

From : VGunby@aol.com [mailto:VGunby@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2010 9:01 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Fwd: Ravenna Bryant Community Association's SR 520 SDEIS
Comments

Dear SR 520 Environmental Manager Jennifer Young,
I sent this Comments package with 2 files from the Ravenna Bryant Community Association and found that the address that I used in the SDEIS which was sr520comments@wsdot.wa.gov was returned to my SPAM file.

So I am resending to you by a forward. Please confirm/reply that you have received this e-mail forwarded to you and with and the two attached files.

Thanks!

Virginia Gunby, SR 520 Representative Ravenna Bryant Community Association
vgunby@aol.com

*** eSafe1 scanned this email for malicious content ***
*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***

Jennifer Young, Environmental Manager
SR 520 Project Office
600 Stewart St., Suite 520
Seattle WA 98101

Dear SR 520 Environmental Manager Jennifer Young,

Attached are two files, one prepared in 2008, outlining constituents interests on SR 520 issues and the other signed by the President Jody Chatalas, with the RBC's Public Comments and Concerns on the SE 520 2010 SDEIS.

Thanks you for WSDOT's review and we urge that the west-side project be started as soon as the Final SEIS is completed, so that the project can move on to construction "On Time and On Budget".

Yours truly,
Jody Chatalas, President,
Virginia Gunby, RBCA's Westside SR 520 Representative

Ravenna Bryant Community Association
*** eSafe1 scanned this email for malicious content ***** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***

C-014-001

Letter of Support of Virginia Gunby on 520 Issues

This note will certify that our Board of Directors heard from you a request from the SR520 mediators that it will reconsider our earlier evaluation of SR 520 alternative designs as that we received a presentation of the East Montlake Interchange Concept also known as the Six Lane Single Point Urban Interchange with Tunnel under Montlake Cut or Option J for short. The presentation was made by Mark Stoner, a designer of the concept. Our board members also asked questions to understand it fully and then we discussed it. The consensus of our board was to retain our current stance. Our current stance is reflected in the Environment and Design principles set forth in Parts 3 and 4 of the document, entitled Communities Forming Agreements of SR520, dated January 15, 2008 also presented at our board meeting.

In 2006 City Councilmember Richard Conlin, then chair of the Seattle City Council Transportation Committee, made a presentation of the Pacific Street Interchange concept to our general meeting of community residents. He was followed by a presentation by Larry Sinnott of an alternate design of SR520 within its existing corridor but adding a parallel bridge to allow transit to cross the Ship Canal in its own lanes. After hearing both presentations, our residents by a near unanimous vote designated Larry Sinnott as our representative to speak to the City Council in favor of replacing the current SR520 with a four lane structure with transit only lanes added and of authorizing a parallel bridge for transit and widening Montlake Boulevard NE up to NE Pacific Street only.

During the City's Stakeholder Advisory Committee process, we joined with the other Northeast Seattle community and environmental organizations in endorsing the green alternative. We posted advance notice on our website and received community input beforehand and approval by residents afterward. As a condition to participating in mediation, our community association had to acquiesce to a six-lane concept with HOV lanes for SR520. Our board made that concession reluctantly over objections of many of our resident members. It did so on the understanding that we would participate to keep SR 520 and all its entrances/exits south of the Lake Washington Ship Canal and to oppose any widening of Montlake Boulevard of NE Pacific St. except in the immediate vicinity of a parallel bridge.

The voting public provides a good reference point for assessing the public interest. Our community association joined with most other northeast Seattle community associations in opposing Proposition 1 of the RTID on the November 2007 ballot due to its potential for funding SR520 with the Pacific Street Interchange. This confirms that our stance reflects our constituents and the public interest as shown by the public at a recent election.

We won't repeat our many reasons for our stance since you've stated them well during the mediation process. We think you're doing a very fine job on a difficult task and we appreciate everything you've done. Consider this a strong vote of confidence from our board.

