

**From:** [Preston, Anne](#)  
**To:** [SR 520 DEIS Comments:](#)  
**CC:** ["Jack & Kath Kindred"; "Ron Melnikoff and Cathy Garrison"; "Melnikoff, Ron";](#)  
**Subject:** Comment on 520 Draft EIS  
**Date:** Monday, October 30, 2006 5:49:56 PM  
**Attachments:** [Revised SR 520 Comment Letter.doc](#)

---

\*\*\* eSafe1 scanned this email and found no malicious content \*\*\*  
\*\*\* IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders \*\*\*

**C-028-001**

**Comment Summary:**

Neighborhood Issues

**Response:**

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

**Portage-Bay Roanoke Park and Fuhrman Boyer Neighborhood Improvement Association  
Comment Letter SR 520 Draft EIS.**

The Portage-Roanoke Park Community Council and The Fuhrman-Boyer Neighborhood Improvement Association (FABNIA) are neighborhood associations that represent the residents of our Seattle community that is located east of I-5 adjacent to SR 520.

Portage Bay / Roanoke Park Community Council was founded in September of 1977. The council has served the community by providing both a forum to discuss neighborhood development issues and as an implementing agent for community improvements. The council has worked recently with WSDOT on the installation of I-5 noise walls on Harvard Avenue, completed a Roanoke Park rehabilitation, and has improved landscaping adjacent to Delmar Drive.

FABNIA is a community Non Profit organization formed in 1995 to work on traffic and community development issues in the Fuhrman -Boyer Street corridor in the Portage Bay – Roanoke Park and Mountlake neighborhoods. We have worked with City of Seattle Parks and Transportation Departments to install street calming traffic circles/ bulb-outs, improve bicycle and walking opportunities and to improve south Portage Bay's natural areas and recreational use areas adjacent street ends and the Montlake playfield.

Land use in Portage Bay -Roanoke Park and nearby parts of the Montlake Community is primarily single family with some multiple housing along Fuhrman-Boyer and Harvard Avenues. The area's residential streets plus Delmar, Boyer-Fuhrman and Harvard arterials are used by recreational pedestrians, runners, and bicycle riders (a key leg in the bridge to bridge non-motorized system). Our neighborhood is served by Metro route #25. Increased traffic congestion on Harvard and Roanoke Avenues results in part from their access to and from I-5 and SR 520. Fuhrman/Boyer Avenue has increased traffic speeds and volumes as a result in part from commuters moving east-west from the U-District, Wallingford, and Eastlake to the Lake Washington/Arboretum and Montlake interchanges. Fuhrman-Boyer Avenue and Delmar Avenue East are bisected by SR 520. A review of the Draft NEPA EIS indicates that our neighborhood adjacent to SR 520 will likely have more significant construction and long-term operational impacts than any other residential area

**C-028-001**

**Construction impacts identified in the draft EIS during the estimated 28 month Portage Bay area construction period include:**

- Noise from pile driving for the steel support piles needed for the support piers of the 2 temporary and the permanent replacement bridges will affect residences in our neighborhood that are located within 300 feet of Portage Bay (Chapter 4- page 33 and Chapter 8 - Page 18)
- Vibrations from impacting residences from pile driving (Chapter 8- Page 22)
- Dust from Portage Bay, Delmar and 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue bridge demolitions that will impact nearby areas (Chapter 4-33 and Chapter 8-Page 20)
- Exhaust emissions from construction vehicles (Chapter 8- Page 28)
- Periods of restricted access to homes (and recreational use areas) near SR 520 (Chapter 8-Page 22)

## C-028-002

### Comment Summary:

#### Neighborhood Issues

### Response:

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

- Closure of Delmar Drive for 9 -12 months for replacement of its SR 520 bridge crossing will funnel traffic onto 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue which is a narrow, steep residential street and Fuhrman-Boyer Avenue which is the only detour connection to the north and east. (Chapter 8-Page 4 plus information in Transportation Discipline Report).
- Passage of 4 -12 construction vehicles per hour on Furman –Boyer, Harvard Avenues during peak construction periods. (Chapter 8 –Page 15)
- Possible turbidity and pollution problems in Portage Bay (Chapter 8-Page 24)
- Possible slope failure of the hill above Boyer during construction which previously occurred in 1963 during original SR 520 construction at Delmar and 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue East (Chapter 8 –Page 27)
- Loss of the only residence in SR 520 corridor which is located at 2542 on Boyer Avenue (Chapter 5- Page 33)
- Loss of docks at the Queen City Yacht Club (Chapter 8-20) and The Portage Bay Condominium.

