From: Robert & Odile Buchanan [mailto:odibob@hotmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 06, 2010 8:52 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Cc: Theodore Lane
Subject: 520 EIS COMMENTS

Robert Buchanan
2632 10th Ave. E.
Seattle, WA 98102

March 4, 2010

Jenifer Young
Environmental Manager
SR 520 Program Office
SR520Bridge_SDEIS@wsdot.wa.gov

The following comments on the SR520 Bridge SDEIS are offered by Robert Buchanan Professor Emeritus and past Department Chair of Landscape Architecture at the University of Washington.

Comments on Attachment 7: Discipline Reports:

I-193-001

"Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report"

- ▪

page 42 pp. For visual quality ratings, based on the discussion above, vividness is high because of the picturesque character of the bay; the scenic panoramas to the east of the Cascade Mountains, Lake Washington, and the Washington Park Arboretum from certain vantage points; and the homes on the Roanoke hillside. *(The homes on the western side of Portage Bay help make the scenery picturesque. There is no mention of the degradation of the view over Portage Bay from these homes that results from the increased scale of the proposed bridge and roadway.)* Intactness is moderate because so much of the surface of Portage Bay is covered with roofed docks and marinas (Exhibit 2-4, Attachment 2). *(The increase in size of the roadway and the area of shadow will certainly reduce even more the intactness of the view.)* Unity is generally high because the collection of the features that creates high vividness also unites them in a pleasing composition.

I-193-002

- ▪

p 53 pp. Vegetation under the west end of the bridge on either side of Boyer Avenue East would be removed, but this currently is an abandoned landscape. *(This area may look unmaintained, but it is still open space and provides view to the water, and the area should be replanted appropriately after construction is completed.)*

I-193-003

- ▪

p 62 pp 5

Portage Bay Landscape Unit

Option A

The primary effects on visual quality and character from operation of the facility would result from the following:

• • •

The character and quality of the new Portage Bay Bridge, wider spaces between columns, and a wider road deck *(new)*, landscaping under the Portage Bay Bridge west of Boyer Avenue

I-193-001

The text referenced in the comment is from the “Affected Environment” section, which only describes the existing, baseline conditions. For potential effects, please the section “How would operation of the project affect visual quality and aesthetics?”on pages 61 through 63 of the Visual Quality Discipline Report.

I-193-002

This comment refers construction impacts. After construction and for operation of SR 520, WSDOT would "re-landscape in a way that would open up views toward the water and along Boyer Avenue" (page 63 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report).

I-193-003

The Portage Bay Bridge would not move from its location in the south end of the bay. However, higher elevation viewpoints with a full view of the road deck from above could have reduced visual quality because the bridge surface would be a larger part of the view than the existing bridge. The perceived effects described in the comment would apply primarily to views from right next to the bridge, where the bridge is currently the main component of the view eastward.

I-193-003

The overall character and quality of this landscape unit would change as a result of the Portage Bay Bridge, but views from water or ground level near the new bridge would be more open. *(Views from the higher elevations would be more degraded by the width of the bridge and by the increase in traffic that would be seen.)* The greater column spacing (from 100 feet on-center currently to as much as 250 feet apart) would open up views under the bridge, especially looking northward from the south side of the bridge (Exhibit 2-5, Attachment 2). The east end of the new bridge near NOAA would be farther north, which could have a moderately positive effect for Montlake Playfield views. A wider west end of the bridge would affect views from the homes next to the bridge on the north side, making the bridge more dominant in eastward views. This would not change visual quality because the bridge is already the dominant structure in the views in this area (Exhibit 2-4, Attachment 2). *(Due to the increase in coverage of the water area, and the location of the bridge more to the center of the perceived water basin and closer to the covered boat moorages, the visual quality will be compromised and lose intactness and vividness and could be construed not as a body of water intersected by a bridge but as a paved surface with minor water areas.)*

****

Supplemental Draft EIS - Full Document

Chapter 5: Project Operation & Permanent Effects:

I-193-004

- 5-51 last pp Heavy earthwork equipment would be required to excavate the bridge piers near Boyer and contour the terrain near Boyer Avenue East and Montlake Playfield for stormwater and landscaping. This equipment would be visible from nearby locations. Vegetation under the west end of the bridge on either side of Boyer Avenue East would be removed, but this area is currently an unmaintained landscape.*(This area may look unmaintained, but it is still open space and provides views to the water, and the area should be replanted appropriately after construction is completed.)*

