

C-004-001

MR. DUBMAN: Hi. Thank you. I'm Jonathan Dubman from Montlake. I know the project team very well. I've been involved in this project for almost a dozen years or more. And I'm from the Montlake neighborhood and here on behalf of the Coalition For A Sustainable 520. That includes the community councils of Madison Park, Laurelhurst, Montlake, North Capitol Hill, Portage Bay, Roanoke Park, the boating community; and our coalition is also joined by the Mayor and the City Council and the Sierra Club and the Husky Bicycle Club in opposing the A-Plus plan.

And that is not because we don't think that 520 needs to be replaced. It does need to be replaced. But the A-Plus plan has a number of serious flaws. And just starting from I-5, in very brief summary, they are: We have a Portage Bay viaduct that is seven lanes. The State law says that the corridor is supposed to be six lanes.

C-004-002

The seven-lane Portage Bay viaduct is wider, in part, to support transit viability through there. But then, as the previous commenter mentioned, the transit is actually removed -- transit access is actually removed from the highway itself, limiting access to commuters to five buses a day.

C-004-003

Then, coming to Montlake, we have a second drawbridge that does not bring bus stops any closer to the rail station, does not really improve transit reliability or fix the traffic-congestion issues in that area. It costs \$81 million we don't have, takes down our homes, makes a giant interchange, and can never be used for light rail.

C-004-004

Meanwhile, we have the entire interchange where, even after 13

C-004-005

C-004-001

WSDOT received a number of comments both in support of and in opposition to Options A, K, and L and the associated suboptions. These opinions are summarized in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Summary of Comments that was published in April 2010 and is available at <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/SDEIS.htm>.

Since the SDEIS was published, FHWA and WSDOT have developed a Preferred Alternative that is similar to Option A, but includes design refinements that that respond to community and stakeholder reaction to the alternatives and design options analyzed in the SDEIS. Please see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for a description of the Preferred Alternative and Chapters 5 and 6 for analyses of its environmental effects.

C-004-002

The Washington State Legislature passed Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 6099 in spring 2007. The bill directed the Office of Financial Management to hire a mediator and appropriate planning staff to develop a 6-lane corridor design for the Seattle portion of the project area. All Montlake area options evaluated in the SDEIS were based on the no build alternative and a 6-Lane alternative identified by the Governor with interchange ramps configured to accommodate the expected traffic volume and to provide acceptable levels of mobility. The new Portage Bay Bridge as evaluated under Option A included six lanes plus a westbound auxiliary lane. The Preferred Alternative for the Portage Bay Bridge includes six lanes plus a westbound managed shoulder instead of an auxiliary lane across Portage Bay. Please see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for more information.

C-004-003

Although the Preferred Alternative removes the Montlake Freeway Transit Station, some functions of the freeway station are replaced by

C-004-005

years of study on this project, as far as I can tell, nobody has spent a day thinking about how light rail might actually be inserted into that interchange, despite the fact that we're supposedly building this floating bridge wide enough for -- beefy enough to accommodate it.

C-004-006

I think I'm out of time now. But it's too big, too high, too wide for the Arboretum, doesn't work for transit, doesn't work for trains, doesn't work for bikes, doesn't work for traffic, doesn't work for Seattle, doesn't work for the region, the state, this nation, and the economy, or the planet. We're going to work to make it better.

Thank you.

(End of comment.)

bus stops included on the Montlake lid for buses traveling between the University District and the Eastside. The Preferred Alternative in the Montlake area accommodates transit needs and functions established by the adjacent University Link Station and bus service. Access to SR 520 bus service in the Montlake interchange area would be reduced because transit riders would be required to use bus service that operates directly between the Eastside and the University District, light rail between the Montlake Triangle and downtown Seattle, or local buses. However, bus riders will have access to more than five buses per day. WSDOT has collaborated with the University of Washington, the City of Seattle, King County Metro, and Sound Transit in the workgroup required by Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 6392 to develop design refinements and evaluate the transit connections at the Montlake Interchange. Specific design recommendations from the workgroup will ensure that an adequate level of midday bus service between Montlake and the Eastside remains after the Montlake Freeway Transit Station is closed.

For additional information regarding effects of removing the Montlake Flyer Station, please see Chapter 8 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

C-004-004

The new bascule bridge will add roadway capacity across the Montlake cut, and reduce the bottleneck that currently exists according to traffic analysis projections. Chapter 1 of the Final EIS discusses the costs of the project. Please see the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for more information regarding effects on public transportation from the Preferred Alternative. Also see the Land Use, Economics, and Relocations Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for information regarding necessary property relocations.

C-004-005

The vision for bus rapid transit in the SR 520 corridor has been identified in the SR 520 High-Capacity Transit Plan of December 2008 that was prepared by WSDOT, King County Metro, and Sound Transit in cooperation with the University of Washington and was endorsed by the Washington State Legislature and the Joint Transportation Committee. One of the bases of the plan is that demand for transit in the 520 corridor at least until 2030 could be satisfied by bus rapid transit that runs in HOV/transit lanes, complementing Sound Transit's East Link. At the same time, the plan acknowledges that after 2030, significant increases in cross-lake travel may warrant dedicated high-capacity-transit facilities on both I-90 and SR 520. By law WSDOT projects are developed in coordination with the state regional transportation plans, which currently do not foresee light rail on SR 520 crossing Lake Washington.

Therefore, the new SR 520 bridge and associated interchanges will be built in a way that will accommodate a two-way light rail line or busway at a future date. Later in this decade Sound Transit will study the demand and need for light rail across SR 520 in accordance with state and regional transportation plans. Please refer to the documents at <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/Library/technical.htm> for more information.

C-004-006

Comment noted. WSDOT will continue to work with stakeholders and the public to refine design and develop mitigation measures that will accomplish the goals of the project, while avoiding and minimizing effects to the degree possible on the environmental and community resources of the SR 520 environs.