From: Duane Tibeau [mailto:djtibeau@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, March 01, 2010 10:27 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Cc: djtibeau@comcast.net
Subject: SR520 floating bridge location

I-172-001 The new bridge needs to be located on the south side of the existing 520 bridge.
I-172-002 There needs to be two road tunnels and one light rail tunnel between I-5 and Madison Park.
There needs to be a new rail road bridge over the ship canal near the WA. state museum.
The new bridge should have one light rail line, one HOV lane, two general purpose lanes and one full width shoulder in each direction. Also one bike lane on the north side of the bridge.
The HOV lanes will split in the tunnel with two lanes going to the U district and two going straight thru to I-5.
The east bound light rail line will come from Seattle and go to Bellevue.
The west bound rail line will come from Redmond and go to the U district and Seattle.
This plan will eliminate 95% of all your environmental problems and save millions of dollars.
This plan will separate all of the cross lake traffic from local Seattle area traffic.
You will not have to rebuild any of the old SR520 road way on the Seattle side.
You will not have to remove any of the old bridge supports below Elevation 22.5 Ft..
The old roadway on the Seattle side can end at the lakes west edge.
Madison Park swimming beach can be moved to the north side of Madison Ave. by State land purchase of private property.
The Madison Park play area can be rebuilt over the two tunnel entrances.
The city or state should consider purchasing the four story building on the So. side of this park.
Seventy percent of the tunnel work can be done from the lake side.
I-172-003 All of the pontoons can be built in the lake union area for less money.
The Grays Harbor area can be used for reclaiming the old floating bridge and old road structures.
At the present time I feel the states plan for the proposed SR520 rebuild is a total environmental disaster and should be rethought.
The pontoon design is also out of character with what is really needed.
It's never too late to change something that is not right.

Sincerely
D. Tibeau

I-172-001

In order to keep traffic moving in the SR 520 corridor and to keep the existing bridge open while the new bridge is being built, the new bridge will be located north of the existing bridge.

I-172-002

The comment proposes the use of tunnels for traffic with additional information on how light rail and other non-vehicle traffic could travel. As described in Chapter 1 of the SDEIS and in the Range of Alternatives and Options Evaluated Report (Attachment 8 to the SDEIS), an extensive range of alternatives has been evaluated for this project. Alternative corridors, technologies (e.g. tubes and tunnels), and travel modes, as well as many design variations within the existing corridor, were evaluated as part of the Trans-Lake Washington Study and again after the initiation of NEPA review in 2000. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS provides additional information on how alternatives were developed and evaluated, and why some solutions were determined not to be reasonable alternatives.

In 2006, citizens from the Madison Park and Roanoke neighborhoods suggested constructing the segment of SR 520 that extends from I-5 to the western end of the floating bridge as a tunnel. WSDOT reviewed the tunnel concept, investigated engineering, evaluated key environmental considerations, and identified preliminary cost ranges. This work is documented in the Assessment of Tunnel Concept I-5 to Lake Washington report of April 17, 2006 (available at: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/B81AC988-E033-4255-AFCE-0D38DF05E52D/0/AssessmentofTunnelConceptI5toLakeWashington41706.pdf.

The assessment found that major engineering challenges are associated with construction of a tunnel through this area. The tunnel concept would provide fewer opportunities for local traffic to access SR 520. Maintaining

correct roadway geometrics would require significant excavation on Marsh Island and Foster Island for the tunnel to transition above ground and connect to the Evergreen Point Bridge, and would likely require substantial open water fill that would be regulated under the Corps of Engineers Section 404 permitting process. Effects to the fragile ecosystems of the Arboretum and Marsh and Foster Islands would be substantial; restoration of the natural environment would take decades. There is a strong likelihood that resource agencies with jurisdiction would be unwilling to issue required permits for tunnel construction, and the tunnel concept would add billions of dollars to the SR 520 project costs. Designing the project to coordinate with the Sound Transit tunnel, the Portage Bay Bridge, the interchange connection to I-5, and on- and off-ramps to the local street network also present unique design challenges and would be expensive to engineer and construct. The reduction in access could result in increases in street congestion in some locations. Based on these issues related to feasibility, design, environmental effects, and cost, WSDOT eliminated the I-5 to Lake Washington tunnel from further consideration as an alternative and did not evaluate it in the Draft EIS.

The proposed project will include two general-purpose lanes and one HOV lane in each direction (see Chapter 2 of the SDEIS and Final EIS). 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 (see Table 2-2 of the Final EIS).

The new SR 520 bridge and associated interchanges will be built in a way that allows the structure to accommodate a two-way light rail line or busway at a future date. While WSDOT believed that the design of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project already accommodated potential future light rail, the agency worked with the City of Seattle and Sound Transit to

identify changes that would enhance the corridor's rail compatibility. The Preferred Alternative reflects these design changes and allows for two potential future rail options:

- Option 1: Convert the HOV/transit lanes to light rail. This approach would accommodate light rail by converting the HOV lanes to exclusive rail use. Trains would use the direct-access ramps at Montlake Boulevard to exit, or could utilize a 40-foot gap between the eastbound and westbound lanes of the west approach to make a more direct connection to the University Link station at Husky Stadium.
- Option 2: Add light-rail only lanes. This approach would allow several connections—via a high bridge, a drawbridge, or a tunnel—to the University Link station.

Thus, it is possible that in the future rail across SR 520 could connect to University Link via a bridge as suggested in the comment. Since rail transit in the SR 520 corridor is not programmed in current regional transit plans, any future project to add rail in the corridor would need to undergo an extensive planning and environmental review process by the responsible transit agency prior to implementation.

The SR 520, I-5 to Medina project will indeed include a bicycle/pedestrian lane on the north side of the bridge (see Chapter 2 of the SDEIS and Final EIS).

I-172-003

The location for pontoon construction was evaluated in the SR 520 Pontoon Construction environmental documents, which can be found at: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520/Pontoons/eis.htm.