C-014-001

Since the SDEIS was published, FHWA and WSDOT have identified a Preferred Alternative that is similar to Option A, but includes design refinements that respond to community and stakeholder comments on the alternatives and design options analyzed into the SDEIS. The Preferred Alternative was developed after considering comments from agencies, tribes, and the public, as well as the findings of the legislative workgroup on tolling that was authorized by Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2211. The identification of the Preferred Alternative followed many years of study, including the Westside mediation process described on pages 1-17 through 1-19 of the SDEIS and pages 36 through 43 of the Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). Please see Section 1.12 of the Final EIS for a discussion of what has happened since the SDEIS was published. Also, please see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for a description of the Preferred Alternative along with information about how and why the Preferred Alternative was identified.

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>.

Ravenna-Bryant Community Association
3/30/10
6535 Ravenna Avenue NE,
Seattle, WA 98115

RE: SR 520 2010 SDEIS COMMENTS and CONCERNS

- C-014-002** | In February 2008 the Ravenna-Bryant Comm. Association, wrote to the 520 Mediation group listing our Community Objectives for the SR 520 West-Side Project. We used our Objectives to provide comment on the 2010 SR 520 SDEIS. The A option, without the Arboretum Ramps is our Preferred 520 Design. It would be improved with new preferential transit lanes on city arterials and traffic lights on Montlake Blvd. E and NE, and Pacific St NE, and would speed transit service, particularly during the am and pm peak hours. Moving transit on the arterials will reduce 520's destined traffic on Montlake E, and stop the rebuilding the Ramp's in our largest, Olmsted designed city park. That is the "trade-off" we support and a refinement in the plan that is needed with the city of Seattle support and involvement.
- C-014-003** | In the SR 520 SDEIS some of our original objectives have been met, some haven't or their status is unknown. *With over 14,000 pages, including the Appendixes, it is a difficult document to comprehensively review.*
1. Our adopted objective of no more than four general-purpose lanes and two lanes for high occupancy vehicles for Transit has been met by both A and A+ designs. (The one difference between A and A+ is that A+ keeps the Arboretum Ramps.) The eight lane option was eliminated by the Governor. All of the SDEIS design options meet the six lane objective. RBCA supports the A option's west side design because it is more transit and environmentally friendly and within the \$4.65B Project Budget.
 2. We oppose expanding the SR 520 on the west-side footprint to 8 lanes, due to the sensitive 1st class wetlands, endangered species-salmon run, protected tribal fishing treaties on Lake Washington, and public need to protect our adjacent large, unique, public park, the Washington State Arboretum and the Boulevard. (Section 2 (4) (b) (v) of the 2010 ESSB 6392 SR 502 bill passed and too be signed on 3/10/10, requires WSDOT to prepare an Arboretum mitigation plan, including wetland mitigation by 12/31/10 for the SR 520 FEIS.)
- C-014-004** |
3. We have great concerns about the K Tunnel and L diagonal Bascule Bridge designs that impact the sensitive environment and have 520 entrances and exits located in park lands, and to and from SR 520 north of the Ship Canal. Both result in a significant increase in vehicle traffic on the north and north-east Seattle arterials and neighborhoods, which would be detrimental to the quality of communities and livability north of the Ship Canal.
 4. We are pleased to learn in the SDEIS that proposed K, L & M designs are not financially or environmentally feasible. The unstudied new M proposal would require another year or more of design and study before a new SDEIS could be prepared and circulated. RBSA does not support any more delay or added public funds spent to study any west side designs that could relocate the existing 520 interchange further to the east in park lands, far from the crossroads.
- C-014-005** |
5. Minimizing traffic impacts in the north and northeast neighborhoods is important for keep our communities livable and less congested. Our concerns includes: 25th and 35th NE, NE 45th, NE 55th, NE 65th, NE 75th, Montlake Blvd E. and NE Ravenna Blvd, Sand Point Way, and the entire group of streets surrounding the University of Washington, University Village

C-014-002

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 determine how to improve transit speed and reliability. The workgroup evaluated the transit connections at the Montlake Interchange and identified preferred bus stop locations and made specific design recommendations to allow for an adequate level of midday bus service between the UW and Montlake and the Eastside after the closure of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station. These recommendations have been incorporated into the Preferred Alternative (see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS).

