

--From: Sean Riley [mailto:seanr@microsoft.com]
Sent: Monday, March 29, 2010 2:05 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: SR 520 SDEIS Feedback

Submitting this via email. Also sent in feedback via the online tool, however, I experienced some technical difficulties with the website and want to make sure our feedback is heard.

Please confirm that this feedback has been collected.

Hello,

I-209-001

As residents of Montlake, specifically East Lake Washington Boulevard in the Arboretum, my wife (Morgan Riley) and I (Sean Riley) would like to submit our feedback on the proposed SR 520 Bridge solution. The feedback is broken down into several categories below: Noise After construction, Noise During Construction, Visual Effects, Traffic Flow and Misc.

Our ask is that you answer our questions/concerns and work with affected neighborhoods to construct a solution that is a benefit to our beautiful, historic (Montlake Historical District, house number 188) community.

Thank you for your time,

Sean and Morgan Riley

2465 E. Lake Washington Boulevard

Seattle, WA 98112

I-209-002

NOISE AFTER CONSTRUCTION:

Noise levels for several homes on LWB, LWBE, and ELWB are significantly above FHWA's criteria of 67dB. For LWB residents, how do you plan to mitigate noise levels above FWHA regulations in addition to noise reducing pavement and sound walls? When will you start working with LWB residents? How will you identify which LWB residents to work with? What is the process for identifying additional mitigation measures?

Section 1-25 states option A is defined as including noise walls and/or quieter, rubberized asphalt pavement. Does the mediation group recommend noise walls and/or quieter, rubberized asphalt pavement for option A+ even though section 1-26 states that quieter pavement has not been demonstrated to meet FHWA and WSDOT requirements and cannot be considered as noise mitigation? What is the process for deciding which areas will get noise walls and/or quieter pavement? What are additional mitigation measure that will be considered?

I-209-003

What is he mitigation process and what are the mitigation measures being considered for eligible, contributing Montlake Historic District homes on LWB, LWBE and ELWB?Where will sound walls be located along the LWB corridors? How will you work with LWB residents when determining placement of sound walls adjacent to and near LWB? Please describe your outreach and design plans in detail.

I-209-001

WSDOT will continue to work with affected communities throughout the duration of the project. Listed concerns are addressed in specific responses below.

I-209-002

Since the SDEIS was published, FHWA and WSDOT have identified a Preferred Alternative which is similar to Option A but with a number of design refinements to address community and stakeholder concerns. These include expanding the Montlake lid to include a full rather than partial lid and to extend it east to the Lake Washington shoreline. The Preferred Alternative also includes a number of noise reduction strategies such as 4-foot concrete traffic barriers with noise-absorptive coating throughout the corridor, encapsulating expansion joints, and noise-absorptive coating around lid portals. Information on noise modeling results for the Preferred Alternative can be found in Section 5.7 of the Final EIS and the Noise Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS); Exhibit 22 in the addendum shows some reduction in noise levels in your area of East Lake Washington Boulevard compared to existing conditions and the No Build Alternative.

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 used the noise expert review panel to identify possible noise reduction strategies and considered ideas for noise reduction from other sources, such as comments received on the Draft EIS and SDEIS. WSDOT also relies on its experience in mitigating noise effects for similar highway projects. The noise expert review panel report does list a number of quieter concrete pavement options and innovative pavement

