

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

Dear WSDot;

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

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

**I-005-001** | It will be a huge disruption to the neighborhood for many years, and anything that can be done to mitigate the noise, traffic, etc will be most appreciated by those of us who live here.

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

**I-005-002** | I would hope the plan allows for the eventual addition of rapid transit across the 520 bridge.

**I-005-003** | I strongly support your choice of the A+ plan. It is the least expensive. It creates the least destruction of the wetlands, animal habitat, and pristine views and access to Portage Bay. The area around the south side of Portage Bay is a unique wild beautiful area, home to many animals, and a wonderful refuge for human visitors amid an urban setting. Please preserve it.

**I-005-004** | Would it not be simpler, better for traffic flow, and more esthetically pleasing to replace the current Montlake bridge with a single new bridge of 6 lanes, the right lanes each way of which could be dedicated at least during rush hour to exit from and entrance on to 520? Surely a new bridge could be built to look very similar to the current structure, which is probably antiquated and in need of modernization.

Thanks for your interest. John Hutchinson 2158 E. Shelby St.

### **I-005-001**

The Preferred Alternative responds to concerns from residential neighborhoods through a number of design enhancements that occurred since the SDEIS was published. These features include a considerably larger Montlake lid, which is a full rather than partial lid and runs from the Montlake interchange to the Lake Washington shoreline; noise reduction strategies such as 4-foot concrete traffic barriers with noise-absorptive coating; a 6-lane Portage Bay Bridge with a managed shoulder rather than an auxiliary lane, a 45 m.p.h. speed limit, and a planted median; and reduced shoulder widths where possible. See Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for additional information.

### **I-005-002**

The project can accommodate future high capacity transit in the SR 520 corridor, which may include bus rapid transit or light rail transit. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS provides further discussion.

### **I-005-003**

Comment noted. WSDOT received a number of comments in support of and in opposition to Options A, K, and L and the associated suboptions. These opinions are summarized in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Summary of Comments (WSDOT, April 2010), available at <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/SDEIS.htm>.

Since publication of the SDEIS, WSDOT has identified a Preferred Alternative, which is similar to Option A but with a number of design refinements that would improve mobility and safety while reducing negative effects. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS describes the Preferred Alternative and Chapters 5 and 6 describe its environmental effects.

**I-005-004**

The addition of a second bascule bridge, as proposed under the Preferred Alternative would have similar capacity as a new 6-lane bridge suggested in the comment, but would not result in changes to the existing bridge, which is listed in the National Register of Historic Places.