I-193-005

- 5.4-1 p---- Bagley Viewpoint page 5-54
All of the options would result in the complete acquisition of Bagley Viewpoint (Exhibit 5.4-1). WSDOT proposes to replace the function of the viewpoint on the new 10th and Delmar lid. *(It would be difficult to replace the automobile oriented function of the viewpoint on the new lid, and incorporating the viewpoint within the lid landscape would not replicate the experience of the present overlook. Delmar Bridge would be a barrier to the viewer on the lid. The best place for a new overlook would be at the south end of the new Delmar Bridge on the east side of Delmar Drive E.) Parking for this viewpoint should be accommodated on the east side of the new Delmar Bridge.*

I-193-006

- 5-65
The landscaped lid could also recreate a more substantial connection between Interlaken Park and Bagley Viewpoint. *(There is little documentation as to the funding for the lids or the construction budgets based on certain design features, or for the finished landscaping for those lids. This lack of information suggests lack of commitment to the idea that the lids are integral to the completion of the freeway itself.) If the support of the citizens affected by the expansion of SR 520 is to be obtained, the lids should have adequate funding consistent with the intended mitigation purposes and the community standards for design of Seattle's public parks.)*

I-193-004

Although vegetation may be removed during construction, measures would be taken to minimize these effects, including the possibility of revegetating the area. See the Mitigation section of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for more information.

I-193-005

WSDOT will construct a new viewpoint on the 10th Avenue East/Delmar Drive East lid that will recreate the experience the Bagley Viewpoint was designed to provide (see the Final Section 4(f) Evaluation in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS for further discussion). The Seattle Parks and Recreation Department has played an integral role in the planning and design of this replacement space.

Bagley Viewpoint Park no longer provides any views north or eastward due to the tall trees surrounding the park. It does not have parking for vehicles, and most people seated in automobiles of standard size are not be able to see over the stone wall. The replacement viewpoint on the lid would be from a higher elevation than existing Bagley Viewpoint and would be panoramic from north to south, and unobstructed by vegetation. The Delmar Bridge would be lower than the viewpoint and would block the scenic, panoramic views that Bagley once offered.

I-193-006

Lids are integral to the project design and would be constructed at the same time as the section of the SR 520 corridor in which they are located (e.g., the Montlake lid would be completed at the same time as the Montlake interchange improvements). This was true for the Phased Implementation Scenario as well. WSDOT has never proposed to defer the lids until after completion of the SR 520 roadway improvements. See Chapter 3 of the Final EIS for a discussion of construction sequencing with the Preferred Alternative.

I-193-007

A new Bagley Viewpoint would be different from the original park, but could be designed to take advantage of the extra space created by the lid for the panoramic vista of Lake Washington and the Cascade Mountains. *The best place for a new overlook would be at the south end of the new Delmar bridge on the east side of Delmar Drive E.) Parking for this viewpoint should be accommodated on the east side of the new Delmar Bridge.*

The view is currently screened by tree canopy. The areas to the north and south of the lid surface would be planted to reestablish the tree buffer and street trees that were removed for construction.

I-193-008

Portage Bay Landscape Unit

Under all options, the overall character and quality of this landscape unit would not change as a result of the Portage Bay Bridge, but views in the vicinity of the new bridge would be more open (Table 5.5-2). (*Views from the Portage Bay basin hillsides would change radically from the wider Portage Bay Bridge, higher, and moved north.)*

The greater column spacing (from 100 feet on center currently to as much as 250 feet apart) would open up views under the bridge, especially looking northward from the south side of the bridge (Exhibit 5.5-2).

The east end of the new bridge would be farther north, which could have a positive effect for Montlake Playfield views. A wider west end of the bridge would affect views from the homes next to the bridge on the north side, making the bridge more dominant in eastward views. This would not change visual quality because the bridge is already the dominant structure in the southern half of their views. *(Shadowing from the wider Portage Bay Bridge would affect views from these homes and would put some of these homes themselves in shadow.)* The areas under the west end of the bridge would be re-landscaped to open up views into those landscapes and along Boyer Avenue.

I-193-009

page 5-81 pp 6

Replace the Bagley Viewpoint Park either on the new lid or reconstructed bridge. WSDOT would work with the Seattle Parks Department to identify an appropriate site. *(The best place for a new overlook would be at the south end of the new Delmar bridge on the east side of Delmar Drive E., where the view would be across the freeway to the northeast instead of to the east onto the freeway. Parking for this viewpoint should be accommodated on the east side of the new Delmar Bridge. A new viewpoint located on the lid would not function as an automobile oriented feature and therefore would not be an adequate mitigation for the loss of Bagley Viewpoint Park.*

I-193-010

page 5-132 Portage Bay Area

Through Portage Bay, Option A would result in slightly more shading than Options K and L because it includes a westbound auxiliary lane (see Table 5.11-2). All of the options would

As discussed on page 78 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report, WSDOT has committed to develop design guidelines that will meet both local and state standards, including for visual standards.

