

**From:** [Karen Wood](#)  
**To:** [SR 520 DEIS Comments](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comments to 520 Draft EIS  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 31, 2006 11:39:11 AM  
**Attachments:**

---

## SR 520 DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

For the following reasons, I believe the SR520 Draft Environmental Impact Statement is inadequate or deficient:

- I-1112-001** | 1. Permanent effects of view obstruction due to sound walls and added height are not clear enough in the Draft EIS for residents to make an informed decision. Why haven't you made available a complete CAD modeling of the bridge that can show views from various points and levels. The drawings that I have found are minimally useful. The document itself is deficient in the way it is composed. Subject categories are not grouped for ease of access and make it tedious to find all the information on various impacts.
- I-1112-002** |
- I-1112-003** | 2. There is no information in the Draft EIS on lighting as it relates to the potential increased height of the bridge and viaduct and how it would effect our neighborhood with the various design options.
- I-1112-004** | 3. There will be no solution to the traffic problems with a wider bridge without considering light rail, the Draft EIS doesn't address light rail.
- I-1112-005** | 4. The Draft EIS (dropped 8 lane) suggests that I-5 and the I-405 cannot effectively handle the increased traffic from a wider bridge, so there is no justification for designing a larger bridge. If there is no point in a wider bridge, why spend the money on anything more than a rebuild with options for breakdowns, like narrow shoulders.
- I-1112-006** | 5. Due to the many bodies of water in the Puget Sound region the only possible solution to the traffic problems is to get people out of their cars into transit and light rail, the Draft EIS has not addressed light rail or if it should be used on 520 at any time now or in the future. We shouldn't spend money for future rail options by adding a six lane which potentially has lanes that could be converted at some future date to SOV, HOV or light rail. We need to study their potential effect in this Draft EIS.
6. Since the Eastside has recently voted for light rail on I-90, studies that

**I-1112-001**  
**Comment Summary:**  
Noise Walls (Aesthetics)

**Response:**  
See Section 12.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-1112-002**  
**Comment Summary:**  
Format and Content

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

**I-1112-003**  
**Comment Summary:**  
Visual Quality Effects

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

**I-1112-004**  
**Comment Summary:**  
Light Rail Transit

**Response:**  
See Section 2.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-1112-005**  
**Comment Summary:**  
8-Lane Alternative

I-1112-006	show traffic volume after construction of light rail should be done to help <b>determine actual traffic capacity requirements for SR520.</b>
I-1112-007	7. Tolls should be added on SR520 now. The tolls would help determine how much capacity is actually needed. People would learn to carpool, use transit and consolidate their trips. And, if they continue to choose SOV, they should pay for building something to alleviate traffic like a bridge with light rail.
I-1112-008	8. We need to quit subsidizing SOV use by allowing for more SOV on a larger bridge. Global warming is a real issue and has not been addressed in the Draft EIS. We are supposed to be planning for our future. (PS, I do not consider myself to be an environmentalist, but I may become one by necessity)
I-1112-009	9. The negative effects on nearby dwellings from excess noise, negative air quality from an increased number of cars sitting on the bridge for long periods of time have not been studied adequately in the Draft EIS. Let's be as concerned about humans as fish and wildlife.
I-1112-010	10. Construction noise levels are above acceptable decibel ranges for proposed construction especially the pile driving. Noise levels of 85 decibels or higher can cause immediate permanent hearing damage.
I-1112-011	11. No studies of permanent noise impacts were done for second level living spaces.
I-1112-012	12. Why are we repeating the negative environmental impacts of 1960 when our state is supposed to be a leader on environmental issues. Why are we allowing this city to build out bridges, overpasses and freeways, rather than placing some light rail underground where it would <u>possibly have less impact</u> . The draft EIS does not include the possibility of having a "Tube". It is doubtful that the current studies of the "tube" option would hold up under legal scrutiny as being adequate. The tube study documents are very minimal and do not look at the environmental, engineering possibilities and <b>real</b> financial costs. If other cities can have a state of the art tube/tunnel why can't Seattle. Let's spend the money required to get an accurate study for a "tube" design and decide whether today's technology will work for Seattle and get an true cost including mitigation on all plans. I believe that Portage Bay, Marsh Island and the Arboretum are important urban wildlife and human life areas that need to be preserved to make this city an example of what you can have if you take the time to address all the issues and design sensibly and sensitively.
I-1112-013	13. There are no choices built into the bridge designs. The <b>six lane option is a misnomer</b> , its not six lane and <i>it purposefully confuses the public</i> . It should be called the 11 lane as it is in actuality. The draft EIS has not built in enough flexibility of choice. It's obvious that the choices, as

