Washington State Department of Transportation

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Supplemental Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to share your comments on the content provided in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement 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 using one of the following methods:

-- Complete this form.
-- Mail your comments to Jenifer Young, SDEIS 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.
-- Speak to a court reporter at an environmental hearing scheduled for 5 – 7 p.m., Feb. 23, at Lake Union Park Naval Reserve Building, 860 Terry Ave. N., Seattle.

1. Name	Linda and Peter Stoner	**CommentDate:**	4/9/2010 22:50
2. E-mail	linda@stonerarch.com	**Comment Source:**	Online Comment Form
3. Address:	1847 East Shelby St.		
4. City:	Seattle		
5. State:	WA		
*** 6. Zip Code:**	98112		

7. Do you have any comments on the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

We have comments on the Air Quality and Transportation sections.

I-246-001 According to the EIS "All options would meet air quality standards." (Page 33) Since we live near the Montlake bridge we know that "Option A's" addition of another bascule bridge next to the existing bridge will continue to cause more and more gridlock as the increased 520 traffic piles up behind the opening bascule bridges. This will inevitably greatly increase air pollution. This will do nothing to allow

I-246-002 easy transit connections between 520 and the Stadium Station. As a result the "Option A" does not provide a workable solution to the traffic mess and air pollution that will only increase in the future.

I-246-003 A new fixed bridge similar to the footprint of "Option L" over Union Bay is the only solution to directly connect transit and avoid the catastrophic air pollution caused by the gridlock that will only get worse

I-246-004 not only in Montlake but in the whole 520 corridor. We should not have to spend billions on "Option A" that does not work and that does harm to the region.

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, comments may be made available to anyone requesting them for non-commercial purposes.

I-246-001

The reason for not studying local air quality effects at all intersection is documented on pages 24 through 25 of the Air Quality Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). In summary, a screening analysis was conducted to determine the five worst-case intersections. Those intersections were modeled, and it was assumed that if the modeled intersections do not cause a violation of the NAAQS, then the other intersections in the study area also would not.

The Montlake Boulevard/Pacific Street intersection was modeled for local air quality effects under Options A, K, and L in the Air Quality Discipline Report and under the Preferred Alternative in the Air Quality Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS). The analysis of this intersection under Option A, which included a second bascule bridge, showed that CO concentrations would decrease compared to existing conditions, and would be slightly lower than the No Build Alternative in 2030. Effects at this intersection with the Preferred Alternative would decrease compared to existing conditions and would be similar to the No Build Alternative. While there would some pollutant emissions associated with vehicles, the effects associated with the second bascule bridge would likely include an improvement over existing conditions and would not violate the NAAQS. The Air Quality Discipline Report Addendum confirms that this intersection is also not expected to exceed the CO NAAQS under the Preferred Alternative.

I-246-002

The SDEIS transportation analysis showed that, while person-trip demand would grow between now and 2030, vehicle-trip demand across the 520 floating bridge in 2030 would be lower with Option A than with the No Build Alternative. This is because the proportion of person-trips using HOVs would increase compared to the No Build Alternative, because of tolling on SR 520 and because completion of the HOV lane system in the corridor would improve HOV speed and reliability,

providing an incentive for people to choose alternatives to driving alone. These changes in demand are described in Section 5.1 of the SDEIS and Chapter 6 of the Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS).

Openings of the existing and new bascule bridges would be synchronized, and the new bascule bridge would allow for lane continuity between the Montlake Cut and the SR 520 Montlake interchange, which would improve traffic operations compared to the No Build Alternative. The bridge would provide additional capacity for transit/HOV, bicycles, and pedestrians across the Montlake Cut. Most notably, overall delay related to bridge openings would decrease for all vehicles because the additional capacity would allow congestion to clear more quickly. Chapter 6 of Transportation Discipline Report describes the changes in traffic volumes and operations on the local streets in the Montlake interchange area. As illustrated in Chapter 8 of the Transportation Discipline Report, all of the SDEIS 6-Lane Alternative design options would provide a travel time benefit during the off-peak periods when the Montlake drawbridge opens as compared to the No Build Alternative.

I-246-003

Comment noted. WSDOT received a number of comments in support of and in opposition to Options A, K, and L and the suboptions to these options. These opinions are summarized in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Summary of Comments (WSDOT, April 2010), available at http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/SDEIS.htm.

I-246-004

Comment noted. WSDOT received a number of comments 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 (WSDOT, April

2010), available at
http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/SDEIS.htm.

Since publication of the SDEIS, WSDOT has identified a Preferred Alternative, which is similar to Option A but with a number of design refinements that would improve mobility and safety while reducing negative effects. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS describes the Preferred Alternative and Chapters 5 and 6 describe its environmental effects.