

From: Francie Williams [mailto:FEvans@nwadmin.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 10:45 AM  
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS  
Subject: 520 Bridge Replacement

April 14, 2010

To Whom It May Concern:

I-286-001

This letter is to supplement our earlier letter in which we stated our support for Option A with the strong recommendation that the on-ramps providing access to and from 520 stay at their present location rather than attaching to Lake Washington Boulevard near Roanoke Street as is currently planned.

I-286-002

We would also like to comment that we agree with the efforts of Mayor Mike McGinn that a light rail system be designed into the 520 Bridge Project at this time rather than as a future add-on. We do not believe that the State's claim that the current design will accommodate the light rail addition is correct. The failure to design light rail now is a major flaw for an infrastructure improvement intended for the next fifty years. The disruption that will be caused by this construction should not be repeated for a light rail add-on that should be done in conjunction with the current project. We should be trying to get more cars off the roads not put more cars on the roads.

Thank you for your consideration of this letter.

Sincerely,

John and Francie Williams  
Montlake Neighbors

< Disclaimer >

-----  
Confidentiality Statement-This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. This communication may contain material protected by HIPAA, ERISA, other federal or state law or the attorney-client privilege. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. You are instructed to destroy the message and notify Northwest Administrators by immediate reply that you have received this e-mail and any accompanying files in error. Please bring any questions you may have on this instruction to the attention of Northwest Administrators immediately. Northwest Administrators does not accept responsibility for changes to e-mails that occur after they have been sent.

### I-286-001

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.

### I-286-002

Section 2.4 in the Final EIS explains why initial implementation of light rail transit on SR 520 is not planned. The decision to locate Sound Transit's initial east-west light rail transit corridor on I-90 rather than SR 520 has been made through extensive regional deliberation (see Table 2-2 of the Final EIS). However, while WSDOT believed that the design of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project already accommodated potential future light rail, the agency 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. Without a specific light rail transit alignment and service plan for the SR 520 corridor, the design options accommodate a number of potential configurations. However, full build out of light rail transit in the corridor would require modifications provided as a future project, including the addition of supplemental floating bridge pontoons to support the additional weight of light rail under either option. 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. It is clear that there would be a need for construction and additional costs to add light rail to the SR 520 corridor, but the costs and risks associated with such an addition have been minimized by the design elements included in the Preferred Alternative. Section 2.4 in the Final EIS provides additional information on planning for high capacity transit in the SR 520 corridor. Please also see the responses to comments from the City of Seattle Mayor's Office, in Item L-007, regarding high capacity transit.