**Response:**

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

**I-1112-006**

**Comment Summary:**

Light Rail Transit

**Response:**

See Section 2.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-1112-007**

**Comment Summary:**

Early Tolling

**Response:**

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

**I-1112-008**

**Comment Summary:**

Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning

**Response:**

See Section 6.4 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-1112-009**

**Comment Summary:**

Neighborhood Issues

**Response:**

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

**I-1112-013** | presented, do not allow for the best of what might be available, a smaller footprint with narrower shoulders, a lid on the 4 lane, a master plan for exactly where light rail will be built... I-90 or 520, an elevated pedestrian byway or no pedestrian byway on the "6-lane" option (there is already a pedestrian/cycle byway on I-90.). How can we build a comprehensive solution to regional traffic dilemmas without the whole picture. Let's make some decisions which can facilitate comprehensive design solutions.

**I-1112-014** | 14. Even though I believe in rights of pedestrians and cyclist, the negative impacts of an extra lane built at the traffic level makes no sense. It is unhealthy for pedestrians due to exhaust exposure, it's open to the water where anyone could jump off. (There is already a problem on the Aurora bridge with pedestrians jumping); unfortunate and costly. There is no mention in the Draft EIS of these potential negative impacts. The cost of the extra lane for the low numbers of users is too high. If there is a pedestrian/cycle lane it should be elevated and enclosed with mesh to allow for safe and healthier passage and to reduce the footprint of the bridge. Obviously, people weigh much less than vehicles, so a cheaper lightweight elevated byway *can* be designed with noise and safety impacts solved in the design process. There is nothing mentioned in the Draft EIS about effect of exhaust and road dust on bridge pedestrians and cyclists. We study fish and wildlife, how about humans.

**I-1112-015** | 15. I am very concerned about the long period of construction impacts in my neighborhood of Montlake; closures of nearby arterials, adding many construction trucks each day on our collector arterial, no dependable bus service for many of the residents who work at the UW and beyond. However, I understand that construction impacts must be borne in many neighborhoods to accommodate better transportation. I would like to know what specific mitigation is being proposed to offset the degradation of our daily life for the 2 + years of the construction process.

**I-1112-016** | 16. The draft EIS **should not go forward without integrating all the transportation options, including both light rail and transit.**

**I-1112-017** | 17. Budget? How can you build Alaska Way Viaduct, light rail and 520. How can we pay for all of these **necessary** transportation components for our region. The draft EIS for 520 is too narrowly focused. You can't design one piece without looking at the whole. Even though Christine Gregoire says we need to quit designing and start building, it looks like the lack of funds gives us plenty of time to look harder at all options and revised some of the current

#### **I-1112-010**

##### **Comment Summary:**

Noise and Vibration During Construction

##### **Response:**

See Section 12.4 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

#### **I-1112-011**

##### **Comment Summary:**

Noise (Methodology)

##### **Response:**

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

#### **I-1112-012**

##### **Comment Summary:**

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

##### **Response:**

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

#### **I-1112-013**

##### **Comment Summary:**

Alternatives Development

##### **Response:**

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

#### **I-1112-014**

##### **Comment Summary:**

Bicycle/Pedestrian Path

I-1112-017 |

I-1112-018 |

options.

18. What are the Emergency plans in the event the 520 bridge fails now or during construction. I would like to see that provision included in the Draft EIS, remember I-90 disaster. Could we add a passenger only Ferry right now from St Edwards Park on the Eastside to Magnuson Park to reduce traffic on 520, now.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Karen Wood

[landmarkconstruction@earthlink.net](mailto:landmarkconstruction@earthlink.net)

**Response:**

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

**I-1112-015**

**Comment Summary:**

Neighborhood Issues

**Response:**

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

**I-1112-016**

**Comment Summary:**

Light Rail Transit

**Response:**

See Section 2.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-1112-017**

**Comment Summary:**

Funding

**Response:**

See Section 3.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-1112-018**

**Comment Summary:**

Alternatives Development

**Response:**

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