I-193-007

See the response to comment I-193-005 regarding the Bagley viewpoint. WSDOT initiated the Park Technical Working Group (Parks TWG) in 2008 as a forum to discuss parks and recreational facilities with project staff, agencies and stakeholders. The Seattle Parks and Recreation Department has had influence in project decisions related to park resources, impacts and proposed mitigation.

I-193-008

The majority of views of the Portage Bay Bridge from Roanoke and North Capitol Hill hillside residences are screened or blocked by mature trees and buildings due to the oblique sight-line toward the bridge. Roanoke views face east so the bridge is on the right side of the view, not in the central or focus part of the view. When the bridge is an element in any view, it is one component of a well developed shoreline that includes houseboats, public buildings, parking lots, marinas and covered slips, and single and multi-family dwellings. For these reasons these views would not be “radically” compromised.

Shadowing would not affect any residences because the height of the west half of the proposed bridge would the same as that of the existing height. The higher portion of the bridge is over water, where there are no houses. Please refer to SDEIS Exhibit 2-7 on page 2-12 for a comparison of profiles of the two bridges.

I-193-009

See response to Comment I-193-007.

I-193-010

be similar in elevation. Approximately 800 linear feet of overwater roadway on the west side of Portage Bay would be constructed on an alignment slightly lower than the existing profile; the remaining proposed 1,200-linear-foot bridge structure at the east end would be about twice the height of the existing bridge (see Table 5.11-3). *(This would be good overall as it would allow more small boat traffic under the east end of the bridge and reduce the noise associated with the cars going up the lesser incline.)*

- ▪

6-3 Closure of Delmar Drive East

I-193-011

The Delmar Drive East bridge over SR 520 would be closed temporarily under all options to accommodate construction on SR 520 beneath the bridge, as well as construction of the 10th Avenue and Delmar Drive East lid. The Delmar Drive East bridge would be closed for approximately 12 months for Options A, K, and L. *(If the new Delmar Bridge were constructed just west of the existingDelmar Bridge which could then be removed once the new bridge was completed, this would make the lid slightly smaller.)* Traffic would be

I-193-012

required to detour via 10th Avenue East or Boyer Ave East, which would increase travel times for all vehicles including transit and nonmotorized. *(The detour route described here is confusing as to what section of 10th Ave. E. would be used. It is only feasible to use 10th Ave. E. south of E. Roanoke St. to access Delmar Dr. E. via E. Miller S.t and 11th Ave. E. The reference to Boyer Ave E. must mean a route that uses Eastlake to Boyer. To access Boyer from 10th or 11th on the north side of Roanoke St. is not feasible due to the extreme gradients and narrow roadway on both of these routes.*

Chapter 6: Effects During Construction of Project

- ▪

I-193-013

6-5 6-6 See also Exhibit 6.1-3 How would construction haul routes affect traffic?

Local Roads

Haul Routes

All options would require construction-related truck traffic on local streets. Most of the trips would use Montlake Boulevard to access SR 520. A few other arterials would be affected, and the estimated number of truck trips along these arterials would be relatively low compared to overall arterial volumes. *(Include current numbers for these truck trips and numbers for peak construction periods for all three options.)*

I-193-014

- ▪

6-5

. . . during construction of nearby facilities. Residential streets that might be used for truck haul routes include 11th Avenue East between Delmar Drive and East Miller Street, East Miller Street between 11th Avenue East and 10th Avenue East, East Shelby Street east of Montlake Boulevard (Options K and L), and East Hamlin Street east of Montlake Boulevard (Options K and L). Haul routes on local roads would be subject to review and approval by the City of Seattle. Exhibit 6.1-3 illustrates the potential haul routes that could be used for all

I-193-010

The slightly elevated segment of the Portage Bay Bridge, along with other noise reduction strategies such as 4-foot concrete traffic barriers with noise-absorptive coating and encapsulating the bridge joints, would result in lower sound levels with the Preferred Alternative than the existing sound levels in the Portage Bay area. Noise modeling indicates that with the noise reduction strategies proposed for the Preferred Alternative, future (2030) project-related noise would generally be less than either existing noise levels or future noise levels with the No Build Alternative.

I-193-011

The Delmar Drive road closure described in the SDEIS is no longer planned. Delmar Drive will be shifted onto a portion of the new lid while the existing bridge is removed.

