

## SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project



### Supplemental Draft EIS Environmental Hearing Comment Form – Feb. 23, 2010

Welcome to the environmental hearing for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Please use this form to share your comments on the content provided in the Supplemental Draft EIS document. WSDOT will consider all comments received between Jan. 22 and April 15, 2010 in making its final decision in the environmental review process. Thank you for your comments.

You can provide comments through one of the following methods:

- **Complete this form** and place it in one of the comment boxes during the meeting. Please write clearly.
- **Mail** your comments to Jenifer Young, SR 520, I-5 to Medina Environmental Manager, Washington State Department of Transportation, 600 Stewart Street, Suite 520, Seattle, WA 98101.
- **E-mail** your comments to SR520Bridge\_SDEIS@wsdot.wa.gov.
- **Visit the Web page** at [www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge](http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge).

Name Bruce Maryman E-mail BMARYMAN@GMAIL.COM  
Address 6705 35th Pl S  
City Seattle State WA Zip 98118

These comments will become part of the public record for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Personal information is voluntary and will become part of the public record if provided. The Washington State Department of Transportation is a public agency and is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Therefore, meeting comments may be made available to anyone requesting them for non-commercial purposes.

Do you have any comments on the Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

I-061-001

With the state's goal of reducing CO2 emissions  
How will adding more lanes reduce emissions?  
Signline has shown up to 100k tons of CO2  
emissions per lane added. Were additional?

### I-061-001

The EIS analysis and the data the comment refers to use different methodologies. The EIS analysis looks directly at the traffic on SR 520 and the proposed changes in this corridor. The analysis the commenter refers to is based on generalized assumptions. In addition, the SR 520 analysis includes tolling in the build scenarios which is intended, in part, to hold congestion to a minimum, thereby keeping traffic flowing at a moderate (and more efficient) speed.

Do you have any comments on the Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement? (continued from page 1)

- I-061-002 | LIGHT RAIL ~~IS~~ IS NOT CONSIDERED. IT SHOULD BE
- I-061-003 | THERE ARE STILL TOO MANY CARS BEING FUNNELLED  
ONTO LK. WASHINGTON BLVD.
- I-061-004 | FLYER STOP IS CRITICALLY IMPORTANT
- I-061-005 | BUILD FOR THE FUTURE; STOP ACCOMMODATING THE  
PAST

### I-061-002

Section 2.4 in the Final EIS explains why initial implementation of light rail transit on SR 520 is not planned. The decision to locate Sound Transit's initial east-west light rail transit corridor on I-90 rather than SR 520 has been made through extensive regional deliberation. Table 2-2 of the Final EIS illustrates the history of regional decision making on east-west mass transit routes, which began in 1967 when the Comprehensive Public Transportation Plan for the Seattle Metropolitan Area identified a rail corridor from Seattle to Bellevue and Redmond on I-90. Subsequent studies and agreements over the next 40 years have all continued to identify I-90 as the preferred rail transit corridor, with predicted ridership similar to or more than SR 520 and substantially lower costs and environmental effects. However, through coordination with Sound Transit, WSDOT has designed the Preferred Alternative to have enhanced compatibility with potential future light rail compared to the SDEIS design options. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS provides further discussion.

### I-061-003

The Preferred Alternative would not include construction of any new ramps in the Arboretum. Access to Lake Washington Boulevard by westbound SR 520 traffic would be moved to a new intersection located on the Montlake Boulevard lid at 24th Avenue East. See Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for additional information. The result of this and other features of the Preferred Alternative is a reduction in trip volumes on Lake Washington Boulevard in the Arboretum compared the No Build Alternative. Under the Preferred Alternative in 2030, a.m. peak hour volumes on Lake Washington Boulevard through the Arboretum would be 1,330 vehicles per hour with the Preferred Alternative, compared to 1,950 vehicles per hour with the No Build Alternative. P.m. peak hour volumes would be 1,410 vehicles per hour compared to 1,730 with the No Build Alternative. See the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for further discussion of trip volumes.

**I-061-004**

The Montlake Freeway Transit Station stops were removed in all of the design options considered in the SDEIS, based on a decision making process that was part of Westside mediation. The mediation process was mandated by Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6099 and is described on pages 1-17 through 1-19 of the SDEIS. The mediation workgroup consisted of members from adjacent neighborhoods, transit agencies, jurisdictions, and State agencies. Removing the Montlake Freeway Transit Station would minimize the width of the freeway through the Montlake area, reducing the width by up to 40 feet compared to keeping the station. The mediation workgroup did not recommend any design options that included the Montlake Freeway Transit Station stops. See Attachment 8 to the SDEIS, Range of Alternatives and Options Evaluated, for further discussion of how and why removal of the stops was considered.

The Preferred Alternative includes removal of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station stops; however, it also includes a modified Montlake Boulevard interchange and lid. Modifications include a full lid from Montlake Boulevard to the Lake Washington shoreline, and bus stops on the lid for both eastbound and westbound buses (see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for a description of the Preferred Alternative). The intent is to provide greater pedestrian amenity in the central part of the Montlake neighborhood while simultaneously providing a better location and environment for the regional bus stops incorporated in the transit/HOV direct access ramps (see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS). At the option of the transit agencies, SR 520 buses will be able to exit at the Montlake interchange during the off-peak periods to service passengers to/from the Montlake lid transit stop. University Link light-rail service, expected to be operational in 2016, will accommodate some of the trips that now use the bus stops. Chapter 8 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) provides further discussion of expected transit operations with the Preferred Alternative, including expected

transit travel times, rider connections, and how future transit would incorporate service currently provided at the stops.

**I-061-005**

The SR 520, I-5 to Medina project would complete the HOV lane system in the corridor, improving reliability and efficiency for transit and carpools, but would not add general-purpose lanes. Thus, the project is aligned with improving the overall efficiency of the transportation system by creating incentives for people to choose an alternative to driving alone. The SR 520, I-5 to Medina project would result in immediate benefits for transit speed and reliability in the corridor by providing high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes across the floating bridge and better HOV connections at the Montlake and I-5 interchanges (see Section 5.1 of the SDEIS and Final EIS). The HOV lanes would allow for the near-term implementation of bus rapid transit, as called for in the SR 520 High-Capacity Transit Plan. Section 2.4 of the Final EIS provides further discussion of how the project can accommodate high capacity transit.