I-209-004	How will you work with LWB residents when determining placement/design/landscaping phases of lid placement adjacent to LWB? Please describe your outreach plans in detail.
I-209-005	What are the projected noise levels after for plan A+ for all homes on LWB before and after sound walls and noise reducing pavement? If this study hasn't been done, when will it be done?
I-209-006	<p>NOISE DURING CONSTRUCTION:</p> <p>What noise reduction measures will be taken during construction for LWB residents? What are expected noise levels during construction? If you haven't done a study, when will it be published?</p> <p>Section 3-13. When trucks pass in front of our house on LWB (property # 188), our windows rattle. Table 3-7 in section 3-31 shows that daily truck trips on LWB will increase from 16 to 100-175 during construction of plan A+. In addition, 3-35 states there will be additional clearing, grading and paving activities on LWB during construction of the LWB ramps. What is the construction period for the ramps? For homes with serious adverse effects during and after construction, will you work with home owners to supplement the cost of replacing single pane windows with multi-paned windows with sound control? How will qualifying homes be identified?</p>
I-209-007	What are the traffic levels on LWB for before and after plan A+ for peak and non-peak hours?
I-209-008	<p>VISUAL EFFECTS:</p> <p>When will we see visualization mock ups for effected properties on LWB and ELWB for plan A+? Can anyone request visualization mock ups from the vantage point of their property?</p>
I-209-009	<p>TRAFFIC FLOW:</p> <p>LWB and ELWB residents experience severe traffic back ups on LWB and ELWB during weekends, peak traffic hours, when the Montlake bridge goes up and during frequent sporting events held at the UW. The backups often prevent residents along LWB and ELWB from safely using their driveways to access their homes. How does plan A+ reduce traffic jams after adding three additional ramps to LWB? How will traffic flow on LWB and ELWB differ with plan A+ versus today?</p> <p>MISC:</p>
I-209-010	How are you evaluating and compensating for environmental affects/quality of life during and after construction (traffic, air quality, visual impact, property devaluation)?
I-209-011	An email string we had going with Daniel Babuca, Jim Salter, Amanda Phily and Marsha Tolon regarding home value still needs to be addressed. Specifically, how with WSDOT compensate homeowners in affected neighborhoods for the devaluation of their home? If a home on ELWB is worth \$1M today, but post construction is worth \$600K due to changes from WSDOT, specifically, how do you plan on compensating these homeowners through mitigation?

technologies. The noise expert review panel report lists 40 different strategies for reducing noise, some of which are now incorporated into the project. WSDOT will continue to evaluate these strategies as the project design development progresses.

Regarding the recommendation of noise walls, the noise analysis provides information regarding the number of residences that experience noise levels above the noise abatement criteria (NAC) with all options. If project-related noise effects are present (meaning if any residence still experiences levels above the NAC), under WSDOT policy additional noise reduction strategies must be considered. Noise walls are then evaluated for FHWA and WSDOT feasibility (noise reduction) and reasonableness criteria. Where noise walls are determined to meet the criteria, input from the community would determine whether they would be implemented. Recommended noise wall locations for the SDEIS options are discussed in the Noise Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS); for the Preferred Alternative they are discussed in the Noise Discipline Report Addendum. Based on noise modeling results for the Preferred Alternative, noise walls are not be recommended in Seattle with the Preferred Alternative, except potentially along I-5 in the North Capitol Hill area where the reasonableness and feasibility of a noise wall is still be evaluated (see Section 5.7 of the Final EIS). The Noise Discipline Report Addendum provides additional discussion about noise reduction strategies and FHWA-approved noise mitigation measures. The Mitigation section of the Noise Discipline Report Addendum discusses how a noise wall for Lake Washington Boulevard was evaluated and why it is not recommended.

I-209-003

Please see the response to Comment I-209-002.

I-209-004

In early 2010, the Washington State Legislature passed and Governor

Gregoire signed ESSB 6392, which directs WSDOT to work collaboratively with the City of Seattle, University of Washington, regional agencies such as King County Metro Transit and Sound Transit, the Seattle Department of Transportation, the City of Seattle Pedestrian Advisory Board, and the Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board, and other stakeholders to consider design refinements and transit connections within the Preferred Alternative. Design and treatment for the Montlake lid are being developed through the ESSB 6392 workgroup process, and further coordination with the City of Seattle and surrounding communities. The ESSB 6392 workgroup recommendations will continue to shape the project as further design development occurs.

I-209-005

See the response to Comment C-209-002.