I-193-012

The Delmar Drive road closure described in the SDEIS is no longer planned. Delmar Drive will be shifted onto a portion of the new lid while the existing bridge is removed.

I-193-013

More specific discussion about anticipated volumes on haul routes is located on page 10-24 through 10-26 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report. These values have been updated for the Preferred Alternative, and can be found in the Final Transportation Discipline Report.

I-193-014

Construction assumptions developed for the project identify major freeways such as I-5, SR 520, and I-405 as primary haul routes intended to carry most project truck traffic. However, there will be times when city

I-193-014

options, and Table 6.1-3 estimates the number of truck trips. *(This clearly states a haul route on 10th Ave. E and E. Miller St. to 11th Ave. E., which must be on the south side of E. Roanoke St. There is no mention of any haul route north of E. Roanoke St.)*

I-193-015

6-13 Delmar Drive Bridge
When Delmar Drive is closed during construction, bicyclists and pedestrians would need to use alternative routes such as Boyer Avenue East on the east side of Delmar Drive and 11th Avenue East to 10th Avenue East on the west side of Delmar Drive. Both routes are feasible for bicycle and pedestrian traffic; however, 11th Avenue East is particularly steep. Depending upon the route traveled, the Boyer Ave East detour could require longer out-of-direction travel. *(This indicates a bike route on the south side of Roanoke that uses 10th Ave. E. and E. Miller St. to 11th Ave. E.)*

I-193-016

6-27 pp 5&6 As described in Chapter 3 and Section 6.1, Transportation, haul routes and detour routes would follow arterials and/or designated truck routes wherever possible. WSDOT has attempted to minimize truck trips on the non-arterial neighborhood streets; however, portions of neighborhood . . .
(This would seem to indicate the use of 11th Ave. E. and 10th Ave. E. north of E. Roanoke St. as a detour route, which corresponds to the diagram on page 6-28)

I-193-017

6-87 & 6-88
Effects from shading and temporary support piers would be the same for all 6-Lane Alternative options in Portage Bay. The construction work bridges constructed within Portage Bay would result in approximately 3 acres of temporary overwater shading (Table 6.11-3). Although these work bridges are relatively narrow (typically 30 feet), the combined shading effects of the existing bridge structure, the two work bridges, and the new highway bridge structures could result in shading an area as wide as approximately 350 feet. The construction work bridge would remain in place for more than 5 years in Portage Bay. *(350 feet of concrete structure will surely degrade the Portage Bay basin, both its viewshed and water surface use for the 5 years)*

I-193-018

page 6-113 pp.
Road Closures and Detours, Haul Routes, Parking, Pedestrian and Bicycles, Transit
All options would have similar construction effects on transportation through most of the project area, with differences in the vicinity of the Montlake Boulevard interchange. Options K and L would result in more effects than Option A because of the amount of truck traffic required for construction of the new SPUI and the traffic effects during the closure of NE Pacific Street.
All options would close the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps for some period of time during construction. The ramp closures would mostly affect local street operations and are not expected to have a substantial effect on SR 520 operations. Traffic that currently uses the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps would be detoured to use the ramps at Montlake Boulevard. A number of improvements would be made to the ramps at Montlake Boulevard in order to accommodate the detour traffic.

streets will need to be used as secondary haul routes. Secondary haul routes for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project were identified based on criteria such as shortest off-highway mileage, and providing access to locations needed for construction where direct highway access is unavailable.
Since publication of the SDEIS, WSDOT has refined potential haul routes to avoid using non-arterial neighborhood streets. Local jurisdictions can limit the use of non-arterial streets for truck traffic; therefore, efforts were made to identify designated arterial streets for potential use as haul routes. Local jurisdictions will determine final haul routes for those actions and activities that require a street use or other jurisdictional permit. The permit process typically takes place during the final design phase and prior to construction.

WSDOT has revised the design and construction sequence for the Preferred Alternative, which has led to refinements in the proposed haul routes and truck volumes for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project. The 10th Avenue East and 11th Avenue East are no longer identified as potential haul routes. See Chapter 3 of the Final EIS for an updated description of the potential haul routes identified for the Preferred Alternative.

I-193-015

The Delmar Drive road closure described in the SDEIS is no longer planned. Delmar Drive will be shifted onto a portion of the new lid while the existing bridge is removed.

I-193-016

See the response to Comment I-193-014 regarding potential haul routes.

