

Online Comment by User: Waltero

Submitted on: 10/29/2006 7:01:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 1414 E. Lynn St., Seattle, WA 98112

Comment:

- I-0952-001** | The title of the project only reflects two of the three missions: SR-520 Bridge Replacement and HOV project. It should add, "and neighborhood enhancement" project. This title avoids the neighborhood enhancement goal, clearly stated. Thus the document is inadequate and needs to be revised and refreshed to put equal status to this goal, which is clearly stated repeatedly in the document.
- I-0952-002** | This document is deficient in that it does not have simple a comparison chart that shows the environmental impact (noise, visual, runoff, aesthetics) and ability to meet project goals: (flow of traffic, safety, neighborhood enhancement) of different design options outside of what is proposed, namely surface bridge vs. tunnel/tube. This makes the document inadequate, because we are unable to assess what the different design options are that actually meet the stated goals in the document.
- I-0952-003** | **Comment Category: General Comments**
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Comment:
This document does not adequately define, in great detail, how the tube/tunnel option was removed from the table. Given that it would provide opportunities for achieving the project goals, it needs further explanation as to who studied the option, and how it was decided – on an environmental impact basis that this was not a viable option.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Comment:
- I-0952-004** | Overall: I would like to see how traffic flows on Delmar Drive/E. Lynn Street are predicted over time. This is an area that is greatly affected by traffic and how 520/I-5 operate, and is part of the project area. Also, how Delmar Drive Traffic improvement (keeping speeds down, improving pedestrian and bicycle access, preventing "cut-through traffic") is not addressed, even though it is a road that appears to be greatly affected by the 520 project. I do not see this anywhere in the document.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1
Comment:
- I-0952-005** | Overall: I do not see how the implementation of tolls would have an impact on usage. It appears that toll rates could be used to increase or lower usage of the bridge for SOVs. This does not seem to be addressed in the document, which implies that we are forever going to have increased traffic with a free highway system.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-1
Comment:
- I-0952-006** | Chapter 1 title: How have transportation needs shaped the area? What about how has transportation needs evolved to be integrated and designed into the urban landscape, where

I-0952-001

Comment Summary:

Format and Content

Response:

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

I-0952-002

Comment Summary:

Format and Content

Response:

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

I-0952-003

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-004

Comment Summary:

Local Street Network

Response:

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

I-0952-005

Comment Summary:

Tolling Scenarios, Pricing, and Revenue

I-0952-006 | families live, parklands exist, fish and wildlife exist? This is a one-dimensional story about throughput. The story needs to include how people put up with the existing structure put together without design considerations for the urban landscape. It ignores that this is where people live, breath, see, and hear.

I-0952-007 | Chapter 4 title: It shows that the project would have positive and adverse aspects on the environment. What about the community?

Question that it is deficient in answering: What is the economic and non-economic value to spending the billions of dollars outside of traffic costs and benefits. How will this structure reflect what the city aspires to be? How does it reflect how it values the community who lives near it? How does this show that Seattle and the State of Washington are a world class city and is forward thinking? The document assumes that an investment is only a replacement, and not an opportunity. There is opportunity cost if quality design, aesthetics, appreciation for setting and tourist draw are not taken into account. Think about the golden gate bridge—how it is an affirmative icon as well as a functional road. The pictures and text state that this is only a road replacement—it is a massive capital project that goes beyond transportation, and this needs to be documented and addressed. This is not addressed in the EIS, and it is deficient.

I-0952-008 | It is deficient in that alternatives that could have positive environmental impacts are not considered: I need to see what the comparisons of alternatives would be for underground (tube/tunnel) in terms of noise, aesthetics, quality of life, environment.

Deficient is the efforts to make sure that the project is compatible with the existing residents, not a strain, or how it is planned to make this a net quality of life improvement, given the hardship of construction.

Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-1
Comment:

I-0952-009 | -1: Arboretum is called a treasure: How is this capital investment designed to enhance the treasure, rather than reduce it? What options have been put forth to make the arboretum a better place, rather than a worse place with this project?

I-0952-010 | 1-1: “Simply stated: More people want to use the highway than can accommodate.” This story is deficient because it is also true: More people want to use the surrounding areas than what the bridge can accommodate: The arboretum, portage bay, and the surrounding neighborhoods have born the brunt of a poor design that neither can accommodate the transportation needs, nor enhance and integrate with the urban environment. It has been a failure not just in accommodating the current and upcoming traffic needs, it is also a failure in assuring that its surrounding environments and aesthetics are loved by those who use the space near it. This story only tells the story of how it is traffic deficient. It also needs to tell the story of how it is design and inspiration deficient, and does not reflect the values of the local community—one that wants to use the “treasure” of the arboretum (it trashes), and sends noise to extended areas.

Response:

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

I-0952-006

Comment Summary:

Format and Content

Response:

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

I-0952-007

Comment Summary:

Context Sensitive Solutions

Response:

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

I-0952-008

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-009

Comment Summary:

Arboretum (Concerns)

Response:

See Section 9.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-010 | “Now once again, the project area faces the imperative of updating its role in transportation.” This is insufficient: “Now once again, the project area faces the imperative of updating its role in transportation, improving design and aesthetics, and valuing the surrounding areas such that they are increased in desirability.” This story is insufficient as to why we need a new 520: The existing one is unstable, does not handle the traffic load, and is inappropriate for its location: A big concrete slab in the middle of of an amazing urban and diverse residential and parkland core.

“The neighborhoods and the region as a whole must be better protected from the negative effects associated with a major transportation corridor.” Protected is the incorrect word—it should be enhanced and that the transportation corridor creates positive effects. For this kind of investment, it should not be only mitigating negative effects: If you are designing a new public building—you want it to be attractive and integrated to the environment. You could put a concrete block building that serves the function of providing offices, but this has a net negative if the form and function do not work in harmony with the surrounding environment. This EIS needs to have commentary about how quality design that enhances the surrounding area, rather than detracts from it is an integral need to make sure that this is a worthwhile investment, and creative alternatives need to be provided in this document in order for this EIS to avoid being deficient.

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-11

Comment:

I-0952-011 | 1-11: It says that the goal is to “Protect and Enhance” neighborhoods. In the other section it says that the goal is to mitigate and avoid project effects.” This document does not describe options that greatly enhance the neighborhoods, just some mitigation (and it varies greatly by alternative provided) thus it is deficient. The only options provided create a worse situation for the existing neighborhoods with greater visual blight, construction noise and dust, and more cars, imposition on parkland and the like.

