

-----Original Message-----

From: Mary Ann Mundy [mailto:mamundy@comcast.net]

Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 2010 4:26 PM

To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS

Subject: SR 520

**I-255-001** | The proposed A+ design is much too high, uses an untried design, is much more expensive than a single deck bridge, and destroys views on Lake Washington.

**I-255-002** | WSDOT claims the pontoon section must have a lower deck to facilitate maintenance. However, the current bridge is closed only 2-3 times per year for maintenance. Spending the money for a maintenance deck is a waste.

**I-255-003** | WSDOT will consider only sound walls for noise mitigation. However, noise experts, brought to Seattle to evaluate the bridge design, offered many other noise reduction suggestions - insulate beneath the bridge, insulation material on the jersey barriers, quiet pavement - which have been ignored.

**I-255-004** | Height resulting from the maintenance deck and the sound walls make the bridge an unwieldy wind catcher that blocks views. The height also makes necessary huge pontoons along with their added cost.

WSDOT also claims the bridge portion must be high to enable water run-off to be collected. The run-off could be collected with a less steep bridge, or by using pipes and pumps.

**I-255-005** | West side neighborhoods spent more than two years working together, and with WSDOT and mediators, to produce a design that does not damage neighborhoods or parks. WSDOT has ignored their suggestions.

Mary Ann Mundy  
2500 Canterbury Ln. E.  
Seattle 98112

### **I-255-001**

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-255-002**

The SR 520, I-5 to Medina project would have a single-deck floating structure in which the bridge deck is raised above the pontoons. This structure would include an area for bridge maintenance below the roadway deck. This would allow maintenance activities to take place while keeping the facility open to traffic. The height also enhances the safety and reliability of the bridge during high winds and crashing waves, protects the bridge and provides future capacity for light rail, and provides for construction efficiency (see the text box on page 2-29 of the SDEIS).

### **I-255-003**

The Preferred Alternative includes several noise reduction strategies, such as 4-foot concrete traffic barriers with noise-absorptive coating; reducing speed limits through the Portage Bay area to 45 mph; encapsulating expansion joints; constructing freeway lids at Montlake and 10th Avenue East/Delmar Drive East; and using noise-absorptive materials around the 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. The noise reduction strategies included in the Preferred Alternative would reduce noise levels along the

corridor to the point that noise walls are not recommended in the Seattle portion of the project area, except potentially along I-5 in the North Capitol Hill area where the reasonableness and feasibility of a noise wall is still be evaluated. 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).

**I-255-004**

The size of pontoons is based on the structural load, not specifically on bridge height. See the response to comment I-255-002 regarding the reasons for the proposed bridge height. Pontoon size was specifically developed to both minimize the bridge footprint, while accommodating traffic needs and potential future transportation planning, like accommodating high capacity transit. See the response to comment I-255-003 regarding sound walls, which are not proposed on the floating bridge, and therefore do not contribute to floating bridge weight, cost, or bulk.

Pipes will be used to convey stormwater on many of the proposed bridges, but pumps add maintenance costs to stormwater management, and introduce some unreliability in the system. It is more efficient and cost effective to move stormwater using gravity and a sloped roadway, and it does not require a steep slope to have an efficient stormwater management system. The increased profile on the roadway allows WSDOT to take advantage of moving the stormwater to facilities that would provide enhanced treatment in some portions of the corridor that would otherwise be very difficult with pump systems.

**I-255-005**

The decision-making process for this project has lasted over 10 years and has incorporated extensive participation from stakeholder groups, including the Westside communities. The Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Discipline Report and Addendum (Attachment 7 to

the Final EIS) document the participation that has occurred, including the Westside mediation that followed the Draft EIS. WSDOT and the mediation participants agreed at the conclusion of the mediation process that Options A, K, and L would be evaluated in the SDEIS. As stated in the SDEIS (page 1-21): “Although the mediation participants, the legislative workgroup, and other political bodies can provide recommendations, it remains FHWA’s responsibility under NEPA, and WSDOT’s under SEPA, to select the final preferred alternative and to ensure that the environmental review process has evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives.” Also see the responses to comments in Item C-040, which was submitted by the Coalition for a Sustainable 520, for further discussion of the relationship between mediation, the range of alternatives, and the Preferred Alternative, and how the process has been and continues to be consistent with NEPA regulations.