I-209-006

Expected construction noise was shown in Table 6.7-5 of the SDEIS. Depending on the activity, average construction noise will range from 83 to 87 dB, with maximum noise levels averaging 91 to 94 dB. Mitigation for construction noise and vibration was discussed in Section 6.7 of the SDEIS. Proposed strategies include requiring all engine-powered equipment to have mufflers, requiring all equipment to comply with EPA noise standards, limiting use of noise equipment such as pile drivers and jack hammers to daytime work hours, installing temporary or portable acoustic barriers around stationary equipment, shutting off idling equipment, restricting use of back-up alarms during evening hours, scheduling construction operations to avoid periods when noise would create an annoyance, establishing a complaint hotline to investigate noise complaints, and monitoring noise and vibration levels so that any issues that arise from noise or vibration can be quickly resolved with the contractor. The existing Lake Washington Boulevard ramps to and from SR 520 would be removed as part of the project. The construction period for the Montlake lid/Lake Washington Boulevard area is approximately

five years. A Community Construction Management Plan (Attachment 9 to the Final EIS) has been prepared for the project and contains specific measures designed to protect affected properties during construction and to address quality-of-life issues.

I-209-007

As analyzed in the SDEIS, under Option A with suboptions (Option A+) in 2030, the a.m. peak hour traffic volumes on Lake Washington Boulevard through the Arboretum would be 1,900 vehicles per hour, compared to 1,800 with the No Build Alternative. For p.m. peak hour volumes, Option A would have 1,800 vehicles per hour, the same as the No Build Alternative.

However, since publication of the SDEIS, FHWA and WSDOT have identified a Preferred Alternative, which is similar to Option A, but with a number of design refinements that respond to community and stakeholder comments on the SDEIS. The Preferred Alternative would not include construction of any new ramps in the Arboretum, and would remove both the existing Lake Washington Boulevard ramps and the R.H. Thomson Expressway ramps. 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. 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. No Build volumes in 2030 are somewhat different from those report in the SDEIS traffic analysis because background assumptions have been updated since the SDEIS was published (see page 5.12 of the Final EIS).

Chapter 2 of the Final EIS describes the Preferred Alternative. Section 5.1 of the Final EIS and Chapter 6 of the Final Transportation Discipline

Report describe the effects of the No Build Alternative and Preferred Alternative on local traffic volumes and operations in the Montlake interchange area, including Lake Washington Boulevard and East Lake Washington Boulevard.

I-209-008

Visualizations of the Preferred Alternative are included in the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report Addendum. The visualization locations were chosen to capture typical views so residents can get a sense of the character of the visual changes.

I-209-009

Refer to response to comment I-209-007 for a description of how the Preferred Alternative would affect traffic volumes and operations on Lake Washington Boulevard.

For the SDEIS and Final EIS, no specific analysis was conducted to evaluate the effects of sporting events at the UW. Instead, the analysis focused on typical conditions during weekday commute periods in order to provide a relative comparison between various alternatives and options. For the Final EIS, an analysis was performed to evaluate the effect of Montlake Bridge openings on traffic operations during the off-peak hours with the Preferred Alternative. Please see the Final Transportation Discipline Report, Chapters 6 and 8, for the results of this analysis.

In addition to the benefits provided by the Preferred Alternative, WSDOT has committed to working with the Seattle Department of Transportation, as part of the Arboretum Mitigation Plan, to fund traffic-calming measures along Lake Washington Boulevard and to identify additional traffic management measures in the Arboretum.

I-209-010

Construction effects on neighborhoods are discussed in Section 6.3 of the SDEIS. Project operation and permanent effects are discussed in Section 5.3 of the SDEIS. Issues such as transportation, air quality, visual quality, and economic effects and mitigation measures are discussed in greater detail in their respective discipline reports (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS).

The Final EIS and the addenda to the discipline reports discuss the Preferred Alternative and include any changes in analysis, effect, and mitigation.

I-209-011

WSDOT compensates for real property acquisitions only in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. If the project results in “real” property impacts (fee area acquisitions) the owner will be compensated fairly. In addition to paying the owner the market value for the property needed for the project, owners are also to be paid for any loss in market value (damages) to the remaining portion of the affected property.