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-11

Comment:

I-0952-012 | 1-11: There is no mention of a lid in the 4 lane alternative. Also—in the no-build section, there is no mention of improving the local neighborhood. OK, so it doesn’t meet the first two criterion, but the third there is some opportunity.

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-12

Comment:

I-0952-013 | 1-12: Disagree with the statement that a freeway that is twice as wide improves the neighborhood. The larger footprint, the increased traffic, the less accessible bus service, This is a deficiency in the document and is misleading. If a 6 alternative was put underground, then this claim could be substantiated.

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-12

Comment:

I-0952-014 | 1-12 Why eliminate the Montlake freeway stop? That is a heavily used stop that reduces the number of cars (including my own).

I-0952-010

Comment Summary:

Context Sensitive Solutions

Response:

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

I-0952-011

Comment Summary:

Neighborhood Issues

Response:

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

I-0952-012

Comment Summary:

4-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0952-013

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-014

Comment Summary:

Montlake Freeway Transit Station

- Comment Category:** Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-12
Comment:
 I-0952-015 | 1-12: The tunnel option would meet all three criteria (safety, traffic and improve neighborhood). The fact that it is not considered is a deficiency in the document.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-14
Comment:
 I-0952-016 | 1-14: Instead of “identifies measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate negative effects,” this should read, “identifies measures to create, maximize and accentuate positive effects.” The negative effects should only be experienced in the build process: If I was renovating my house, I would not put as a result of the project, “I hope that after I’m done, this avoids, minimizes and mitigates negative effects.” It is not worth the investment—there should be more positive goals, as stated in this own document.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-16
Comment:
 I-0952-017 | 1-16: It states that Portage Bay/ Roanoke Park was consulted with, yet the key recommendations of the community: That good design is built in to the project, such that it is an improvement to the neighborhood is not addressed substantially in the alternatives, although the document explicitly agrees with this recommendation. As a result, all alternatives are deficient.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-17
Comment:
 I-0952-018 | 1-17: 3rd Bullet Point: “Neighborhoods. . . Want the effects of the original freeway construction in the 1960s to be mitigated in ways that were not done when the corridor was first built.” This is incorrect: Neighborhoods such as Roanoke Park/ Portage Bay want integrated design that makes a project like this enhance the neighborhood, not “mitigation”. We are not looking at it from a “correct the past”, as we have already suffered 40+ years of that. We are “shape the future” and this means more than mitigation—this means building in excellent design that meets all goals—thus alternatives must be examined that not only improve traffic flow and safety, but improve the neighborhood. The Tunnel/ Tube comes to mind. The “better bridge” movement comes from the same desire for creative solutions to enhance the project. The “Pacific Exchange” idea is not a “mitigation” of the freeway – it is a proposal for a better designed freeway. While the Pacific Exchange people like this better design, RP/PB likes better design that accomplishes traffic goals and improves Portage Bay, and it is unacceptable if the project is looked at only as an opportunity to mitigate a bridge that will no longer exist.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-18
Comment:
 I-0952-019 | 1-18: "Neighborhoods appear to support the 6 lane corridor." I don't think that this this is the case, unless the 6 lanes were put underground. The specific mention of the Montlake Community's support of the Pacific Exchange highlights the lack of acknowledgement of what PB/RP supports, making the document deficient.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Response:

See Section 2.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-015

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-016

Comment Summary:

Format and Content

Response:

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

I-0952-017

Comment Summary:

Neighborhood Issues

Response:

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

I-0952-018

Comment Summary:

Coordination with Other Transportation Projects

Response:

See Section 1.0 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

- I-0952-020** | **Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-19**
Comment:
 1-19: A Design Advisory Group: This implies that this group is only decorating the slab. Like only being able to choose the necklace on a model, not the clothes or the model itself. Burying the role and scope of the DAG limits the ability to meet the third goal of improving the core freeway design so that it enhances the neighborhood, rather than detracts from it.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-6
- I-0952-021** | **Comment:**
 -6: Why the project is implemented: It discusses the “Outmoded design”, but talks only about transportation design (narrow lanes, no shoulders). Just as outmoded is the lack of aesthetics, mitigation of noise, runoff, and design elements that make being near a transportation corridor desirable. It is a current design that ignores that it runs through a residential and parkland area, causing harm not only to traffic flow, and the environment, but the to the community as well.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-7
- I-0952-022** | **Comment:**
 1-7 it talks about disincentives for businesses willing to locate in the area: In a similar vein, this document is deficient in that it does not talk about the disincentive for living in the urban core, and the harm a poorly designed freeway that runs through residential areas causes. For example, in areas where transportation needs are high, but the land is also valuable and desired, the usual solution is to consider underground builds, so the land is continued to be valued and the transportation needs are addressed. This is how a city like Paris is considered to be beautiful and valued and drawn to the world over: Imagine what Paris would be like if they built all the freeways and metro overground. Imagine the cost to Paris’ reputation, business and living environment. It would not be considered a great city, but a sad place. Instead Paris is the very definition of a world class city. This EIS is deficient in that it does not address the costs that re-doing the existing design has: It basically sentences the region to continued bad design, equivalent to putting freeways through Paris.
- I-0952-023** | **“Meets Today’s Design Standards”** : I want to see what the aesthetic design standards are for modern freeways—these have changed just like they have changed for width of lanes, the need for wider shoulders, and better run-off.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-7
- I-0952-024** | **Comment:**
 Exhibit 1-3: There needs to be an Exhibit of, “Appeal of design” for no-build, 4-lane, 6-lane and tunnel. This is just as valid as the throughput measure.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-8
- I-0952-025** | **Comment:**
 1-8: Improve safety, increase mobility. “Avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate project effects on neighborhood and the environment.” This is deficient in the goal should be “improve safety, increase mobility, improve the environment and neighborhood.” — why is it that the

I-0952-019

Comment Summary:

Neighborhood Issues

Response:

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

I-0952-020

Comment Summary:

Context Sensitive Solutions

Response:

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

I-0952-021

Comment Summary:

Neighborhood Issues

Response:

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

I-0952-022

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-023

Comment Summary:

Context Sensitive Solutions

- I-0952-025** | neighborhoods have to be mitigated, when there is an opportunity for improvement? How about “mitigate safety, mitigate mobility, and improve the neighborhood.”
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-8
Comment:
- I-0952-026** | 1-8: It talks about the 8 lane alternative, but it does not talk about other alternatives, like the tube/tunnel. As this is an EIS, options that have the opportunity provide a better Environment—especially since the existing structure is inadequate from this standpoint. must be acknowledged and stated.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-9
Comment:
- 1-9: I want to see a box that describes, “What happened to the tube/tunnel alternative?” In the box, it also leaves open the possibility of bringing back the 8 lane alternative: This means that is possible to bring back the tube/tunnel alternative. Since this is possible, there is substantial reason to do this and shows the deficiency of this document.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-1
Comment:
- I-0952-027** | 2-1: “diverse, human, complex and natural landscapes.” Thus this is a project that should have in the EIS designs to improve human, natural landscapes. The EIS describes only enhanced roadscapes with a nod to improved areas around it, thus it is deficient. It should have options and designs that seek to enhance the human and natural landscapes.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-16
Comment:
- I-0952-028** | 2-16: “What is the current condition of SR-520 in the current project area?” There needs to be a section, “What is the current condition of the project area because of SR-520.”
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-17
Comment:
- I-0952-029** | 2-17: There is a strong discussion of the growth of traffic. This needs to address why the EIS is proposing options that have the same 2-dimensional option (flat bridge), which has limited capacity for growth, compared to 3-dimensional options (tubes, stacked tunnels).
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-22
Comment:
- I-0952-030** | 2-22: Visual Character: Discusses that views are scenic from 520, but does not mention that views of 520—especially from Madison Park, Portage Bay are not scenic and dominate and does not fit into the natural landscape or humanscape. There should be verbiage that this is an intrusion to the human and natural character of the area. It is deficient to say that views of 520 from Montlake are seasonal. “The bridge is a small feature in the distance” does not describe the experience of Roanoke Park, Portage Bay. This is a massive, man-made structure that dominates Portage Bay--as is mentioned elsewhere in the document---and has no effort to integrate into the landscape. There is no mention of the view—or the noise environment-- of 520 from Portage Bay
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-23

Response:

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

I-0952-024

Comment Summary:

Context Sensitive Solutions

Response:

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

I-0952-025

Comment Summary:

Format and Content

Response:

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

I-0952-026

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-027

Comment Summary:

Format and Content

Response:

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

- I-0952-031** | **Comment:**
2-23: "Leading Commercial and Cultural city in the pacific northwest". Contradictory messages: This document does not adequately describe how a large capital effort demonstrates that it values the natural and city scape. The roads and the environment are not described with equal priority. The focus and advocacy of the document is how to push more traffic, rather than incorporate commerce, humans, landscape. Options need to be detailed that show this. Currently, the only options are for road size increase with mitigation, rather than improving the citiscape substantially as we grow in commercial and cultural importance.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-23
- I-0952-032** | **Comment:**
2-23: It says that new growth will mainly result from increasingly dense development in neighborhoods. This document contracts this by advocating for more surface roadscape that makes dense living environments less attractive over time. This is the exact opposite in trends in urban design--big bulky freeways. It is likely that as time progresses, desirability of being near a big freeway with lots of noise will go down. As a result this EIS does not adequately take into account the human toll of the alterantaives and contradicts the vision of the future.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-33
- I-0952-033** | **Comment:**
2:33: Exhibit 2-12: This is unclear as to whether this is a current noise model or the future noise model. Secondly, this should indicate what the noise modeling would look like if a tube/tunnel were offered. Given that this comes right after the commentary that local neighborhoods are severely affected by noise. Providing this option for public review will give citizens an opportunity to view what the benefits and costs are to the project and better be informed about what the options. The current EIS implies that living with great amounts of noise is inevitable, when this is not necessarily the case.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-34
- I-0952-034** | **Comment:**
2:34: The discussion of the vision for transit in the coming decades focuses on increased transit capacity. The options provided in the EIS focus on increased throughput of SOVs. The document is thus contradictory to the overall planning. The planning for the project needs to reflect the goals of the vision statements.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-35
- I-0952-035** | **Comment:**
2:35: "Seattle's Comprehensive Plan supports protecting neighborhoods" as a first priority according to this document. The options provided in this document to not reflect the ways a 520 expansion would protect neighborhoods. The reflect further invasiveness into Seattle neighborhoods with mitigation. Options in the EIS need to show designs that both meet the goals of better transit, safety and traffic throughput and significantly protect and enhance the neighborhood.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-36

I-0952-028

Comment Summary:

Format and Content

Response:

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

I-0952-029

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-030

Comment Summary:

Visual Quality Effects

Response:

See Section 10.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-031

Comment Summary:

Format and Content

Response:

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

I-0952-032

Comment Summary:

Plans and Policies

- I-0952-036** | **Comment:**
2:36: It says that the Seattle area meets air quality standards. But the document does not state whether air quality standards are met in the project area. This document needs to show how the design options will meet air quality standards in the project area, and show options that dramatically improve air quality in the project area, so citizens can make a fair assessment of the cost and benefits of different design options that aim at the project goals. This document should also include a vision of how to not just “stay within standards” but continue to strive for improve air quality, especially as density and growth are anticipated to continue.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-37
- I-0952-037** | **Comment:**
2:37: The discussion of pollutants assume cars in an “above ground” scenario, and not in an enclosed space that can manage this. It provides no vision, technology or options for containing air pollutants coming from gas-powered engines prior to being emitted into the atmosphere.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-39
- I-0952-038** | **Comment:**
2:39: The discussion of bridge vulnerability does not mention the option of underground tunnel options and their ability to be design for earthquake issues. It assumes that a bridge is the only option for managing against earthquake and liquefactions. This document needs information about how well a tunnel/tube would handle issues surrounding geologic vulnerabilities. This will allow citizens to make an informed choice for design options.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-40
- I-0952-039** | **Comment:**
2:40: The discussion of water quality assumes only surface bridge options for run-off issues. The discussion shows that the current state of water quality is affected very badly by surface roads. A discussion needs to be added that compares underground and underwater technologies in managing transportation and water quality.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-41
- I-0952-040** | **Comment:**
2:40-41: The discussion of wetland preservation assumes only surface bridge options for run-off issues. The discussion shows that the current state of wetland and wildlife quality is affected very badly by surface roads/bridges. A discussion needs to be added that compares underground and underwater road technologies in managing transportation and surface wetland/wildlife quality.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-4, Page-46
- I-0952-041** | **Comment:**
2:46: The side-bar discussion on Automobile, Traffic and bus traffic should indicate that this project has the opportunity and obligation to prevent this sub-set of pollutants and that design options exist to achieve this.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-1