The Preferred Alternative will provide compatibility with transit signal priority at the intersections of Northeast Pacific Street/Montlake Boulevard Northeast (including the high-occupancy-vehicle [HOV] queue jump lane), Montlake Boulevard Northeast/East Shelby Street, the Montlake Boulevard Northeast/HOV direct access road, and the Northeast 24th/HOV direct access road. Please see Chapter 8 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for more information about transit facilities that would be provided with the Preferred Alternative.

The Preferred Alternative would eliminate the existing Lake Washington Boulevard eastbound on-ramp and westbound off-ramp and the R.H. Thomson Expressway ramps. Westbound SR 520 traffic would be able to access Lake Washington Boulevard via a new intersection located on the Montlake Boulevard lid at 24th Avenue East. The modifications included in the Preferred Alternative would result in lower traffic volumes through the Arboretum on Lake Washington Boulevard. Please see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for additional information.

C-014-003

- C-014-005** | and Children's Hospital. *Not enough DEIS analysis is available on 520's impacts on local arterials.*
- C-014-006** | 6. RBCA and A design supporters in the SR 520 Mediation Group focused on Transit/HOV-related solutions for the new HOV lanes, staying within the budget and "doing the least harm". The result is our A west side design with HOV lanes.
- C-014-007** | 7. RBCA supports the city of Seattle SDOT's UW Area 2009 Project 32 Traffic Action Strategy that recommends installing variable Message Transportation Information sign(s) on Montlake Blvd.NE near NE 45th for north-end transportation users to learn about current 520-related traffic. Issues such as Montlake bridge openings, the LRT/BRT schedules for service east and south, or optional alternate non-congested modes/routes, HOV lane/riders pick-up area info, traffic back-ups on the SR 520 Portage Bay ramps to I-5, and other relevant Travel Information. If installed early and available on the web, the new information could replace the SDEIS suggested need for a new southbound HOV lane addition on Montlake Blvd.NE. from NE 45th to Pacific St NE.
- C-014-008** | 8. RBCA opposes a proposal in the SDEIS to add a HOV lane on southbound Montlake Blvd NE. This project should be postponed until there is improved Traffic Information and signs operating. to help reduce SOV trips through this congested area. **If ever built**, the arterial HOV lane should only use right-of-way on the east side of Montlake Blvd.NE, from Pacific St.NE to NE 45th. Large trees, adjacent to the Burke Gilman Bike/Ped trail, should not be removed on the west side of Montlake Blvd.NE.
- C-014-009** | 9. The adjacent city arterial streets and SR 520 should fully embrace new pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle safety, enhanced aesthetics, and a "**Complete Streets Plan**" with trip reduction Demand Management programs to promote transit, reduce and channelize traffic destined for E/W-SR 520, encourage walking, reduce street noise and CO2.
- C-014-010** | 10. We support the initiation of Pre-Construction-Tolling on 520 in 2011 as a way part to close the \$2.65 B gap in project funds, by having the users pay for the project. We urge a proactive SR 520 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program that could help to reduce the daily city arterial traffic jams and SOV trips and to use a part of the SR 520 Tolls to help subsidize the costs of increased and improved, sustainable Transit Operations on the SR 520 Corridor.
- C-014-011** | 11. The Puget Sound Regional Council's new adopted 2040 Regional Transportation Plan includes a new TDM program called (12) SMART Corridors for the 4-county Region. The new SMART Cross-Lake Corridor includes both SR 520 and I-90. Joint performance is monitored as part of the Corridor Management Program. The PSRC's program staff will review the multi-mode performance and efficiency for moving people, cars and freight on SR 520. The PSRC will prepare a long-term, integrated SR 520 Corridor Performance Plan, with performance objectives for all modes. Staff will, track and report on the overall performance, also reflecting the actual experiences of 520 users. Long and short term goals for SR 520's overall and modal performance objectives will be adopted. PSRC staff will report on whether the 520 goals/objectives were met annually, and recommend changes, if needed to improve performance for all users and modes. An annual SR 520 Performance Report would be made available to the adjacent communities, large employers, transportation Agencies and users of the 520 Corridor. The SMART Corridor Report would recommend changes, if needed, to improve the overall performance and to keep SR 520 performance sustainable over time.

