

STATEMENT OF JOHN HANSON

1
2

I-0333-001

3 My name is John Hanson. I live at 2502 Canterbury
4 Lane East, Apartment No. 309. And I'd like to bring to the
5 attention of the DOT that in their design -- the design has
6 a very large negative impact on where I live from several
7 standpoints.

8
9
10
11
12

Number one is the visual impact: Right now, I look
across the present bridge, which has a bridge deck of about
five feet off the water, and when I look across, I can see
Union Bay; and I can see all the boats that come by through
the -- on opening day.

13
14
15
16
17
18

As the proposal -- the proposed alternatives, either
the four or six lane alternative -- I understand the height
of the bridge deck there is going to be 50 feet off the
water, and then there'll be an additional sound wall, which
I haven't quite found out exactly how high it is. I can't
seem to find out that information at this meeting.

19
20
21
22
23
24

But that will provide a visual impact that will block
my views presently, which go from the -- I can see the
Olympic Mountains over the Montlake Bridge to the -- almost
the 180 or plus degrees to the east end of the present
floating bridge and all the lake and the forest and the
mountains in between.

I-0333-002

Also, speaking to the construction engineers that are

I-0333-001

Comment Summary:

Visual Quality Effects

Response:

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

I-0333-002

Comment Summary:

Schedule

Response:

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

I-0333-002

here at this presentation, I'm told that there's going to be a temporary construction bridge built on the south side of the present bridge structure and which will be -- right now when I leave my dock at the Canterbury Shores Condominium, my route is about between 20 to 30 feet off the present bridge to take advantage of the deeper water there. I can't cut across north of the Edgewater Apartments because there's a lot of shoal area there; that's too shallow, and I don't have the sufficient depth in my sailboat to go across that area without going aground. So whatever construction bridge is there has got to take this into consideration and give me access to the lake.

I-0333-003

Also in the presentation, I see that their present west end elevation of 44 feet is going to be reduced to 25 feet. Now I've sailed on Lake Washington for well over 25 years, and predominately my sailing is north of the present bridge location. And so to sail on the north side of the bridge, I would have to travel to the south side of the proposed bridge to the east side and then go underneath the higher area there -- I guess that's about 70 feet that's proposed for clearance from the water -- the height of my mast is such that it would not clear the 25 feet that's being proposed at the west end of the bridge. And so this means a very inconvenient arrangement.

I-0333-003**Comment Summary:**

Navigation (During Operation)

Response:

See Section 19.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0333-003

Also sometimes if I had to do that, I might be in very, very choppy water. The water - you know, if there's a storm, and I'm having to come across the windward side of the bridge, the waves reflect back on the bridge and make a very, very dangerous seas to travel through.

I-0333-004

Also the noise level I'm sure even with the sound wall will still be detrimental to the environmental aspects of where I live.

I-0333-005

So what I'm urging the Department to do is to take a look at abandoning this type of a project and going to a submerged tube approach from I-5 to the west end of the floating bridge. It would be better environmentally, and it would be better from the visual impact standpoint, and it would be better from a noise standpoint. So I strongly urge the Department to investigate that further and take a positive approach to it. Thank you.

I-0333-004

Comment Summary:

Noise Walls

Response:

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

I-0333-005

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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