Union Bay.

Finally, it is about time that a means was found for connecting the Burke-Gilman Trail to the Eastside, and for providing a way to get to Madison Park WITHOUT having to go miles out of the way as well as polluting the Arboretum with car emissions!

There has been discussion of using a toll to fund the Arboretum master plan and better manage traffic on the Lake Washington Boulevard, and I heartily endorse this even though I'd have to pay this toll.

Since there is a way to solve the immense traffic problems in Montlake, provide increased access for all parties, build something with quality and beauty, protect the environment and natural setting of the Arboretum and surrounding wetlands, I enthusiastically and strongly favor the Pacific Street Interchange option for replacing SR520's bridge.

Online Comment by User: Tami

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:25:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-1

Address: ,, 98136

Comment:

520 should definitely be replaced/expanded to meet traffic flow needs. As far as Foster Island/ Arboretum effects, it seems that most of the vegetation growing there is pretty aggressive and will quickly grow back. I was amazed by the historical accounts describing how quickly the tolls paid off the bonds, in one case 19 years early! If that will still hold true in our current political climate, tolls are easier to accept.

I-0918-001 |

I-0918-002 |

I-0918-003 |

Online Comment by User: tcitrano

Submitted on: 10/29/2006 10:12:00 AM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98092

Comment:

I strongly encourage you to drop the Pacific Street Interchange Option. This would drastically, negatively effect the spirit of our community by reducing much needed parking south of Husky Stadium - an area where the true spirit of Washington grows and thrives.

Additionally, the Pacific Street Interchange has adverse impacts on the UW Campus, UW Hospital, and the Arboretum (most importantly).

It is a completely irresponsible use of tax payer monies to select the most expensive plan with all of its negative impacts.

This is one very emphatic NO to the Pacific Street Interchange!!!!

Trent Citrano
Auburn, WA

I-0919-001

Online Comment by User: Terry Moore

Submitted on: 8/24/2006 6:16:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 6519 NE 61st St, Seattle, WA 98115

Comment:

I support the Pacific Interchange option. As a regular commuter over the Montlake bridge, the uncertainty as to whether the crossing will take five or forty-five minutes (at any time of day!) is of immense importance to me. This is the only option that (as far as I can see) will address this issue.

Thanks!

I-0920-001 |

Online Comment by User: Terry Thomas II

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 4:13:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 33467 33rd Pl S, Federal Way, WA 98032

Comment:

As a practical alternative please consider the following program which can be implemented almost immediately at a reasonable financial cost:

1. The 520 bridge is effectively a series of barges, connected together to make a functioning roadway.
2. By taking the approach of maximizing the size of the bridge to accommodate future transportation modes (auto, bus, truck & light rail, etc.) an analysis of the most precarious sections of the bridge can be immediately made and the construction of the largest single piece (barge) of the future design could be built first.
3. Upon completion of this first section, the most precarious piece could be removed and the new section slid into place.
4. Then the next most precarious piece could be addressed and the same procedure done.
5. This may take a single piece being made and replaced each year but would allow for the bridge to be completed before 2020 and in the meantime the infrastructure needed at each shoreside end could be addressed over time so that the completion of the full bridge and the shoreside infrastructure would coincide.

Remember, this is a series of barges and effectively a fleet. This type of bridge, unlike a suspension bridge, cable stayed bridge, etc affords you the luxury of replacing a piece of the fleet each year with little impact on the fleet operation. Not really any different than operating a shipping company.

If your approach was taken in this manner, this bridge could be continually up upgraded towards the end of each piece's (barge) useful life.

Should you choose to have further inputs from me, please email me at any time.

Terry Thomas, II
terry@pnwgroup.com

I-0921-001

Online Comment by User: theresavm

Submitted on: 10/30/2006 8:22:00 PM

Comment Category: Transportation and Traffic

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98105

Comment:

To whom it may concern:

I live in NorthEast Seattle and am writing to urge you not create the Pacific Street 6 Lane version of SR 520. It is costly, in terms of money and the environment. Such money would be much better spent constructing transportation alternatives rather than expanding the highway, damaging wetlands, plant and animal habitat. Not to mention reducing the feeling of escape in the city one gains when paddling or walking about the Arboretum. If you should make the mistake of expanding 520 we will all suffer. The traffic on I-5 and 405 cannot handle the increase in traffic that the expansion would bring either. Expanding 520 creates more transportation problems. Please look into how to give buses and carpools priority on 520. Save the money you have thought about throwing into construction for a more sustainable solution.

Thank you,

Theresa V. Milstein

I-0922-001