

**I-1176-001**

**Comment Summary:**

6-Lane Alternative

**Response:**

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

**From:** [jrochford@comcast.net](mailto:jrochford@comcast.net)  
**To:** [SR 520 DEIS Comments:](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** FW: 520 comments  
**Date:** Sunday, October 29, 2006 9:18:13 PM  
**Attachments:**

---

Rochford  
John  
2613 Boyer  
Ave E  
Seattle, WA  
98102  
520 Highway  
Environmental Review Responses

Dear Govenor Gregoire,

**I-1176-001**

My name is John Rochford. I live within three house lots of the 520 viaduct on Boyer Ave E. I should be predisposed to oppose any expansion of the 520 bridge but Iâ€™ve come to support a six lane replacement of the existing bridge.

From my living room window, I can see traffic jams on 520 on a daily basis. Several times a month I see accidents. When I see Medic One responding to the scene, I am reminded that innocent people are being harmed by the current, outdated design of the bridge.

I could wish that the bridge would simply go away, or that people would stop driving their cars and contribute to pollution and global warming. But that isnâ€™t realistic. We need a strong infrastructure.

That being said, I have several wishes for how the 520 bridge will be constructed.

I-1176-001

1. Require that the added lanes (5 and 6) be high capacity or transit only. While this is the current intent, I would like it written into the governing legislation so that it cannot be "undone" by future generations who would want single occupancy vehicles in all six lanes. There is no point in having six lanes of traffic feed into Interstate 5. I-5 is already over its capacity; adding more traffic will only create a parking lot on 520.

I-1176-002

2. Support the Pacific Street Interchange. First 70% of the traffic at that intersection is heading north; so put it north of the Montlake Bridge. Second, there needs to be a connection to Sound Transit's light rail system at Husky Stadium. However I am concerned that the interchange will overrun the Arboretum. I would recommend that the **entrances/ exits to the arboretum be restricted to high occupancy vehicles**. SOV's can enter / exit at Pacific Street.

I-1176-003

3. As I understand it, the bridge will be built in three phases. In each phase, an interim bridge will need to be constructed parallel to the existing bridge. I would advocate that interim bridges are appropriate for phases that extend over the water, however I believe that **the viaduct should simply be closed while a new viaduct is constructed (no interim bridge)**. My recommendation would be to build the new bridge and the Pacific Street interchange and synchronize their completion to the Light Rail service at Husky Stadium. Closing the viaduct during construction will accomplish several things:

• Speed Construction and save money. Funds will not have to be expended to build an interim bridge. The area between Delmar Drive and I-5 is extremely tight and there isn't room for an interim highway anyway. I think if we simply closed the section for the construction period, the new bridge could be constructed faster and for less expense. The only properties that are slated for condemnation are due to the interim bridge; we can avoid that.

• Create **incentives for people to ride Light Rail**. If the cross Lake Washington section is completed to tie into the light rail service (and the Portage Bay viaduct is closed) people will be highly inclined to try its direct service to Seattle downtown

I-1176-002

**Comment Summary:**

Pacific Street Interchange Option

**Response:**

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

I-1176-003

**Comment Summary:**

Schedule

**Response:**

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

I-1176-003

and Capital Hill. Any savings from construction savings could also be directed into additional bus service.

• **Minimize disruption to the existing neighborhoods.** Construction of a highway in the midst of development will never be easy. Disruptions at Montlake and Roanoke will sever two of the only connections between our neighborhoods and Capitol Hill. The less time we have to suffer the better!

I-1176-004

4. **Establish Tolling to pay for bridge construction now.** I believe that tolls should be reinstated to the bridge as soon as possible. We know that bridge construction is expensive and that the state doesn't have reserves to pay for it. Rather than take out bonds and pay interest rates, we should establish tolls to create (at least part of) the reserve necessary to pay for the bridge. We should model good behavior- save money for things you need; don't mortgage it. All roads are subsidized, the public needs to understand that.

• Tolling should also be constructed with **congestion pricing models.** There should be disincentives for using the bridge at rush hours when capacity is strained.

I-1176-005

5. Noise Reduction is essential. I am pleased to see that the six lane proposal includes lids over sections in Roanoke and sound walls.

**The surface of the highway also needs to be sound deadening.**

I-1176-006

6. Pollution control is essential. Currently the Portage Bay Viaduct runoff runs straight into the water. This **runoff needs to be treated** before it has a chance to contaminate the water.

Sincerely

John Rochford

I-1176-004

**Comment Summary:**

Early Tolling

**Response:**

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

I-1176-005

**Comment Summary:**

Noise Walls

**Response:**

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

I-1176-006

**Comment Summary:**

Stormwater Treatment

**Response:**

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