I-193-017

The 350 feet represents the overall width of the area affected during the construction process, while this entire width would not be affected at the

I-193-018

All options would close Delmar Drive East for 9 months to accommodate construction on SR 520 beneath the bridge, as well as construction of the 10th Avenue East/Delmar Drive East lid. Traffic would be detoured to 10th Avenue NE. *(Should read 10th Ave. E, not NE.)*

I-193-019

- page 6-1-1 Closure of Delmar Drive East

The Delmar Drive East bridge over SR 520 would be closed temporarily under all options to accommodate construction on SR 520 beneath the bridge, as well as construction of the 10th Avenue and Delmar Drive East lid. The Delmar Drive East bridge would be closed for approximately 12 months for Options A, K, and L. Traffic would be required to detour via 10th Avenue East or Boyer Ave East, which would increase travel times for all vehicles including transit and nonmotorized. *(Depending on when the lid will be constructed—will be deferred in the Phased Implementation scenario—the closure might be more than the 12 months.)*

I-193-020

- 6-5 Haul Routes

All options would require construction-related truck traffic on local streets. Most of the trips would use Montlake Boulevard to access SR 520. A few other arterials would be affected, and the estimated number of truck trips along these arterials would be relatively low compared to overall arterial volumes. *(Include current numbers for truck trips and numbers of truck trips for peak periods in all options.)*

. . . during construction of nearby facilities. Residential streets that might be used for truck haul routes include 11th Avenue East between Delmar Drive and East Miller Street, East Miller Street between 11th Avenue East and 10th Avenue East, East Shelby Street east of Montlake Boulevard (Options K and L), and East Hamlin Street east of Montlake Boulevard (Options K and L). Haul routes on local roads would be subject to review and approval by the City of Seattle. Exhibit 6.1-3 illustrates the potential haul routes that could be used for all options, and Table 6.1-3 estimates the number of truck trips that could be generated as a result of construction activities. For the purpose of developing construction duration estimates that meet the current schedule, it was assumed that construction activities would typically occur 16 hours a day, with 10 hours each day to haul material for most construction activities. *(Is this peak construction activity or normal construction activity?)* East Roanoke Street, Harvard Avenue East, 10th Avenue East *(south of Roanoke Street)* , 11th Avenue East *(south of Roanoke Street)*, East Miller Street, Boylston Avenue East, Boyer Avenue East, Fuhrman Avenue East, Eastlake Avenue East *(would all experience this increased and prolonged truck traffic.)*

I-193-021

- Chapter 6 Exhibit 2-1
- Construction activities would occur adjacent to Seattle Fire Station 22 on East Roanoke Street (Exhibit 6.2-1). However, during construction, the station would be fully operational, access would be maintained, and emergency response would not be affected. See Section 6.3, Social Elements, for a detailed description of potential effects on area neighborhoods.

I-193-022

- tip 6…effects of construction

The proposed haul route for material transport is along East Roanoke Street and Boylston Avenue East to access I-5. As part of construction in this area, Boylston Avenue would be narrowed temporarily and shifted to the west. Trucks would use Boylston Avenue East adjacent to the TOPS school. The school and Rogers Playground (located a block west of the

same time, or for the entire duration of the project. Refer to the Ecosystems Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for a discussion of construction effects.

I-193-018

This information was updated for the Preferred Alternative. Please see Chapter 6 of the Final EIS.

I-193-019

Demolition of the existing Delmar Drive East bridge is part of the construction process for the new 10th and Delmar lid. Under the Phased Implementation Scenario described in the SDEIS, the vulnerable structures would have been replaced and the lanes would have been configured to connect with existing, adjacent lane alignments. The Delmar Drive Bridge would not be demolished until construction of the 10th and Delmar lid is ready to proceed. The Delmar Drive road closure described in the SDEIS is no longer planned. Delmar Drive will be shifted onto a portion of the new lid while the existing bridge is removed and re-constructed.

I-193-020

See the response to Comment I-193-014 regarding potential haul routes. See pages 10-11 through 10-19 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report for a full account of construction traffic and haul route assumptions, including average and peak truck trips for all routes evaluated. See the Final Transportation Discipline Report for updated information on haul routes and truck volumes estimated to support construction activities for the Preferred Alternative.

These assumptions were developed to characterize daily average construction activities. The text recommended by this comment is not an accurate characterization or application of the construction assumption in

I-193-022

interchange) could also experience increased noise and dust *(and vibrations damaging to the historic buildings)*. Rogers Playground is located over 500 feet from where lid construction would occur. Noise and dust effects on the park are expected to be minor. *(The school playground is immediately behind the school, and Rogers Playfield will be only a block away from the increased noise, dust, and diesel emissions.)*

I-193-023

North Capitol Hill

- Construction of the 10th Avenue East/Delmar Drive East lid would affect North Capitol Hill residences adjacent to SR 520 and along proposed haul routes. Seattle Preparatory School, a private high school, is located on 11th Avenue East and could *(would)* also experience increased traffic volumes from haul truck trips.