The Preferred Alternative is six lanes and is similar in design to Option A. Please see the response to Comment C-014-001.

C-014-004

Since the SDEIS was published, WSDOT and FHWA have developed a Preferred Alternative that is similar to Option A. Chapters 1 and 2 of the Final EIS contain information regarding project funding and project alternatives, as well as why certain options are not reasonable alternatives.

C-014-005

WSDOT reevaluated the study area for effects on local transportation in preparing the analysis for the Final EIS. This reevaluation considered potential effects along the 23rd/24th/Montlake corridor as far south as the 23rd Avenue/East Madison Street intersection. However, based on standard methodology, the local study area reported in the Final EIS was determined by the change in traffic volumes on the local streets with the No Build Alternative versus the Preferred Alternative during peak hours; only intersections where traffic volumes would increase by more than 5% were included. Five percent was selected as the criterion because a change in traffic of that amount could result in measurable operational changes. If traffic volume increases were less than 5% on adjacent streets, the intersection was not included in the analysis. Thus, all intersections not included in the local study area would experience an overall change in traffic volumes during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours of less than 5% with implementation of the project.

C-014-006

The design of the Preferred Alternative is similar to Option A; however, there have been some changes since the SDEIS was published. For example, the Preferred Alternative includes a new westbound transit/HOV direct access ramp that connects to 24th Avenue East,

C-014-012 | 12. RBCA supports an A design for 520 that works for transit, is environmentally sound, that reduces the impacts on the Arboretum by removing the Arboretum ramps permanently, protects our waterways, wetlands, fish, and wildlife habitat, and reduces Green House Gas global pollution. We learned recently from the Seattle Parks Department staff that McCurdy Park land *will be entirely taken for SR 520 Right-of-Way. This is a major concern.* We urge mitigation for the loss of McCurdy Park and on the landscaped McCurdy Lid, planned for over SR 520. The final design should not include any **Arboretum Ramps.** The new Trails planned for Lid should have user informational signage that indicates the history of McCurdy park, Mohai, the Montlake Cut and the historic Native cultural areas nearby and unique wetlands.

C-014-013 | 13. The RBCA's representative has been involved with 520 since 1997, first with the Translake Study and now with the recent west-side SR 520 studies. Our organization adopted a process objective of promoting a transparent 520 process to obtain all relevant information, including traffic studies, feasibility studies and details about how all major elements, including transit would be incorporated within the west-side design and plans. We find in that the SR 520 A design meets most of our objectives, after many hours of Mediation informational meetings and group discussions.
But the SR 520 SDEIS it is lengthy, encyclopedic, and does not focus on some major public issues such as Transit
Connectivity and reducing traffic on arterial streets near 520. We urge that the SR 520 FEIS be more succinct, and provide more details, answers and solutions for the major substantive and recent controversial SR 520 related issues.

C-014-014 | 14. Final Recommendations: We regret groups opposed to the A and A+ options have circulated misinformation about the SR 520 designs. SR 520 is a complex project with many details. The misinformation have seldom been corrected by the Press or at Public WSDOT Meetings. We also support more emphasis by WSDOT on plans with SR 520 to support increased transit use on SR 520 and I-90 state corridors. This includes:
A) New Plans for connecting **a multi-modal, west-side design between SR 520 and nearby local Seattle city arterials.** For example- Public Information on the new 520 related METRO local Bus routes/service, the Sound Transit's Bus Rapid Transit/Cross-lake routes/services, and the North Link LRT south routes, and how SR **520's impacts on land-uses and city arterial traffic congestion could be mitigated and reduced.** and
B) Preparing Public Information on the evolution of SR 520 from BusRT to Light Rail Transit. How will the SR 520's BRT use the center SR 520-HOV lanes, and what is the conversion Plan for moving BRT/HOVs out of the HOV lanes for the future LRT system. Is there a design for an LRT connection at Montlake Blvd., or to a less sensitive Corridor? and
C) **I-5 Express Lane Plan Revision** is needed to change the current connection and planned operations of the 520 HOV Lane into I-5 and from I-5 to SR 520 EXPRESS lanes to move more people all-day- on two-way HOV/Transit service on

