

From: Justin Lancaster [mailto:justin@nationalsolarusa.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 20, 2010 11:35 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS; mike.mcjinn@seattle.gov
Subject: 520

Dear Washington State Department of Transportation,

I-204-001

I live at 2601 11th Avenue East here in Seattle Washington and have a view of the current 520 bridge from my home as it crosses Portage Bay. You current plans do nothing for noise abatement as far as I have heard or seen. The bridge currently is extremely noisy all hours of the day and night, the pavement used is noisy as well as the expansion joints.

I-204-002

Further, the current design does not move more people across the bridge but simply adds more cars and gridlock. How can you widen a bridge that simply dumps into a backed up interstate; the bridge is not a island of transportation but rather connects to very crowded roadways. The questions, is why is there no design for rapid transit, such as rail across the bridge that would limit the size and impact of your outdated designs of bigger and wider-- I suggest go smarter and start thinking about the future. Scare tactics and spreading fear of sinking bridges may push your current agenda and design through but why not create a legacy of vision and leadership when so much public money is being used.

Just my thoughts on the 520.

Justin Lancaster

I-204-001

The Preferred Alternative includes several noise reduction strategies such as 4-foot concrete traffic barriers with noise-absorptive coating, encapsulating expansion joints, and using noise-absorptive materials around the Montlake and 10th Avenue East/Delmar Drive East lid portals. Quieter concrete pavement is included as a design feature for Option A, Option K, and the Preferred Alternative; however, because it is not an FHWA-approved mitigation measure and because future pavement surface conditions cannot be determined with certainty, it is not included in the noise model for the project. WSDOT will continue to consider other noise reduction methods as design development progresses.

I-204-002

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. Section 2.4 in the Final EIS explains why initial implementation of light rail transit on SR 520 is not planned. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS also explains how the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project can accommodate high capacity transit, such as proposed bus rapid transit or potential future light rail.

The project would provide a new reversible HOV ramp connecting to the existing I-5 reversible express lanes south of SR 520. Option A provided an auxiliary lane on the Portage Bay Bridge to reduce congestion approaching the I-5 interchange; the Preferred Alternative provides this function through a managed shoulder rather than an auxiliary lane. The SR 520, I-5 to Medina project would not preclude future modifications to the SR 520/I-5 interchange or to I-5. The SDEIS and the Final EIS describe project effects on I-5 interchanges in the project area. See

Section 5.1 of the SDEIS and Final EIS, and Chapter 6 of the Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 of the SDEIS) and Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 of the Final EIS). Additionally Final EIS Section 5.1 and Chapter 6 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report describe effects of the project on I-5 operations.