I-193-024

- Construction activities would require the Delmar Drive bridge to be closed for approximately 9 months. A temporary bridge at 10th Avenue East would cross SR 520 and include sidewalks for safe pedestrian and bicyclist movements. All construction activities in this area are common to Options A, K, and L and would occur over a 27-month period.

I-193-025

Portage Bay/Roanoke

Construction of the 10th Avenue East /Delmar Drive East lid and the Portage Bay Bridge would affect the Portage Bay/Roanoke neighborhood near the I-5/SR 520 interchange for up to 27 months and residences along the east shore of Portage Bay for up to 42 months. These elements are common to Options A, K, and L. Roanoke Park *(The Roanoke Park Historic District, Roanoke Park itself,)* and the surrounding neighborhoods would experience

I-193-026

construction noise and dust, especially in the southern part*(s)* of the neighborhood*(s)* near Roanoke Street. The haul routes along *(Harvard Ave. E.,)* 10th Avenue East and Roanoke Street would increase truck traffic along the borders of the neighborhood*(s)*, although these are both arterial streets with high volumes of existing traffic. *(This seems to indicate that the haul route is on 10th Ave. E. south of E. Roanoke Street.)* These effects would be temporary and would occur during construction.

I-193-027

Interlaken Park is divided into two portions by Delmar Drive East. Construction would occur within the park while curbs and sidewalks are replaced along Delmar Drive East. A small portion (0.05 acre) of Interlaken Park would be temporarily used as a construction easement under all design options (Exhibit 6.4-2 and Table 6.4-1). This area would be returned to park use after construction.

Bicyclists and pedestrians who currently use the on-street bike path to access the park would be routed along the 10th Avenue East construction *(detour?)*. This area of the park would also experience noise and dust from construction activity associated with the construction of the 10th Avenue East/East Delmar Drive lid for approximately 15 to 24 months. Construction noise is discussed in Section 6.7.

I-193-028

All options would acquire Bagley Viewpoint in its entirety, and all options include a proposed haul route adjacent to Roanoke Park. Construction effects on these parks would be the same for all options and would last approximately 2 years.

the previous sentence, and was not added to the Final EIS text. However, more discussion is provided in Chapters 3 and 6 of the Final EIS discussing haul routes, truck volumes, and the anticipated effects of those activities on the surrounding streets and resources.

I-193-021

Comment noted. Effect on Fire Station 22 would be the same with the Preferred Alternative as with Option A.

I-193-022

The Preferred Alternative does not include a lid across East Roanoke Street as Option A did, although it does include construction of an enhanced bicycle/pedestrian crossing in this area. The construction of the enhanced bicycle/pedestrian path over I-5 would be of lesser intensity and shorter construction duration (12 months) than the 27 months of construction required for the I-5 lid that was evaluated as part of the SDEIS.

As described in the Recreation Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 of the Final EIS), the effects of project construction on views and background noise levels at Rogers Playground would be minor. The effects from visual interruptions and dust would largely be blocked by the Denny-Fuhrman (Tops) School buildings and large trees in the area. Additionally, the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 of the Final EIS) demonstrates that on most days, there would be no noticeable difference in traffic volumes at the playground, compared to existing conditions as a result of using the roadway material for hauling.

The Final Cultural Resources Assessment and Discipline Report (Attachment 7 of the Final EIS) includes a discussion of potential effects to the Denny-Fuhrman (Tops) School. WSDOT's analysis has concluded that the WHR-listed and NRHP-eligible school buildings may potentially experience noise, fugitive dust, and possible vibration for

I-193-029

Construction activities in the Roanoke landscape unit would be visible from *(quite)* a few homes, the upper floors of Seward School, and nearby roadways and surface streets. The 2 years of construction activity associated with mobilization and construction of the Roanoke lid, eastbound and westbound mainline ramps, and reversible HOV ramp would have a high impact on visual character and quality for all viewers. However, viewpoints with long-distance views across Portage Bay or to the west would be minimally affected by construction in Roanoke because most construction activities would occur along the roadway corridor. *(There are no views of Portage Bay from the I-5 corridor)*

- .