providing access to Lake Washington Boulevard and to northbound Montlake Boulevard. Please see the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) and Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for information regarding HOV lanes under the Preferred Alternative.

C-014-007

The SR 520 project will include WSDOT Smarter Highways features, including a high-tech traffic management system that will automatically alert drivers to changing road conditions, regulate speed limits, and post lane closures. These features will be further developed as project design progresses. It is unlikely that such safety features would replace the capacity HOV lanes provide, but they would supplement other traffic management elements, as well as improving transit times and keeping drivers informed.

C-014-008

The Preferred Alternative includes high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes on Montlake Boulevard between the Montlake Bridge and the SR 520 westbound ramps/Montlake Boulevard Northeast intersection. The Design Refinements and Transit Connections Workgroup that was mandated by Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 6392 recommended an outside southbound transit/HOV lane and an inside northbound transit/HOV lane to allow for the most reliable service for passengers along the Montlake Boulevard corridor. Continuing the outside transit/HOV lane southbound from Pacific Street on Montlake Boulevard to Hamlin Street would allow for continuity in transit/HOV movement and would allow buses to bypass congestion that could result from bascule bridge openings.

WSDOT would avoid the removal of mature trees wherever feasible, and it is not likely that trees would be removed along Montlake Boulevard north of Pacific Street by the SR 520 project.

C-014-014 | the underutilized I-5 EXPRESS lanes.

C-014-015 | RBCA reaffirms that **we are adamantly opposed to SR 520 ever widening SR 520.** We urge progress in the preparation of a long-term inter-local SR 520/I-90 HCT Cross-Lake Agreement. The Agreement is needed now on the new SR 520's 6-lanes, and the future Phases for LRT modes and vehicle operations. It should include the maximum width needed for LRT operations and must include no future widening of SR 520. The SR 520 LRT NOW! supporter's questions must be answered today, and for the next generation. Long range SR 520 Agreement policies should address the existing long-range LRT Plan, financing and protecting future adjacent communities including residents, the Arboretum, the historic Washington Park Arboretum and Blvd., the University of Washington Campus and the Medical School, and the city of Seattle's livability.

C-014-016 | RBCA continues to be open to new ideas and to working positively with relevant organizations, entities and WSDOT representatives to achieve a consensus on the final SR 520 west side plan, so that it will be constructed soon, and be available for all involved communities, before a windstorm of earthquake damages the existing bridge and corridor.

Thanks for WSDOT's SR 520 staffing and for the opportunity to offer Public Comment on the 2010 SR 520 SDEIS issues and our related concerns.

Sincerely,

Jody Chatalas, President

520DEIS RavennaBryant32010.doc

File: SR

C-014-009

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) includes a variety of strategies that provide alternatives to driving in single-occupant vehicles. TDM consists of ongoing programs rather than constructed project elements. WSDOT supports the planning and implementation of TDM through its Public Transportation Division, which coordinates extensively with corridor projects and provides a variety of assistance to other organizations that implement TDM programs throughout the state.

The SR 520, I-5 to Medina project will provide new infrastructure that will allow corridor-operation programs such as TDM to be more effective. For example, the addition of HOV lanes would substantially improve travel times for transit and carpools, and a new regional path across Lake Washington on SR 520 would make it easier to choose cycling as a transportation option.

Please refer to the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for information about how the Preferred Alternative would affect the movement of people along the SR 520 corridor. Chapter 7 of that report discusses effects and improvements to nonmotorized facilities.