#### Other construction impacts are not discussed in the draft EIS. They include:

- Possible elimination or service cut-backs of the Route 25 bus service on Fuhrman-Boyer Avenue requiring long walks to Eastlake, Montlake, or 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue for other bus access.
- Disruption of bicycle use and walking opportunities of Fuhrman-Boyer Avenue owing to traffic closures and traffic congestion
- Possible access limitations to the Montlake Playfield that includes ballparks, a gymnasium, a summer camp program and adult recreational activities. The ballparks and gymnasium have for several been at capacity for youth and adult soccer, football and basketball programs.
- A projected level of construction noise and vibration that will limit use of the community's street end parks and Montlake Playfield area for both wildlife and human activity.
- Placement of construction barges on Portage Bay that will eliminate or severely restrict recreational boat usage
- Placement of barges and other bridge construction activities will use wildlife usage of the south shore of Portage Bay. This area includes a rare inner city marshland. This area has been frequented by herons, bald eagles, turtles, cormorants and beavers.
- Vibrations along unstable slopes with single-family housing on Fuhrman-Boyer Avenue, Delmar and Roanoke Streets. Homes located on Fuhrman Avenue lost their backyards during the slide season several years ago, and the repairs to the slope cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to repair.

The draft EIS does not list the Montlake Playfield as a possible staging. Area. If it is selected the level of impact would likely even be greater.

#### C-028-002 Permanent Project impacts identified in the EIS that directly and negatively impact our neighborhood area include:

- Increased shading of Portage Bay (Chapter 9 – Page 8)
- Undefined configuration of conceptual Portage Bay bridge stormwater wetland treatment facility (Chapter 3 Exhibit 12 - Page 41)

- C-028-002**
- Placement of a water quality vault between Boyer Avenue East and the Portage Bay shoreline (Chapter 3 –Page 39)
  - Need for noise walls. (Chapter 5- Pages 19-22)
  - View obstructions of Portage Bay from nearby areas (Chapter 5- pages 2-3)
  - Increase in evening peak hour traffic at E Roanoke/Harvard off ramp with 6 lane alternative (Chapter 5-Page 13)

**Permanent impacts that are not specifically discussed in the draft EIS include:**

- Lack of any discussion of the proposed project's night lighting and glare
- Street traffic flow changes on our neighborhood arterials including Boyer-Fuhrman Avenue, Delmar, Harvard and other connecting streets to SR 520 access ramps. The existing traffic projections on these streets are included in the Transportation Discipline Report only in areas adjacent to the Roanoke/Harvard intersection. Livability and safety are greatly impacted by speed and volume, and this analysis completely ignores these issues, and instead focuses only on signalized intersection capacities.
- Lack of a full discussion on the project's impact on I-5 traffic congestion. Adding traffic to I-5 may also divert more traffic to Seattle surface streets.
- Possible increase in our neighborhood's noise levels and air pollution owing to increased traffic congestion on connection streets to SR 520 access ramps. Air pollution may also increase if there are more vehicles on an expanded SR 520 east of I-5 interchange.
- Limitations on recreational boat use of Portage Bay after construction of the larger bridge crossing and proposed wetland stormwater treatment facility
- Long term changes in wildlife usage of Portage Bay shoreline area adjacent to Mountlake Playfield
- Recreational use at street end parks and Montlake Playfield

- C-028-003**
- The analysis of significant impacts to our neighbor included in this draft EIS is totally deficient with the exception of noise impacts.**

Our neighborhood residents appreciate that the project does include a noise wall as mitigation. Only the discussion on noise wall mitigation appears detailed enough to be fully understandable. We would like its design options to consider the installation of a plexiglas wall. A lighter, brighter and more aesthetic plexiglas wall will preserve views for both motorists passing across the Portage Bay Bridge plus the territorial and distant views of nearby residents. It would allow construction of a lighter, less massive, likely less expensive structure across Portage Bay.

