

---

**From:** Arbutus@aol.com [mailto:Arbutus@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 31, 2006 6:04 PM  
**To:** Milton, John; Mercedjl@wsdot.wa.gov; Tim.ceis@Seattle.gov  
**Subject:** 520 comments

Gentlepeople:

**I-1244-001** | As having a home in one of only two areas **signaled (both in Laurelhurst)** to get more **bang** for the buck in noise, i.e. louder, as shown in the impact statement on the WSDOT's draft, I feel affected.

**I-1244-002** | My comments:

Its was frustratingly hard to get a grasp of the visual impact from the two hours I spent trying to find a clear visual representation of the plans. So based on the fog that was produced:

- Oh put it in a tunnel, under water. Right!
- The BIG Six lane proposal is probably too messy and causes too much impact, causing more acrimony and lawsuits to cost WAY more money.
- The 110 foot bridge could be a great selling/rallying point if it worked, that is, if it became a visual wonder, (a la Calatrava), AND somehow was able to reduce noise.
- Montlake needs two bridges, one to 520, one to the 'neighborhood.' Currently it is a ill designed mess, for example @ 7:30 am, twin metro busses, empty, cruise past the Hospital in the HOV lane and into the Montlake Bridge lanes, at which point they try to move out of the right lane, jammed with cars wishing to go East on 520, for two blocks, AND then move back into the right lane to pick up passengers at the 520 bus stop entrance

**My vote is the simpler six lane alternative.**

A Laurelhurstian,  
John Behnke, zip 98105

John Behnke

**I-1244-001**

**Comment Summary:**

Noise (Methodology)

**Response:**

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

**I-1244-002**

**Comment Summary:**

6-Lane Alternative

**Response:**

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