C-014-010

In 2008, the federal government, WSDOT, King County, and the Puget Sound Regional Council formed the Lake Washington Urban Partnership Agreement to use technology and tolling to relieve congestion across and around Lake Washington. As part of that effort, WSDOT has been authorized to implement early tolling on the existing SR 520 bridge, beginning in 2011, using a new variable tolling system that will improve traffic flow in the SR 520 corridor. The purpose of the toll is to reduce congestion and improve travel time, speed, and reliability and to generate revenue for the SR 520 corridor subject to legislative appropriation.

Ravenna/Bryant SR 520 Constituent Issues **DRAFT1/20/08**
Background: Since last September, 35 SR 520 Mediation Stakeholders have been meeting in Seattle to study and agree on a design for the west-side of the rebuilt SR 520. The eastside of 520 has been designed by WSDOT to that community's satisfaction. It has precluded the west options for SR 520.

(520 is the longest floating bridge in the world, completed in 1963, 60' wide, (4 lanes with minimal shoulders) was structurally strengthened in the 1990s and has a life of less than 20 years, due to now obsolete construction standards, and does not meet earthquake and maximum wind standards. With leaking pontoons it is lower in the lake. The bridge and transition segment, plus the replacement of the Portage Bay Bridge to meet new standards is required. A straighter corridor with 4/2 new HOV lanes, wider shoulders, adds capacity for SOVs, in the new 4 mainline lanes, that HOVs used on old bridge.)

Range of Costs

Total Replacement Cost: Estimated to \$3.8-\$4.3B (Separate Budget Attach. 1)

The Current Ravenna/Bryant Community Association's constituent's interests:-

1. Oppose the Pacific Interchange (North of the Cut) design alternative, or any new reincarnations that are located North of the Montlake "Cut"- (See "J" below) Mediators say Pac.Int is out.

2. Actions to oppose any SR 520 design options that would increase traffic through the R/B communities, 25thNE and 35NE, NE 50th, NE 65th and NE 75th - north end Communities.

--- a.) A related issue is opposing the proposed widening of Montlake Blvd., with at least 2 lanes, between Montlake/Pacific Place intersection and the University Village/NE 50th area..

Current Design Alternatives: The biggest problem so far has been that the Mediation process has been weak providing information promised last September, at our first meeting. (The Jan. 08 Meeting Summary removed the Retrofit option from the table. Maurice Cooper, sponsor, from the Madison Park Community, has withdrawn his support for this option.)

1. The "G" option is a proposed short tunnel or green lidded above water section, adjacent to Foster Island and the 1st ClassWetlands. One option removes the existing Arboretum ramps, and revises any new on/off ramps to the west. The "short tunnel, "G" would be used with either a 4-lane Retrofit option and a future 2-lane transit bridge if needed, or a new 4/2HOV-lane cross lake bridge. (Graphic of "G" option Attach 2)

+ Plus-Decreases noise, visual impacts, storm water pollution, least harm to Arboretum, improves habitat, adds significant green space from Montlake to Lake Washington, Berm reduces costs

-Minus- Permitting constraints, impact on fish of permanent fill, construction impacts, sensitive Seismic area, coffer dam dewatering and pilings down to 100' bedrock, Tribal concerns, costs, impact on Arboretum

2. The "J" option graphics was available at our last Board meeting. The designer of the extensive Montlake green lid, with a 7% grade tunnel under and up the other side of the ship-canal with a curves option was at the last R/B Board meeting with graphics of the proposal. It is on the Feb. Agenda as a new east 6-lane Bascule bridge (about a ¼ mile east of the Montlake bridge, with or without Arboretum ramps. All vehicles

Please see the response to comment C-014-009 for information regarding transportation demand management.

C-014-011

WSDOT will work with the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) as it monitors compliance with the Transportation 2040 Plan, including the identification and contribution of system performance data that will be used to update the Congestion Management Process Report. WSDOT understands that such data assists PSRC planners in developing strategies for efficient mobility options.

C-014-012

Please see the response to comment C-014-002 regarding the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps. Also see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for a discussion of the Preferred Alternative design features that would reduce effects of the project.