- C-028-004**
- Otherwise, not enough specific information is provided to understand the magnitude of both construction and permanent impacts in just about all impact areas. Many of the reader friendly chapter discussions in the draft EIS discuss multiple topic areas in a manner that is too diffuse and generalized.

- C-028-005**
- Possible best management practices (BMPs) for construction noise, dust, air and water pollution control activities, traffic detour routes and work schedules need more detailed analysis. A plan for monitoring of dust, vibration and noise impacts needs to be included. The plan needs to

**C-028-003**

**Comment Summary:**

Noise Walls (Aesthetics)

**Response:**

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

**C-028-004**

**Comment Summary:**

Format and Content

**Response:**

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

**C-028-005**

**Comment Summary:**

Neighborhood Issues

**Response:**

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

- C-028-005** | include mitigation for various levels of impacts. The discussion of BMPs in this EIS does not include necessary specifics.
- C-028-006** | The draft EIS's analysis of permanent project impacts on traffic congestion analysis notes that a specific LOS level of E is forecasted for the six lane alternative at the Harvard/Roanoke intersection. This complex coupling of streets that includes 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue East, Roanoke, Harvard and Delmar plus a SR 520 off ramp is already a log jam during rush hour periods. The area has also become less safe for bicyclists and pedestrians who need to cross the roadways. The further decline in LOS requires traffic and safety mitigation that is not specifically discussed.
- C-028-007** | The draft EIS also considers LOS levels of other intersections in this area from A to D as low to moderate and puts them all together as an apparently acceptable level of impact. Intersection delays at levels C and D will cause diversion of traffic to our street corridors. The diversion of traffic into our neighborhood from the University District, Wallingford, Eastlake, and North Capital Hill for motorists seeking I-5 and SR 520 access ramps has been an ongoing impact in our residential neighborhood. All neighborhood intersections need to be analyzed not just those in the Harvard/Roanoke/10<sup>th</sup> intersection area.
- C-028-008** | I-5 apparently does not have the capacity to handle additional traffic from SR 520. The additional capacity may also result in more traffic being diverted to Seattle arterials that serve our neighborhoods. The increased traffic and congestion may totally overwhelm our neighborhood.
- C-028-009** | There is no discussion on the coordination necessary to provide traffic circulation with the proposed 9 –12 month closure of Delmar Drive East and the undiscussed schedules of closures for the Boyer Avenue and 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue East SR 520 crossings. The possibility of completing one half of the bridges at a time has not been considered. .
- C-028-010** | The proposed storm water treatment facilities to be located in our neighborhood do not include any estimation of size configurations. The size of the storm water treatment vault on Boyer Avenue may be a significant impact. The innovative but not as yet implemented concept of a storm water treatment wetland at the base of Portage Bay bridge piers also has no information on its possible size or extent. Since treatment areas generally must be at least 1/3 the area of the surface area to be treated, this constructed wetland must be much larger than shown. The relatively large area needed under the bridge for this treatment concept is not evaluated. The size of the storm water facilities along with the increases size of a 4 or 6 lane bridge will significantly impact both the natural habitat of Portage Bay and its recreational use. This may make it impossible to continue our efforts to improve the natural habitat and recreational activity at street end parks and the Mountlake playfield area.
- C-028-011** | There is no specific discussion of the construction impacts affecting wildlife usage of marshland area on the south shore of Portage bay and access limitations to the recreational programs at the Montlake Playfield.
- C-028-012** |
- C-028-013** | The draft EIS also does not discuss the recent vote of the eastside communities to favor the development of light rail service to Bellevue and Redmond via I-90 over further expansion of

#### **C-028-006**

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

Local Street Network

##### **Response:**

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

#### **C-028-007**

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

Local Street Network

##### **Response:**

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

#### **C-028-008**

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

Freeway Operations (I-5 Area)

