

---

**From:** Carl Stixrood [mailto:stixrood@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 01, 2006 7:29 PM  
**To:** SR 520 DEIS Comments  
**Subject:** 520 DEIS comments

**I-0468-001**  
**Comment Summary:**  
Noise (Methodology)

**Response:**  
See Section 12.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

Carl and Annie Stixrood  
2510 Boyer Avenue East  
Seattle, Washington 98102

Governor Christine Gregoire  
Office of the Governor  
PO Box 40002  
Olympia, WA 98504-0002  
Phone: (360) 902-4111  
Fax: (360) 753-4110

Paul Krueger  
Environmental Manager  
SR 520 Project Office  
414 Olive Way, Suite 400  
Seattle, WA 98101  
sr520deiscomments@wsdot.wa.gov

RE: Comments on SR 520 DEIS

We appreciate the opportunity to review the Draft EIS on the 520 project and have the following comments. We live very close to the existing viaduct across Portage Bay and hope that through implementation of new federal and state design and environmental standards the completed project will be an improvement over the existing structure.

**Current problems include:**

- Land under the viaduct has not been maintained by the state and has provided a location for homeless persons to live. Neighborhood residents are precluded from access to Portage Bay by the existence of homeless camps.
- The sidewalk under the viaduct along the south side of Boyer Avenue was never replaced after viaduct construction. For over thirty years, a missing sidewalk section under the viaduct broke the continuous sidewalk that existed for three miles between the University Bridge and 23<sup>rd</sup> avenue. Children walking to neighborhood stores were forced to cross a busy street. Finally, a neighborhood group prevailed upon the City of Seattle to rebuild the missing section of sidewalk.
- There is no water quality treatment or noise mitigation on the current viaduct.
- Review of historical documents and discussion with long time residents suggests that Portage Bay was substantially deeper before construction of the current viaduct. Material cut from the Montlake interchange area was placed on the peat soils in what is now Montlake Park. It appears that placement of fill has pushed peat into Portage Bay making the Bay extremely shallow and full of sediment.

**I-0468-001** | **Areas of Inadequate Discussion**

The following topics received inadequate treatment in the DEIS and should be addressed more fully in a supplement or final EIS.

- Noise

I-0468-001

Application of Washington State Department of Transportation Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Procedures.

The noise standard applied to Montlake Park and the Arboretum could be that of "Lands on which serenity and quiet are of extraordinary significance and serve an important public need and where the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is to continue to serve its intended purpose."

The standard that appears to have been considered is

"B 67 (exterior) Picnic areas, recreation areas, playgrounds, active sports areas, parks, residences, motels, hotels, schools, churches, libraries,

We did not find discussion in the DEIS of what the proper noise standard is under WSDOT environmental procedures. This should be addressed.

I-0468-002

- **Earth** There is no mention of the impacts of fill on Portage Bay depths. This should be addressed.

I-0468-003

- **Traffic** There is no discussion of impact to local pedestrian and vehicle circulation on Boyer Avenue during and after construction. This should be addressed.

I-0468-004

- **Recreation** There is no discussion of potential access to Portage Bay for the public under the viaduct or access for pedestrians from Boyer Avenue to Roanoke Park. There is no mention of current efforts to renovate wildlife/wetland habitat in Montlake Park by Seattle Parks and neighborhood volunteers. There is no discussion of impact to local sidewalk/stairway network in the vicinity of the project. This should be addressed.

I-0468-005

- **Alternatives**

A Tunnel alternative from I-5 to Madison Park was not adequately addressed although this alternative does appear to meet the criteria in SEPA for reasonable alternatives. WAC 197-11-440 (5) (b) "Reasonable alternatives shall include actions that could feasibly attain or approximate a proposal's objectives, but at a lower environmental cost or decreased level of environmental degradation." A tunnel alternative from I-5 to Madison Park appears to meet the intent of SEPA and should be included.

The no-action alternative is deficient in the lack of discussion of a retrofit approach. The first line in the EIS document "The existing Portage Bay and Evergreen Point bridges .... are at the end of their useful life and must be replaced" is clearly a statement of opinion that has no place in an objective EIS document. The bridges could be retrofit to extend their useful life and improve earthquake resistance. Since none of the project alternatives have substantial benefits in areas of increased capacity or reduced congestion it makes sense to consider the no-action alternative (upgrade maintenance and retrofit) in more detail as a cost effective option.

I-0468-006

- **Aesthetics**

The negative "image" and economic effects of expanding an elevated roadway along the shoreline should be considered. The quality of life and environment in Seattle is an important aspect of the economic engine of Washington State. The Seattle portion of this project is unique because the elevated roadway extends along three miles of shoreline rather than just crossing the shoreline at one point. These are the types of projects that are being removed in cities that are trying to

I-0468-002

**Comment Summary:**

Seismic Hazards

**Response:**

See Section 17.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0468-003

**Comment Summary:**

Traffic Management (Construction)

**Response:**

See Section 4.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0468-004

**Comment Summary:**

Park Effects

**Response:**

See Section 9.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0468-005

**Comment Summary:**

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

**Response:**

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

I-0468-006

**Comment Summary:**

Context Sensitive Solutions

**I-0468-006**

promote their quality of life. The aesthetics section should be expanded to include discussion of regional image impacts.

**I-0468-007**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the SR 520 DEIS. I know you will consider your upcoming decision carefully; it is one we will have to live with for generations. I hope that in this case, cost is put in proper perspective. Tolls on the bridge could pay for a project that is an asset to the region.

Sincerely



Carl and Annie Stixrood

**Response:**

See Section 10.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0468-007**

**Comment Summary:**

Tolling Scenarios, Pricing, and Revenue

**Response:**

See Section 3.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.