I-193-030

6-50

The greatest effect on views would result from large-scale activities that involve heavy equipment and collectively span 2 years. These would include demolition of ramps and bridge overcrossings; construction of new ramps; replacement of bridges at Roanoke Street, 10th Avenue East, and Delmar Drive East; and construction of the new I-5 and 10th and Delmar lids. Removal of the Delmar Drive East overcrossing and construction of detour bridges would result in the removal of Bagley Viewpoint and the tree buffer below it. *(This states that a temporary bridge will be constructed as a detour over the Delmar Drive East overcrossing. Good. That illuminates need for a detour route on 10th Ave. E north or south of E. Roanoke St. Note that many homes alongI-5 and SR 520 in North Capitol Hill, along E. Roanoke St., in the 2600 blocks of Harvard Ave. E., Broadway Ave. E., and 10th Ave. E., and along both sides of Delmar Dr. E. and in the southern end of the Portage Bay neighborhood would have their views degraded by these large-scale activities.)*

I-193-031

Temporary detour bridges during construction of the new structures would be large, complex structures that would clutter views from the roadways and overcrossings. Construction equipment and activities would be visible from homes along I-5 because *(a few of)* the newly constructed noise walls along Boylston Avenue and Harvard Avenue in the vicinity of Roanoke Street would be removed to build the I-5 lid. *(A new permanent bridge would be constructed just west of the existing bridge and then the existing bridge removed. This would make the lid coverage smaller by the width of the new bridge but should still provide the same noise and visual blockage.)*

I-193-032

Construction would remove some trees and shrubs from the I-5 median and in the I-5/SR 520 interchange. Preparation for constructing the lids would permanently remove mature roadside trees and shrubs along both sides of SR 520. Views from homes that are currently screened by these trees and walls would then overlook ongoing construction actions and equipment. *(No vegetation should be removed until the construction of the lids is assured by allocation of funding for this purpose, and vegetation removal should be delayed as long as possible.)*

I-193-033

Portage Bay Landscape Unit

Construction activities would be visible from most locations around Portage Bay. The greatest change to visual quality would result from the size and complexity of construction bridges on both sides of the Portage Bay Bridge. The later construction of the new Portage Bay Bridge would increase the effects.

The combination of the construction bridges, falsework finger piers, and the phased demolition and reconstruction of the Portage Bay Bridge over the course of more than 6 years would result in substantial degradation of visual character and quality of the south part of Portage Bay. The bridges would block water and ground level views near these structures. The viewers most affected by these changes would be commuters crossing the bridges,

construction activities to rebuild the I-5/SR 520 interchange and HOV ramp, the enhanced bicycle/pedestrian path and the 10th and Delmar lid. While the setting and feeling of the school may be affected by construction and by passing haul-trucks, the characteristics that allow the school to convey its significance would not be compromised and would retain integrity.

I-193-023

See the response to Comment I-193-014 regarding potential haul routes. See Chapter 3 of the Final EIS for an updated description of the potential haul routes identified for the Preferred Alternative. See Chapter 6 for discussion of how the haul routes would affect surrounding communities and resources.

I-193-024

The Delmar Drive road closure described in the SDEIS is no longer planned. Delmar Drive will be shifted onto a portion of the new lid while the existing bridge is removed and re-constructed.

I-193-025

WSDOT has reviewed the potential for construction of the Preferred Alternative to affect surrounding neighborhoods. Construction of the 10 Avenue East and Delmar Drive East lid would take approximately 2 years, and construction of the Portage Bay Bridge is expected to last for approximately 5 ½ years. Due to the length of the construction period and its potential impact, WSDOT is working with a number of community groups, stakeholders and Section 106 consulting parties to develop a Community Construction Management Plan (CCMP) (outlined in Attachment 9 to the Final EIS). The CCMP will contain strategies to avoid, minimize and mitigate for the effects from project construction. The CCMP will also address quality of life issues.

I-193-033

residents on houseboats and near the bridge ends *(and residents along the west side of Portage Bay including the hillsides and the Roanoke plateau)*, park users at Montlake Playfield, and boaters at the marinas (Queen City and Seattle yacht clubs).

I-193-034

Heavy earthwork equipment would be required to excavate the bridge piers near Boyer and contour the terrain near Boyer Avenue East and Montlake Playfield for stormwater and landscaping. This equipment would be visible from nearby locations. Vegetation under the west end of the bridge on either side of Boyer Avenue East would be removed, but this area is currently an unmaintained landscape. *(Again this area may look unmaintained, but it is still open space and provides views to the water, and the area should be replanted appropriately after construction is completed.)*

- .

6-51

I-193-035

Portage Bay Landscape Unit section 5

Under all options, the overall character and quality of this landscape unit would not change as a result of the Portage Bay Bridge, but views in the vicinity of the new bridge would be more open (Table 5.5-2).

