

---

**From:** Walter Scott [mailto:wscott@legacy-commercial.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 02, 2006 12:46 PM  
**To:** SR 520 DEIS Comments  
**Subject:** DEIS: 520 Bridge: Comment to Noise mitigation section

**I-0516-001** Seattle (West -side) noise for the 6 lane alternative is modeled to exceed FHWA/ WSDOT threshold levels @109 residences- fewer such residences than the 4 lane alternative w/ no lids. This fewer residences does not mean less noise; in reality, the 6 lane version is modeled for (80,000/day ?)higher traffic counts and 2 hours / day less congestion which means more traffic for more time at highway speeds and this = significantly more overall noise for the adjacent communities - except for those areas adjacent to the lids. No way around it. The 2 lids are an improvement for those very specific areas and WSDOT should be applauded for this forward thinking and chastised simultaneously for leaving the rest of the residences out in the noise when something can be done that is cost - effective; noise reducing over a long period of time that would also extend the life of the new concrete freeway indefinitely - Overlay by Rubberized asphalt ("AR" ) - used extensively in other US States & other countries for years . Originally designed as a more durable alternative to HMA , AR turned out to be safer ( reduced ponding , truck spray, and higher friction coefficient) , better environmentally - cutting noise by 4- 8 dBA and recycling of used tires ( Az now recycles 70% of all the States used tires back into its highways ) and more cost effective than replacing concrete every 50 yrs.

**I-0516-002** Noise walls –Very expensive & only effective 3 blocks back(18-20') at level grade or less given that your plan only envisions walls 8' -18' and is not applicable at all for homes & businesses near the Lake or on hillsides. Unless you only care about the quality of life of the residents living within 3 blocks of the highway, your discussion about noise walls is meaningless. Except in the areas near the lids , you are doing nothing for those living > 3 blocks from the freeway except guaranteeing higher noise over longer periods ; you are degrading their quality of life, yet your mitigation section sounds like a Summer Camp brochure ( "Historical section " ) .

What about Laurelhurst and the neighborhood more than 3 blocks away? - offer nothing when you could easily do so? Oh yes, we know that WDOT policy does not permit you to consider any noise mitigation technique that is not "approved" by FHWA. There's a problem though- FHWA has known about AR's proven effectiveness for years but still claims they do not have the "frequency measurements" to turn on the "surface" function of the model which they have to do a 5 yrs before they can "approve" AR as an official noise mitigation technique, so I suppose in a "policy" sense, you have no obligation to do anything else.. Too bad because, noise walls could be reduced or eliminated, saving a lot of money even after laying 1 ½" of AR "sacrificial layer. Then, the neighborhoods would get half the noise they are now getting and the taxpayers would get a more economical new highway.

In the scoping neighborhood meetings last year, we wrote comments including a direct statement that if the EIS did not include AR as a mitigation technique, we would appeal it. I even spoke to John Milton about this in Clyde Hill this Summer. WSDOT policy is that they must follow FHWA approved guidelines BUT, Washington Law says that State agencies must evaluate all legitimate means of mitigation (Not limited to FHWA or even WSDOT policy). Most importantly, this will galvanize the neighborhoods to come out against their own State Agency. WSDOT could be the "hero" here, innovating to protect the people, but, it's a missed opportunity to connect in a positive manner w/ the public. I wouldn't want to be an elected official for this area that was viewed to be in favor of this project.

W. Scott  
425.450.2336

## I-0516-001

### Comment Summary:

Noise (Methodology)

### Response:

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

## I-0516-002

### Comment Summary:

Noise Walls

### Response:

See Section 12.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.