Response:

See Section 6.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-033

Comment Summary:

Format and Content

Response:

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

I-0952-034

Comment Summary:

Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning

Response:

See Section 2.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-035

Comment Summary:

Plans and Policies

Response:

See Section 6.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-036

Comment Summary:

Air Quality Analysis

Response:

See Section 13.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

- I-0952-042** | **Comment:**
3:1: The Trans-Lake Washington Study Committee agreed on a set of possible ways to improve traffic flow across Lake Washington. This addresses only one of the stated goals in the EIS. The subsequent statement “mitigation and enhancement must be integral to and inseparable from the proposed transportation improvements.” The design options provided do not show enough of this value. It is tipped to surface roads that can only be mitigated (and there is thorough discussion on this). There is not enough discussion on design options that would “enhance” and thus the document is deficient.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-1
- I-0952-043** | **Comment:**
Chapter 3 feedback: Aesthetic impacts are not explicitly discussed in this chapter. They are often cited for not doing components of the project, but not the project itself. Since aesthetic impacts are often cited, a section on design options and their aesthetic impacts need to be included. Currently, it is assumed that only a wider version of the currently (very ugly) span is provided. This is not acceptable for a project of this scope and visibility.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-10
- I-0952-044** | **Comment:**
3:10: The Four lane alternative does not show the DelMar Dr. Lid (as with the 6 lane alternative). This means that the four lane alternative as it describes misses an significant enhancement to the neighborhood, and misses the project charter of integrated enhancement to the surrounding area as part of any construction. This needs to be changed.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-11
- I-0952-045** | **Comment:**
3:11: Not discussed in this document is how enhancements to Lake Washington Blvd. are planned. Under the current document, it does not state any alternatives of reducing noise, pollution for this street running through a massive park. This makes the document deficient and it does not appear to meet the goal of improving the area.
Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-11
- I-0952-046** | **Comment:**
3:11: The four lane alternative does not show the Montlake Lid. This evades a key component to the project: To enhance the neighborhood. Thus this needs to be added for the 4 lane alternative, as it is for the 6 lane alternative.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-2
- I-0952-047** | **Comment:**
3:2: Where it says “Project Design should include features such as sound walls, lids, stormwater treatment and habitat improvements.” This implies that the only option discussed was an above-water bridge and does not adequately articulate the full range of design options. This discussion needs to explicitly show why design options other than surface bridges are not articulated.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-2

I-0952-037
Comment Summary:
Tube/Tunnel Concepts

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

I-0952-038
Comment Summary:
Tube/Tunnel Concepts

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

I-0952-039
Comment Summary:
Stormwater Treatment

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

I-0952-040
Comment Summary:
Stormwater Treatment

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

I-0952-041
Comment Summary:
Water Resource Effects During Operation

I-0952-048 3:2: The key question is “Can we reasonably avoid, minimize or mitigate its environmental impacts” —this question is contradictory to the phrase stating that “mitigation and enhancement must be integral to and inseparable from the proposed transportation improvements.” The question should be—in order to first, “Does the proposed design significantly enhance and is integral to the project?” This is a flaw in the process that needs to be reassessed and highlighted in the EIS. It is currently ignored.

The core question implies that it only looks at the negative effects of the proposals—and how to mitigate—rather than offer proposals that make for benefits to the environment and neighborhoods.

Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-2
Comment:

I-0952-049 3:2: “How much will it cost?” This section needs a detailed assessment of how options that appear to meet the project goals but are not documented in this EIS were thrown out. I need to know, as a citizen, why an obvious option, such as a tunnel/tube, which appears to meet all project goals, does not have a detailed cost estimate, along with other EIS assessments.

Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-2
Comment:

I-0952-050 3:2 This first wave assessment should indicate who was managing the process: If it was exclusively transportation departments, and not advocates for enhancement of local neighborhoods and the environment, then this should be pointed out, and the need for this to be integral in the discussion of design options needs to be addressed.

Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-20
Comment:

I-0952-051 3:20: “Mitigating” the widening of the bridge to justify the lid is not the correct argument. The 4 lane alternative significantly widens the bridge, too. So the lids need to be added to the 4 lane alternative. Also, the lids are not there just to mitigate—the project charter, as stated in the document, is to integrate improvements. Thus waiting for the widening to be so bad, then mitigate with lids, is contradictory to a key component of the project.

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-20
Comment:

I-0952-052 3:20: Stating that the 6 lane alternative meets the 3rd goal can be called into question. The design options clearly show a massive freeway through human and natural environments. Aside from noise and some environmental mitigation, it is unclear how this is an enhancement. Design options that significantly improve the area—aesthetically, environmentally and commercially, just as the options for improving traffic and transport—looking forward to the future—need to be developed and presented.

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-21
Comment:

I-0952-053 3:21: The document describes how alternatives to the 6 lane option were generated through discussion with the neighborhoods. It does not state that options advocated by

Response:

See Section 15.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-042

Comment Summary:

Alternatives Development

Response:

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

I-0952-043

Comment Summary:

Context Sensitive Solutions

Response:

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

I-0952-044

Comment Summary:

4-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0952-045

Comment Summary:

Arboretum (Concerns)

Response:

See Section 9.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

- I-0952-053** | neighborhoods—i.e., the tunnel/ tube option was rejected without thorough study. Since this statement about input contradicts the Roanoke Park/Portage Bay community’s stance, it needs to be addressed in this document at this point.
Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-21
- I-0952-054** | **Comment:**
 3:21: Using the argument that the cable bridge was not an adequate design because it is “out of character with the surroundings” implies that this is a crucial design criterion. If this is so, then an elevated freeway bridge of any size of any sort is “out of character with the surroundings.” Thus, design options and discussions of them that are in character with the surroundings: a natural and human habitat—need to be provided. A tube/tunnel option would offer design that is in character with the surroundings, and needs to be included in this document.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-22
- I-0952-055** | **Comment:**
 3:22: It discusses Dropping design considerations between “High and Low” designs. What other improvements to the current design are offered by this project? Only a vision of current “concrete slabs” are provided. There must be better visions of bridges out there and this document needs to show them (or how they are developed), since aesthetics are a part of the environmental concerns.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-22
- I-0952-056** | **Comment:**
 3:22: The Portage Bay Bridge would be 9 lanes wide. Please describe how this is an enhancement to the neighborhood. It appears that such a significant increase in size would be a net detriment, and how this would be an enhancement is not addressed in this document.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-28
- I-0952-057** | **Comment:**
 3:28: Impact to the lack of freeway stops is very cursory. This is a major hub of public transportation, to and from UW and Capital Hill, not to mention Roanoke Park/Portage Bay and Montlake. More discussion on how this impacts existing transit commuters must be made. As it is written, it implies that people need to somehow go downtown to catch a bus across the bridge. This makes no sense and is a net negative to the users of the area.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-29
- I-0952-058** | **Comment:**
 3:29: The discussion of Evaluating the Pacific Exchange Option states that all of the alternatives negatively affect the nearby resources. As a result, alternatives must be presented that show positive effects. A tube/tunnel option has this possibility, and thus requires study.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-29
Comment:

I-0952-046

Comment Summary:

4-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0952-047

Comment Summary:

Alternatives Development

Response:

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

I-0952-048

Comment Summary:

Format and Content

Response:

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

I-0952-049

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-050

Comment Summary:

Alternatives Development

- I-0952-059** | 3:29 In the discussion of Evaluating the Pacific Exchange Option, it says that the option of cutting through the Foster Island is not an acceptable option because it is a park. With this I agree. However, all options presented cut through the Arboretum, which is a park. Therefore, the options presented are untenable. The existing design and proposed designs should not be replicated because they all “cut through parks.” Design options could exist that provide transportation and preserve parkland, such as a tube/tunnel design. This would actually increase parkland, and thus be a key option for consideration, as it meets all the goals (improved traffic, safety, and neighborhoods), and thus needs to be documented in this EIS.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-36
Comment:
- I-0952-060** | 3:36: This section is a discussion of bicycle lane improvements. It shows that bicycle lanes on Delmar Drive are a part of the system (as a part of the park). Currently the bicycle lanes on Delmar Drive/E. Lynn street are unsafe due to the high speed of the traffic on Delmar (a city street requires guardrails(!) and the design of the roadway. This document and project needs to address how bicycle and pedestrians will be more safe on Delmar/Lynn as part of this project, and needs to account for how the surface streets will be enhanced so that the bicycle and pedestrian network beyond the lid will be improved, especially since the bicycle and pedestrian network is a key element of enhancement for this project.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-39
Comment:
- I-0952-061** | 3:39: In the discussion of stormwater treatment, it should be noted that if there was a tube/tunnel option, stormwater from the freeway would not be an issue in areas with a tunnel, since it would never storm onto the roadway.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-41
Comment:
- I-0952-062** | 3:41: “Standard Stormwater treatment strategies are difficult to construct on floating bridges” Since this statement is true, the project needs to offer designs other than floating bridges wherever possible. Otherwise, it is building in a problem that can be avoided altogether with alternate designs.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-6
Comment:
- I-0952-063** | 3:6: The discussion on why the tube/ tunnel option was rejected does not indicate who did the analysis on peat deposits. This needs to be documented in detail. In comparison, the analysis for eliminating the 8-lane alternative was based on studies, extensive funding including traffic modeling and the like. There is no such discussion for eliminating the tube-tunnel option other than the intimation that it would be “difficult”. This makes this EIS deficient.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-6
Comment:
- I-0952-064** | 3:6: In an argument against the tube/ tunnel option, it says that the interchange would require a “complex and costly underground ramp design.” First, it needs to be detailed as

Response:

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

I-0952-051**Comment Summary:**

4-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0952-052**Comment Summary:**

Context Sensitive Solutions

Response:

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

I-0952-053**Comment Summary:**

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-054**Comment Summary:**

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

- I-0952-064** | to who made this assessment. In comparison to the 8-lane discussion, no study other than impressions seems to have been made as it currently reads. Information disclosing how this study of “complex and costly underground ramp design” was made. This makes the Draft EIS deficient, and eliminates an option that appears to meet the three stated goals of the project (safety, traffic flow, neighborhood enhancement). Second, information needs to be shown just how complex and just how costly this would be. Since this is the environmental impact statement, it needs to show what the environmental costs and benefits of such a design would be, not just the financial costs. Financial costs (especially when not studied) are not adequate to eliminate a design when the document is focused on environmental impacts.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-6
Comment:
- I-0952-065** | 3:6: Discussion on the construction process and how this was determined need to be detailed. Based on the document’s discussion, it is not clear that this was given extensive study, other than impressions by participants.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-6
Comment:
- I-0952-066** | 3:6: The argument that permits would not be obtained for a construction project when a massive overground construction project is being proposed makes no sense. It seems that permit granting would be difficult for both projects. Thus it cannot be used as an argument in the document, especially one that assesses the environmental impact, not the “permit gathering” impact.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-6
Comment:
- I-0952-067** | 3:6: Discussion of the cost needs to reveal as to how the \$8 billion price tag was determined. This needs to be documented how this was determined, making it a significant flaw in the Draft EIS. Whom did WashDot consult with? To what degree was it studied? How were environmental impacts so quickly assessed? Also, since this is an Environmental Impact Study, and not a Financial Impact Study, arguments about financial impacts should not come into play. Impacts on finances should come into play in the Financial Impact Study. This Draft EIS is incomplete because it does adequately show why this option was eliminated, other than by cursory analysis by WashDot. Improvement to this document can be made by revealing how this information was determined who provided it to WashDot and by including the tube/tunnel option as an integral option in any future drafts.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-8
Comment:
- I-0952-068** | 3:8: Four lane alternative: Stating that it enhancing the neighborhood is not adequately stated. It should say that it mitigates neighborhood issues. It does not meet the goal of having integrated design to improve the surrounding area.
Comment Category: Other 6-Lane Options
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-12
Comment:

I-0952-055

Comment Summary:

Context Sensitive Solutions

Response:

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

I-0952-056

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-057

Comment Summary:

Montlake Freeway Transit Station

Response:

See Section 2.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-058

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-059

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

I-0952-069	<p>4:12: The discussion on the Montlake Freeway station removal does not demonstrate any benefits for those who use this station. In fact, it articulates severe loss of service. As a result, there is no discussion on how this option would increase SOV traffic, due to the limited Montlake Freeway station options. Comment Category: Other 6-Lane Options Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-14 Comment:</p>
I-0952-070	<p>4:14: It says in the Draft EIS that a tunnel is not practical in the area, but the same document, it shows a planned tunnel in the area for Sound Transit. Therefore, the argument that the tunnel is not practical cannot be cited in the discussion about the tunnel if there is a parallel project that accepts this as possible. Comment Category: Other 6-Lane Options Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-16 Comment:</p>
I-0952-071	<p>4:16: The discussion of closing the HOV lane Westbound during construction is not clear. It needs to detail why the project would choose to close the HOV lane rather than a general purpose lane. It seems that this project would punish the transit riders, rather than reward the transit riders. This document needs to provide what the alternatives are for when HOV lanes are closed, other than putting busses in the same traffic as SOVs. Comment Category: Other 6-Lane Options Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-18 Comment:</p>
I-0952-072	<p>4:18: Air Quality discussion. It says that the models used assume a decrease in emissions in general, and thus the impact on air quality will be negligible. Please indicate what the air quality would be if emissions stayed at the current level (since it is out of the project scope to reduce the average emission of cars), and then make the argument as to how this is a net improvement for the local area. Otherwise, it is not a good apples to apples comparison for citizens to review. Comment Category: Other 6-Lane Options Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-18 Comment:</p>
I-0952-073	<p>4:18: It says that the lids would reduce air pollution. If this is true, please make a note about how much air pollution would be expected under a tube/tunnel scenario, as this will provide more insights to the environmental impact. Comment Category: Other 6-Lane Options Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-21 Comment:</p>
I-0952-074	<p>4:21: This discussion needs to include the costs and benefits of Seattle's image. Re-constructing an overland freeway in a residential area speaks volumes of how Seattle sees its residents and natural habitat, and a discussion of the costs to Seattle's image as a world class city that doesn't value its residential areas and natural habitat must be made. The current bridge is basically an embarrassment in design, built on-the-cheap through parkland and residential areas. This project document needs to describe why it is repeating this fundamental design despite it not meeting the core goals of the project. Comment Category: Other 6-Lane Options Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-22 Comment:</p>

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-060

Comment Summary:

Bicycle/Pedestrian Path

Response:

See Section 2.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-061

Comment Summary:

Stormwater Treatment

Response:

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

I-0952-062

Comment Summary:

Stormwater Treatment

Response:

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

I-0952-063

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-075	<p>4:22: A discussion of the reduction of property tax revenues need to indicate the loss of potential additional property tax values based on a wider freeway that cuts through parkland. Also, it needs to indicate the opportunity cost of property values were there to be no obtrusive freeway coming through a residential area. That is, this document needs to indicate what would property taxes be with increased parkland and less noise and air pollution in a tunnel scenario.</p> <p>Comment Category: Other 6-Lane Options Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-26</p>
I-0952-076	<p>Comment: 4:26: All of the alternatives discussed identify significant negative and worsened effects for views. Thus these design options presented do not meet one of the key criteria for the project, which is to enhance the local areas. This document needs to provide information about design options that would improve the visual impact of the local area, such as a tube/tunnel option.</p> <p>Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-27</p>
I-0952-077	<p>Comment: 4:27 The discussion of noise reduction should show a chart of the noise experienced under the tube/ tunnel option. All options still show a significant amount of noise, and thus an option should be presented that has a significant improvement in noise.</p> <p>Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-29</p>
I-0952-078	<p>Comment: 4:29: This document is insufficient in that it does not assume lids for the 4 lane alternative. This must be included to be a complete EIS.</p> <p>Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-30</p>
I-0952-079	<p>Comment: 4:30: This section shows that all of the alternatives take away parkland, rather than add parkland. One of the stated goals of the project is to enhance the local area, rather than detract from it. Removing parkland by no means improves an area. This EIS needs to show design options, such as a tube/tunnel that add parkland, and include it on this chart. This way people can assess the benefits and drawbacks more accurately of the project. Based on the description of Section 4(f), a more through discussion of why a tube/tunnel (or other designs) are not feasible or prudent must be made.</p> <p>Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-31</p>
I-0952-080	<p>Comment: 4:31: Taking away from parks does not seem like a viable option. This document needs to provide options for increasing parkland (and with the same rigor that it advocates the six lane option, advocate for increased parkland as a result of the project).</p> <p>Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-31</p>
I-0952-081	<p>Comment: 4:31: With the wider footprint, a discussion on the effects on the properties that would newly about the project needs to be made. Are they right next to the freeway? What is the</p>

I-0952-064

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-065

Comment Summary:

Schedule

Response:

See Section 4.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-066

Comment Summary:

Permitting

Response:

See Section 6.5 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-067

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-068

Comment Summary:

4-Lane Alternative

- I-0952-081** | impact of those residences? What would be the impact if the freeway were put underground/water?
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-32
Comment:
- I-0952-082** | 4:32: A discussion on available options for how to add residential space should be provided, as this would meet the goal of enhancing the neighborhood and meet the goals of increased urban density. Currently the document only assumes less neighborhood land as an option. Options need to be provided that show some increased neighborhood land.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-32
Comment:
- I-0952-083** | 4:32: Regional and community growth: This discussion is inadequate because it assumes that over time, a freeway going through a residential area is considered an acceptable thing. It should have a discussion on how future freeways in highly prized land are not foreseen to be acceptable over ground, cutting through parkland and residential areas. Just as it would be unacceptable to put a freeway or a new subway line through Paris overground, the same vision should be made for this project. As a result, this discussion is inadequate, because it replicates poor, on-the-cheap freeway design that has been reviled since the first time it was built in 1963 and continues it out to 2030 and beyond.
Comment Category: Other 6-Lane Options
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-34
Comment:
- I-0952-084** | 4:34: The environmental justice comment says that low income bus riders would benefit. This is not clear in the "remove the freeway station" scenario, which implies that people will just have to figure it out. This section needs to be revised to reflect this possibility.
Comment Category: Other 6-Lane Options
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-37
Comment:
- I-0952-085** | 4:37: The negative effects described here show substantial decrease in quality to the local area, and thus an alternative needs to be offered that provides a substantial increase to the local area, such as a tube/tunnel option.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-38
Comment:
- 4:38: This section needs to have a tube/tunnel column to show what the effects would be.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-39
Comment:
- 4:39: It makes an argument that removing unused freeway ramps would have a benefits to the ecosystem. Please make this document complete by comparing that option with putting the transportation system in a tube/tunnel. Because if removing the unused freeway ramps would be an improvement, the comparative improvement of not having any freeway above ground must be significant, and needs to be documented for public review.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-39
Comment:

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-069

Comment Summary:

Montlake Freeway Transit Station

Response:

See Section 2.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-070

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-071

Comment Summary:

Traffic Management (Construction)

Response:

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

I-0952-072

Comment Summary:

Air Quality Analysis

Response:

See Section 13.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-085 | 4:39: It says that construction could affect habitat for up to 5 years. Earlier in the EIS, it says that the tube/tunnel alternative was rejected because it could affect habitat for several years. As this is a contradictory statement, and if temporary disruption of habitat is acceptable, this means that the tube/tunnel option should be reinstated, and until it is, this document is deficient, as it does not adequately describe the options available to the public.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-41
Comment:
4:41: This chart needs to show the impact on wetlands that a tube/tunnel option would provide.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-8
Comment:

I-0952-086 | 4:8: Please describe the congestion at E.Lynn St. and Boyer Ave E under the different scenarios. This is an intersection that needs to be studied. Also, what efforts will be made to these roads as part of the project. How much “cut through” traffic is expected on these two streets?
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-1
Comment:

I-0952-087 | 5:1: It says “in some cases, one or both build alternatives may affect the project area in a negative way.” As part of the project charter is “mitigation and enhancement must be integral to and inseparable from the proposed transportation improvements” then alternatives must be provided that are truly integral to the project. A tube/tunnel alternative would do this, and need to be acknowledged as an option, and then studied in an EIS.
Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-13
Comment:

I-0952-088 | 5:13: Could Boyer Ave E. and E. Lynn St. be included in this chart?
Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-17
Comment:

I-0952-089 | 5:17: In the discussion of parking, it should be added what the effects would be if the entire project were put underground/water. This would be relevant information for reviewers of the project.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-18
Comment:
5:18: Describe the number of parking stalls that could be ADDED in the tube/tunnel scenario. This is relevant information for citizens reviewing the options of the project.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-19
Comment:
5:19: Describe the number of residences that would be affected by noise in the tube/tunnel scenario. This is relevant information for people considering alternatives to 520.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-2

I-0952-073

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-074

Comment Summary:

Context Sensitive Solutions

Response:

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

I-0952-075

Comment Summary:

Economic Effects

Response:

See Section 6.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-076

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-077

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

- I-0952-089** | **Comment:**
5:2: Visualizations of an underground transportation option must be provided so that citizens can see what the possibilities for the project could be.
Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-2
- I-0952-090** | **Comment:**
5:2: Again, it is unclear as to why the 6 lane alternative has lids and not the 4 lane alternative. The reason must be stated clearly for this to be complete. Also, it should be stated that if lids improve the amount of vegetation in the project area, what would the amount of vegetation be increased by if the entire project were put underground/underwater?
Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-2
- I-0952-091** | **Comment:**
5:2: "WSDOT is committed to a number of actions to reduce the project's visual affects." This implies that all options are negative and need to be negative. This contradicts the project's requirement that "mitigation and enhancement must be integral to and inseparable from the proposed transportation improvements." Enhancement is not seen in this statement, only mitigation.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-20
- I-0952-092** | **Comment:**
5:20: Please include data on this and subsequent exhibits that include the scenario for a tube/ tunnel option. This is relevant information for people considering the project.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-21
- I-0952-093** | **Comment:**
5:21: In this discussion, it shows marginal differences in noise as a whole. While this is nice, it is not clear how "mitigation and enhancement . . .integral to and inseparable from the proposed transportation improvements" have been achieved. Options must be provided that show clear tangible improvement beyond minor improvements. Strong arguments are made for improved traffic flow, but weak arguments are made for improved human experience. This shows a deficiency in the document as it only proposes solutions that are non-integrated with enhancement.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-23
- I-0952-094** | **Comment:**
5:23: "Some areas that are now predominantly affected by 520 noise would be quieter, while other parts of the study area would become noisier." This, again, shows that the traffic improvements are not integrated with neighborhood improvements. Imagine if the document said, "Traffic flow will be better in some places and worse in others." This would show that the project is not on track. The same goes for neighborhood enhancements. The proposed enhancements, namely the lids, are the best arguments. But if these arguments are good, further putting underground/ water the roadway are great arguments, and may indeed help progress the project more quickly, since you aren't arguing for mitigation, but for substantial improvement and options.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Response:

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

I-0952-078

Comment Summary:

4-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0952-079

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-080

Comment Summary:

Section 4(f)

Response:

See Section 21 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-081

Comment Summary:

Property Acquisitions

Response:

See Section 6.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

- I-0952-095** | **Comment Location:** Chapter-7, Page-24
Comment:
 5:24: It describes how the neighborhoods were “severed” by the poor previous design. Another aspect of the previous design was creating a massive intrusion into the local environment. If it is worth studying “reconnecting” severed neighborhoods, it is also worth studying removing massive visual and noise intrusions. The lids are excellent at reconnecting neighborhoods, thus it must be even more excellent to extend covering the roadway further and the benefits and drawbacks of this need to be presented in the EIS.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-25
- I-0952-096** | **Comment:**
 5:25: Since it is described that access to Montlake Playfield will be lessened with this, how is this design “integral to and inseparable from the proposed transportation improvements.” A design needs to be proposed that makes access to the Montlake Playfield just as important as transportation access.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-28
- I-0952-097** | **Comment:**
 5:28: Montlake Playfield is not described in this chart. This chart would also be improved by showing what the tube/tunnel would do to parkland.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-29
- I-0952-098** | **Comment:**
 5:29: Improved access is described, but this needs a clear articulation of what other design options, such as a tube/tunnel would provide.
Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-3
- I-0952-099** | **Comment:**
 5:3: The discussion of the visual appeal of the bridge does not indicate improved design from the existing (poorly designed) bridge. As a result, it does not demonstrate that it is meeting the goal of the project, to enhance the surrounding areas. “Box like” and “Massive” indicate that this bridge should be placed underwater/ground so that negative visual effects can be avoided altogether.
Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-3
- I-0952-100** | **Comment:**
 5:3 If the motorist’s view is impacted, then there is no net negative impact to motorists’ view if they are traveling in a tunnel. As this will eliminate the “scenic route” possibility for motorists, it is an opportunity to make the area more scenic by removing the overland structure altogether. Since this discussion is not provided, the draft EIS is deficient.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-30
- I-0952-101** | **Comment:**
 5:30: Please include a listing of land use effects in the tube/tunnel scenario. This will give citizens a more complete view of options.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-30
Comment:

I-0952-082

Comment Summary:

Plans and Policies

Response:

See Section 6.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-083

Comment Summary:

Context Sensitive Solutions

Response:

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

I-0952-084

Comment Summary:

Environmental Justice

Response:

Please see Section 8.1 of the Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-085

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-086

Comment Summary:

Local Street Network

- I-0952-102** | 5:30: Please create visuals that show the structures impacted by a tube/tunnel option.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-34
- I-0952-103** | **Comment:**
 5:34: This discussion is incomplete. It needs to discuss the growth opportunities that are gained by increasing parkland and other usable land by putting the roadway underground. This needs to be studied in order for this discussion to be complete. This discussion also does not describe the ill-will that the installation of the bridge in the first place created. It has created tension an aggravation due to its poor design for over 40 years. This document repeats the same mistakes made 40 years ago, and dooms the local area to ongoing tensions about the appropriateness of a freeway of this design in a residential neighborhood. This is a discussion about the freeway being “ok” to live with, rather than a discussion about being truly enthusiastic about integrating transportation needs with residential needs. This is a lost opportunity that this document does not discuss, and must be added in order for it to be complete.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-38
- I-0952-104** | **Comment:**
 5:38: A discussion should be added about how elimination of a overground freeway would greatly enhance the historic nature of the area. How it is a story of changing poor transportation design and turning it to a story of great transportation design. Instead, it dooms to history an ongoing story of mediocre transportation design.
Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-4
- I-0952-105** | **Comment:**
 5:4: These pictures show uninspired design. Is this really the best that can exist? Surely there are bridge designers who can do better. No discussion is provided on how this bridge design was determined – implying that no design efforts were made. This will not enhance the community image, and will detract showing that the design of its “massive” structures have no design. The unattractiveness of the bridge indicates that design options have not been explored. Please indicate what efforts will be made to make the road look better than the computer model, or just put the road somewhere no one on the outside can view it (i.e., underground/water), if you are not providing improved design.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-43
- I-0952-106** | **Comment:**
 5:43: A discussion of the effect of a tube/ tunnel would greatly enhance this document and provide citizens a more comprehensive view of the options.
Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-46
- I-0952-107** | **Comment:**
 5:46: A display of the effect of a tube/ tunnel would greatly enhance this document and provide citizens a more comprehensive view of the options.
Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-7

Response:

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

I-0952-087

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-088

Comment Summary:

Local Street Network

Response:

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

I-0952-089

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-090

Comment Summary:

4-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

- I-0952-108** | 5:7 This section needs to describe/ show how views would improve should the project be placed underground. This would help show options that citizens can consider.
Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-8
Comment:
- I-0952-109** | 5:8 Please provide a picture for what this view would look like under the tunnel/ tube option. This would help show options that citizens can consider.
Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-9
Comment:
- I-0952-110** | 5:9 Please provide a picture for what this view would look like under the tunnel/ tube option. This would help show options that citizens can consider.
Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-9
Comment:
- I-0952-111** | In 5:7, 5:8 and 5:9, it is clear that the following statement is not the case: “mitigation and enhancement must be integral to and inseparable from the proposed transportation improvements.” Instead the pictures show massive transportation improvements, and clear visual and environmental detriments. Since this is not achieved, this Draft EIS is incomplete and needs to be revised to provide options that show an effort to connect enhancement to the local area in addition to the transportation improvements.
Comment Category: General Comments
Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-1
Comment:
- I-0952-112** | The goals (provide structures and improve mobility) to not match those of the community – deficient. The goals should be to improve the aesthetics, environmental problem areas, incorporates state of the art design, reflects the values of the community, looks forward to the future not the past. It has a narrow goal – it’s as though we spend 5 billion dollars only for cars. An investment like this must aspire to more than mobility: it is an integral part of living areas, an urban environment, and should integrate with this. The narrow scope shows the deficiency of the document.
- It is deficient because it uses narrow thinking about what the possibilities are: Criticizing the existing structure by saying you’re going to build a similar structure, but better built, makes no sense. The same criticisms will surface. It is not sufficient because it re-introduces the same vulnerabilities of a bridge.
- There is a deficiency in that the leads are transportation agencies. There should be urban development and improvement agencies that are co-leads. This EIS reflects the lack of investment in the communities, aesthetic design, and creativity that support the structure and this needs to be addressed. Aesthetic impact (and opportunity loss based on this) is not addressed. We are investing 5 billion dollars and it does not look at the opportunity for improved community image, draw, living quality, only throughput and the minor efforts to mitigate this in the local areas. This lack of addressing the impact of bridge to be a significant improvement to quality of life is a severe deficiency.

I-0952-091

Comment Summary:

Context Sensitive Solutions

Response:

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

I-0952-092

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-093

Comment Summary:

Noise (Methodology)

Response:

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

I-0952-094

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-095

Comment Summary:

Bicycle/Pedestrian Path

Response:

See Section 2.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0952-096

Comment Summary:

Park Effects

Response:

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

I-0952-097

Comment Summary:

Park Effects

Response:

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

I-0952-098

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-099

Comment Summary:

Context Sensitive Solutions

Response:

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

I-0952-100

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-101

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-102

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-103

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-104

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-105

Comment Summary:

Context Sensitive Solutions

Response:

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

I-0952-106

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-107

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-108

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-109

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-110

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0952-111

Comment Summary:

Context Sensitive Solutions

Response:

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

I-0952-112

Comment Summary:

Neighborhood Issues

Response:

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