Existing	High	Moderate	High
All options	High	Moderate to high	High

The greater column spacing (from 100 feet on center currently to as much as 250 feet apart) would open up views under the bridge, especially looking northward from the south side of the bridge (Exhibit 5.5-2). *(Regarding the height of the Portage Bay Bridge: a bridge that is higher at the east end would be less visually intrusive—due to the angle of vision as a function of eye level— as seen from the western side of the bay basin. I feel that the entire Portage Bay should be bridged by a higher level structure, one that goes from the high point below the Bagley Viewpoint to a low point at the Montlake Blvd. underpass in one continuous line. This would not significantly change the view of the western half of the bridge but would alter the view of the eastern half, putting it higher and therefore reducing the view of the roadway from the surrounding residential areas and creating meaningful views under the structure, views of the larger bay areas and boats and allowing more boat traffic under the bridge. A bridge higher on the east end would also allow better pedestrian use between the Montlake Playfield and the public and semi public/private open spaces north of the bridge.)*

I-193-036

The east end of the new bridge would be farther north, which could have a positive effect for Montlake Playfield views. A wider west end of the bridge would affect views from the homes next to the bridge *(and all along the east side of Roanoke and the hillsides on the west of Portage Bay)* on the north side, making the bridge more dominant in eastward views. This would not change visual quality because the bridge is already the dominant structure in the southern half of their views. *(Visual character would be significantly diminished by the increased width of the bridge especially when viewed from the crest of the hill on the west side of Portage Bay.)* The areas under the west end of the bridge would be re-landscaped to open up views into those landscapes and along Boyer Avenue.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Robert Buchanan
Professor of Landscape Architecture Emeritus, University of Washington.

WSDOT has also worked with the adjacent historic districts, the Roanoke Park Historic District and the Montlake Historic District, through the Section 106 Consultation Process, to avoid, minimize and mitigate the adverse effect to historic properties. The consultation culminated with the signature of a Programmatic Agreement, which outlines the terms and conditions agreed upon to resolve the adverse effect from the project (Attachment 9 to the Final EIS). Although the stipulations provided in the Programmatic Agreement were designed for protection of historic properties in the project area, they will also benefit other surrounding neighborhoods.

WSDOT would further avoid, minimize and mitigate for construction impacts by deploying a number of best management practices during construction and implementing the community construction management plan.

I-193-026

See the response to Comment I-193-014 regarding potential haul routes.

I-193-027

The requested change was not made because the original statement is accurate.

I-193-028

This comment, I-193-028, is a reiteration of a key point found on page 6-40 of the SDEIS. For additional information to support this key point, please see the discussion on pages 6-40 - 6-50 of the SDIES, which pertains to construction effects on recreational resources.

I-193-029

The I-5 landscape unit extends east to the shoreline of Portage Bay and

includes the east-facing hillside homes of the Roanoke ridge. Please refer to page 31 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report.

I-193-030
These visual effects due to construction activities have been noted in paragraphs 1 and 3 through 5 on page 6-51 of the SDEIS.

I-193-031
Comment noted. The I-5 lid is not part of the Preferred Alternative.

I-193-032
The lids are integral to the project design and would be constructed at the same time as the section of the SR 520 corridor in which they are located (e.g., the Montlake lid would be completed at the same time as the Montlake interchange improvements). WSDOT has never proposed to defer the lids until after completion of the SR 520 roadway improvements.

I-193-033
Yes, these residents were grouped under “residents…near the bridge ends,…”

I-193-034
Please see the response to Comment I-193-004.

I-193-035
The eastern half of the proposed bridge would be higher than the existing bridge and would eliminate the low point (“sag”) that you mention. The slope of the western half of the proposed bridge is the same as the existing bridge. Please refer to SDEIS Exhibit 2-7 on page 2-12 for a comparison of profiles of the two bridges. A bridge that drops

in a straight line from Roanoke to Montlake/NOAA would be quite high in the center of the bridge, nearly twice the height of the existing bridge. This would make the bridge more visible from most viewpoints whether on the west side of Portage Bay or the east side.

I-193-036

Roanoke hillside views over Portage Bay face east and the bridge is on the right edge of these views, not the central or focus part. The scenic, panorama view eastward would not be compromised. In addition, views of the Portage Bay Bridge from Roanoke and North Capitol Hill hillsides are screened or blocked by buildings and mature naturalized or planted trees. When the bridge is an element in any view, it is a component of a developed shoreline that includes houseboats, public buildings, parking lots, marinas and covered slips, and single and multi-family dwellings. For these reasons these views would not be compromised.