Like all of the SDEIS options, the Preferred Alternative would require the permanent acquisition of part of McCurdy Park for project right-of-way. The Preferred Alternative requires the least amount of McCurdy Park property to be acquired than other design options. When any park property is proposed for change to non-park use, WSDOT and the Federal Highway Administration will work with the property owner, the City of Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation, to identify measures to minimize harm and mitigate for the acquired property as required by federal and state regulations. Mitigation could include enhancing existing parks and recreational properties in accordance with applicable plans. Possible mitigation measures for the acquisition of McCurdy Park are discussed in the Final Section 4(f) Evaluation (Chapter 9 of the Final EIS).

C-014-013

The Final EIS has a description of the Preferred Alternative and its

travelling east of west on SR 520 would enter on a new 6 lane south Stadium (parking lot) highway and it is not known how the bridge would interchange to move users to east and westbound SR 520 lanes from the Bascule bridge without creating another generation the Pacific Interchange,

+ Plus-Removes SR 520 traffic from the Montlake area to the south Uof W stadium. Uof W doesn't support any portion of the SR 520 on the campus.

-Minus 7% grades are of tunnel, sharp curve to/from are difficult for buses, trucks and slows traffic

Bascule bridge is subject to openings for large vessels and sailboats, except at peak hours.

Transit service reliability is impacted. by bridge openings.

2. SR 520 V.Gunby DRAFT

3 Base-6 Options—WSDOT and Seattle's A-1, 2,3 with 4' narrower width design, 6 not 9 lanes across Portage Bay—Approx. width narrowest 138,' with 15' bike/ped lanes, w/o ramps, merge lanes etc the width would be wider. A WSDOT Montlake Design Workshop is to be held in March to discuss these options and any revisions to the area, to reduce noise, community and environmental impacts. Suggested additions have been:

*-East Transit ramps in/out the HOV lanes, Transit controlled traffic lights, reserved AM/PM

city arterial lanes for buses in the north end near the new ST Campus Transit Station

*-Stacked lanes to narrow corridor, lower profile,

*-Green lids over interchange,

*-Remove flyer stop/replace under over pass, Keep flyer stop

*-Emphasize transit/moving people to the new ST/LRT Campus station and into the new I-5 express lanes to and from the CBD,

*-A parallel Montlake Bridge with new access and egress ramps to sort out the east and west traffic at Montlake.

*-Eliminate "U" turn at Hamlin and Shelby

*-Noise walls good to reduce impacts, bad for visual impacts-

*-Storm-water collection and protection of the adjacent wetlands, parks and open space

*-Tolls, on SR 520/I-90 before, during or after construction

*-Managing construction to reduce impact on the surrounding community

*-GHG emissions reduction

Discussion Questions:

1. What are the Ravenna/Bryant community's priorities for the westside SR 520 Design?

2. What are your views on the process, or the options described?

3. What messages do you want to send back from this community to the Mediation members?

Other-

4. In light of the proposed construction of SR 520, the LRT Station and Tunneling, the Childrens Hospital expansion, the U of W stadium reconstruction and major development in the U village area Should Ravenna/Bryant request that the city initiate an Northeast Area Transportation Study ASAP?

potential effects on such resources as transportation, ecosystems, visual quality, noise, air quality, and others. For detailed information about project effects on transportation, please see the Final Transportation Discipline Report in Attachment 7 to the Final EIS. Chapter 6 of the report covers local traffic issues, and Chapter 8 discusses transit operations.

C-014-014

WSDOT has collaborated with Sound Transit, King County Metro, and the City of Seattle in workgroup required by Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 6392 to determine how to improve transit operations. The suggested design refinements from workgroup are included in the ESSB 6392: Design Refinements and Transit Connections Workgroup Recommendations Report (Attachment 16 to the Final EIS). The SR 520, I-5 to Medina project would include high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes on Montlake Boulevard between the Montlake interchange area and the Montlake Multimodal Center that would accommodate SR 520 buses. Additional transit priority treatments beyond those included in the project could be implemented by the City of Seattle and King County Metro.

