

From: [Ron Melnikoff and Cathy Garrison](#)
To: [SR 520 DEIS Comments:](#)
CC:
Subject: Released from eSafe SPAM quarantine: Comments on Draft SR 520 EIS
Date: Wednesday, November 01, 2006 7:29:03 AM
Attachments:

I-1124-001

We live on Boyer Avenue East in Seattle within 200 feet of SR 520 on the west side of Portage Bay. We have reviewed the SR 520 draft EIS and some of the supporting discipline reports. We found most of the information to be too generalized to understand the impacts of this project on our house and the adjacent neighborhood. The reader-friendly version used may make it somewhat easier to browse through, but it does not provide focused detail on the impacts which all readers need.

This is a very difficult EIS to review since the impacts have been put into paragraphs scattered through generalized chapters such as Seattle or Construction impacts. Severe construction impacts including truck traffic, access to our homes and detours affecting Boyer Avenue, Delmar, 10th Avenue and Roanoke Street are not adequately discussed. The closure of arterials, including Delmar for 9-12 months, will create huge bottlenecks and divert traffic on our area's steep and narrow residential streets. The extent of vibration from pier installation and dust from both bridge removal and excavation are generally glossed over. Noise impact information is provided, but there is only a minimal discussion of necessary mitigation.

Increased traffic, noise, dust and vibration in our community is a serious public health issue. These impacts add to stress and discomfort. A wide range of products are available. For example, to help absorb noise, such as noise reducing pavement and sound proofing houses that will have severe impacts.

I-1124-003

We find that the discussion on the no-build, four-lane and six-lane alternatives are equally over-generalized and incomplete. Our neighborhood suffers from increased cross traffic on Boyer, Harvard, Delmar and Roanoke from vehicles traveling between the University District, Capitol Hill and the I-5 and SR 520 interchanges. The draft EIS traffic analysis only considers intersections on streets that directly serve SR 520 and I-5 access ramps. It does not discuss

I-1124-001

Comment Summary:

Format and Content

Response:

See Section 23.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1124-002

Comment Summary:

Neighborhood Issues

Response:

See Section 7.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1124-003

Comment Summary:

Local Street Network

Response:

See Section 5.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1124-004 Boyer Avenue at all. METRO cross lake bus service projections are made that do not consider completion of light rail to the eastside via I-90. This transportation project was recently selected as the preferred alternative by eastside community officials. We prefer the four-lane alternative based on the relatively smaller extent of its impacts, and lower cost. The four-lane alternative can successfully function with the completion of I-90 eastside light rail. Yet, we cannot find any information in the EIS or discipline report information concerning completion of the I-90 rail corridor.

I-1124-005 Permanent project mitigation that is discussed in the draft EIS includes noise walls along SR 520 and a lid for the six-lane alternative between Delmar Drive and 10th Avenue East. Draft EIS contains assurances that construction impacts will be successfully handled by implementing best management practices and detours. However, these assurances are based on generalities. We do not understand why a lid was not included with the four-lane built alternative. Also,

I-1124-006 we do not know why a lighter, view-preserving Plexiglas wall was not considered for the Portage Bay Bridge. Plexiglas noise walls are used in other countries, such as the Netherlands, to preserve views and minimize the bulk and scale of huge concrete freeways and structures.

I-1124-007 Proposed stormwater treatment facilities in this area include a vault under SR 520 between Boyer Avenue and Portage Bay and the concept of a wetland treatment platform at the base of a new Portage Bay bridge pier. The size and configuration of these facilities has not been determined. These facilities will impact our vistas of Portage Bay and its recreational use, such as boating!

I-1124-008 WSDOT has dismissed the use of a tunnel to mitigate this area's environmental impacts. A tunnel may be more expensive but it still needs to be fully studied. Why have other cities in the world used tunnels in similar situations but WSDOT won't even fully address this issue?

I-1124-009 The extent of this project's impacts requires that additional construction management and permanent mitigation must be considered in our severely impacted neighborhood. SR 520 project staff needs to work with our community to develop this necessary information. This additional impact and mitigation information is needed for our community and other neighborhoods. It needs to be part of a revised and reissued draft EIS. Just adding some changes with comments in a final EIS will not be acceptable.

Ron Melnikoff and Cathy Garrison
melngar@mindspring.com

I-1124-004

Comment Summary:

Methodology (Freeway)

Response:

See Section 5.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1124-005

Comment Summary:

4-Lane Alternative

Response:

See Section 2.0 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1124-006

Comment Summary:

Noise Walls (Aesthetics)

Response:

See Section 12.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1124-007

Comment Summary:

Stormwater Treatment

Response:

See Section 15.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1124-008

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

2543 Boyer Avenue East
206-329-3188

Response:

See Section 1.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1124-009

Comment Summary:

Neighborhood Issues

Response:

See Section 7.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.