##### **Response:**

See Section 5.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

#### **C-028-009**

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

Traffic Management (Construction)

##### **Response:**

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

#### **C-028-010**

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

Stormwater Treatment

- C-028-013** regional bus service. The impact of this proposal on regional METRO SR520 corridor bus is not discussed. This development compliments the 4 lane alternative since the additional HOV lanes in the 6 lane alternative may now be considered as a lower public priority whose expenditure may remove funding availability for east side light rail
- C-028-014** The draft EIS finally does not provide a thorough review of the tunnel option discussed in Chapter 3, pages 5-6. Without a full analysis of its impacts, dismissing it as too expensive is premature and irresponsible. A comparison needs to be included of its impacts compared to the no-build, four lane and six lane alternatives.
- C-028-015** **The lack of specific information also makes it difficult to judge the difference in relative impact of the no build, 4 lane and 6 lane alternatives. It also does not consider any appropriate mitigation.** The extent and severity of construction and post construction operational impacts discussed in this letter will likely force many of our neighborhood residents to conclude that the no build option is the only livable alternative. As noted there is not enough information to determine if we can adequately adjust to the construction and operational impacts of even the four- lane alternative. Our neighborhood residents may accept the four lane alternative if adequate impacts and mitigation information is provided. This may include shrinking the width of the proposed shoulders and placing the bike lane under the Portage Bay Bridge. The only clearly documented advantage of the six-lane alternative for our neighborhood is the proposed lid over SR 520 between 10<sup>th</sup> and Delmar. We do not understand why the lid also cannot be provided for the 4- lane alternative. Is the inclusion of a lid only for the six lane alternative recognition of this alternative's considerable additional impacts? The difference in extent of impacts created by the six lane alternative as compared to that created by the four lane alternative can not be clearly understood from information provided in the draft EIS.
- C-028-016**
- C-028-017** The severely intrusive impacts of the project's intensive twenty eight month construction period can only be acceptable with an appropriate level of mitigation. FABNIA with the support of the Portage-Bay Roanoke Park Community Council has worked with the Montlake Playfield Advisory Board completing a plan for long-term improvements of the south Portage Bay shoreline area and adjacent sections of the playfield. City of Seattle Parks Department has approved this plan. Appropriate mitigation should consider support for plan elements that include building a walkway connecting the Everett street end with the Montlake Playfield area and providing natural tree plantings in the playfield area adjacent to the Portage Bay shoreline. The walkway will provide a pedestrian pathway connecting the Portage Bay and Montlake communities that will be away from the increasing traffic congestion on Boyer Avenue and other streets.
- C-028-018** Another appropriate element of support will be providing funding for additional traffic calming measures along Harvard and Fuhrman-Boyer Avenues. Designs for traffic calming of each intersection on Fuhrman and Boyer Avenue are designed and on file with Seattle Department of Transportation.
- C-028-019** We find that this draft EIS does not adequately address the very significant impacts of the four and six lane build alternatives that will impact our community. This draft EIS must be rewritten to include more specific information on impacts and mitigation measures.

**Response:**

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

**C-028-011**

**Comment Summary:**

Wildlife Effects

**Response:**

See Section 16.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**C-028-012**

**Comment Summary:**

Park Effects

**Response:**

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

**C-028-013**

**Comment Summary:**

Light Rail Transit

**Response:**

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

**C-028-014**

**Comment Summary:**

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

**Response:**

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

Please contact us if you wish to discuss any element of this letter. .

Jack Kindred  
President  
Portage Bay Roanoke Park Community Council

Anne Preston  
President  
Fuhrman Boyer Neighborhood Improvement Association

-

**C-028-015**

**Comment Summary:**

Format and Content

**Response:**

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

**C-028-016**

**Comment Summary:**

4-Lane Alternative

**Response:**

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

**C-028-017**

**Comment Summary:**

Park Effects

**Response:**

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

**C-028-018**

**Comment Summary:**

Local Street Network

**Response:**

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

**C-028-019**

**Comment Summary:**

Format and Content

**Response:**

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