The SR 520 High-Capacity Transit Plan, which was endorsed in 2008 by the state, King County Metro Transit, and Sound Transit, found that until at least 2030, demand for transit in the 520 corridor could be satisfied by bus rapid transit that runs in HOV/transit lanes, complementing Sound Transit's East Link on I-90. At the same time, the plan acknowledges that after 2030 significant increases in cross-lake travel may warrant dedicated HCT facilities in both I-90 and SR 520. Therefore, 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

FYI-Legal/EIS Issues

A.) A 2006 DEIS was issued on the project with 4 options, e two 4-lane and two 6-lane options. "Base-6 and the Pacific Interchange appear to be WSDOT's options. The 2007 Legislature and the Governor in ESHB 6099, authorized *the Mediation of a 6-lane design option* on the west side. All prospective members of the Mediation were pledged to study only alternatives for the 6-lane option. This was after the 2006 DEIS, but before the SEIS and FEIS were completed or a "Preferred Alternative" was declared in Record of Decision ROD process.

(Note: The SR 520 "de facto" Preferred Alternative was decided prior to the completion of the DEIS/SEIS/FEIS or the finding of a Preferred Alternative.

B.) The University President was asked by the Gov. for the University stay "neutral" on SR 520 project, and not involve the staff or faculty in any study of the design that could have less impact on the campus facilities.

C.) A Pontoon DEIS Hearing was held on 1/17/09 in Gray Harbor WA on sites, technique and options for the construction of a "graving" dock to use for new pontoons, in case of the bridge sinking from a catastrophic storm. The description of the process states that starting this process will not preclude design decisions made by the Mediation. (Planning, Designing and Building early is estimated to save \$400 M.)
File:RavBryantSR520Constitissues12908.doc

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.

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. Under the SR 520 High Capacity Transit Plan, Sound Transit would study the demand and necessity of light rail later in this decade. For more information, please see Section 2.4 of the Final EIS, and the SR 520 High Capacity Transit Plan at:

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/Library/technical.htm>.

The I-5/SR 520 interchange is included in the travel demand model and the freeway simulation models used to analyze project effects (see the Transportation Discipline Report in Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). The effects of congestion at I-5 were described in Chapter 5 of the Transportation Discipline Report, and this discussion has been updated in the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) to reflect the design refinements in the Preferred Alternative.

C-014-015

Please see the response to Comment C-014-014 regarding potential future light rail. WSDOT, Sound Transit, and King County Metro published the final SR 520 High-Capacity Transit Plan in December 2008. The plan responded to the requirements of Engrossed Senate Substitute Bill 6099, passed in the 2007 session of the Washington State Legislature and codified as RCW 47.01.410. The citation is provided in full below.

RCW 47.01.410 State route No. 520 improvements - Multimodal transportation plan.

As part of the state route number 520 bridge replacement and HOV project, the governor's office shall work with the department, sound transit, King county metro, and the University of Washington, to plan for high capacity transportation in the state route number 520 corridor. The parties shall jointly develop a multimodal transportation plan that ensures the effective and efficient coordination of bus services and light rail services throughout the state route number 520 corridor. The plan shall include alternatives for a multimodal transit station that serves the state route number 520 - Montlake interchange vicinity, and mitigation of impacts on affected parties. The high capacity transportation planning work must be closely coordinated with the state route number 520 bridge replacement and HOV project's environmental planning process, and must be completed within the current funding for the project. A draft plan must be submitted to the governor and the joint transportation committee by October 1, 2007. A final plan must be submitted to the governor and the joint transportation committee by December 2008.

The plan met the legislative mandate both by developing a proposal for high-capacity bus rapid transit on SR 520, and by developing a plan for the Montlake Multimodal Center to serve as a major transfer point between the University Link rail station, the proposed SR 520 BRT lines,

and local bus service. The multimodal center will ensure effective and efficient coordination of bus services and light rail services, as called for in the legislation.

C-014-016

WSDOT will continue to work with the communities that will be affected by the project throughout detailed engineering design, construction planning, and the permitting process.