

From : oppa3@aol.com [mailto:oppa3@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 10:11 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: SDEIS Comments: Air Quality concerns

I-291-001

Attached are the air quality concerns of the Love-Kane Family who live in the adversely affect neighborhood of Montlake
The SDEIS does not adequately address the issue of increased air pollution during construction and after construction due to increased traffic

*** eSafe2 scanned this email for malicious content ***
*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***

I-291-001

Comment noted. Chapter 1 of the SDEIS provides an overview of how Options A, K, and L were developed. Attachment 8 to the SDEIS, Range of Alternatives and Options Evaluated describes the history of the alternatives and options considered for the EIS.

Dear Governor Gregoire,

I-291-002

We are opposed to Plan A as described in the SDEIS:

I-291-003

I feel it is important to share with you our personal story in order to attach a family, a face, and a life to the decision the state is making purely on budgetary considerations. There appears to be no recognition for the people in our community or for the generations to come.

On August 5th 2009, our son Declan was born almost 6 weeks prematurely. Please see the attached photo. He spent close to one month in the NICU at Swedish fighting for his life. On an average day he would stop breathing up to 8 times and needed intervention. He was intubated, on a respirator, and feed by gavage. He will not be able to tolerate the air quality that will prevail in our neighborhood because of Plan A's short term and long term effects. The dust, particles, and unknown airborne elements during construction pose a huge risk. The general air pollution and emissions will be devastating. Declan has had breathing issues since birth. We simply cannot knowingly put our son in harms way.

I-291-004

We bought our home in 2005. In it is our life savings. We have 5 children and at the time considered this our best investment for our children and desired the quality of life Montlake offered them. My Husband and I made the very difficult decision to put our house on the market 3 weeks ago based on the extreme health related issues Plan A guarantees for our son and other children as well. We had to list our home at a price that is less than what we paid for it. We will not be able to sell it unless we take a huge financial hit. Every single realtor and potential buyer loved our home but used terminology such as "Black Plague" to describe our situation, based solely on the 520 initiative. If the state can give the University of Washington \$500 million for inconveniences, then they can easily buy us out. Please let me know how to proceed to make this happen before construction begins. For those who elect to stay, we request compensation for lost property value, retrofitting of windows and an air filtration system to mitigate the harmful effects this project will bring.

It would certainly be a gesture of good faith and create positive press to a neighborhood devastated. A class action suit is inevitable unless you exhibit the leadership and take quick decisive action to do the right thing for the people you govern.

I-291-005

All construction options pose short term issues and disruption. The Pacific Interchange option and iterations of that would have a long term positive outcome for us, the city of Seattle and the state. I would think that simply retrofitting the 520 bridge would still be on the table as a viable option. At the very least until the state can afford to do this project the right way.

I-291-002

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-291-003

The Air Quality Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) includes a quantitative analysis of pollutant emissions during construction, and a list of mitigation measures to address the potential effects. Emission factors typically decrease by year as older and less efficient equipment are phased out. The greatest amount of emissions would be produced at the Evergreen Point Bridge and Eastside Transition areas because this location requires the most support equipment, haul truck trips, and worker commute trips. The tug boats used for this construction area contribute the majority of the NOx and CO emissions. There are no state or local guidelines for evaluating the degree of impact from construction pollutant emissions. See the Potential Effects section of the Addendum.

The Addendum also includes a quantitative analysis of mobile source air toxics emissions associated with project operation, and an expanded discussion related to health effects associated with air quality. Air toxics is an emerging field and current scientific techniques, tools, and data are not sufficient to accurately estimate human health effects that would result from a transportation project in a way that would be useful to decision-makers in a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) context.

I-291-004

WSDOT compensates for real property acquisitions only in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition

I-291-006

We are vehemently opposed to Plan A because it destroys the historical Montlake Bridge and surrounding homes, encourages 7000 cars daily on Montlake Boulevard, is designed with insufficient lids, and will ultimately not improve the congestion merging onto interstate 5. I know you are aware of all the logistical reasons this project does not work but I thought it was important to marry a human story with the tragic story of the 520.

I-291-007

I am also emailing this to Mr. Steve Ballmer so that he can better understand the harm that was done by one of his employees who lacks the understanding of this project and ignited an "us vs. them" scenario. Please see attached. I believe Mr. Smith is using his position to unfairly sway the masses to advocate for an unjust plan.

This letter comes to you in order to illustrate the health risks that are eminent and potentially deadly for 1 of your youngest constituents. For what it's worth, my husband is a police officer and puts on a uniform everyday to serve and protect you, Mr. Ballmer, and the people of our state. I look forward to hearing from you on how you will uphold your oath to serve and protect us.

However dire our situation is, I understand that your job is to make decisions that benefit the majority. So please review with renewed concern how most aspects of Plan A are not only harmful to my family, but to the rest of my community. I would hate to see Montlake ravaged by an ill conceived plan and a short-sighted government. I would hope you feel the same.

Best regards,

Michele Love- Kane
1879 East Hamlin St.
Seattle, WA 98112

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.

The value of real estate cannot be predicted with any certainty; thus assessing a project's effect on the value of private property would be speculation at best. The NEPA process avoids such speculation when supporting evidence is lacking.

As stated in the WSDOT handbook *Transportation Property Needs and You* (<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/EAC145C0-9CC9-4B3A-A766-DC1EEA698D85/0/TranspPropNeedsNEW.pdf>): "Your rights as a property owner and the rights of the state are well defined under the laws. These rights are designed to safeguard you, as the owner, from receiving less than the market value for your property to which you are entitled. At the same time, it prevents the state from making payments which would be unfair to the taxpayers whose funds make the improvement of our transportation facilities possible. Mitigation for noise and air quality effects are included in Chapter 3 of the Final EIS. WSDOT will continue to work with adjacent communities to better understand the potential impacts of construction and to jointly develop mitigation measures."

I-291-005

Comment noted.

I-291-006

Option A would not "destroy the Montlake Bridge" as stated in the comment. The SDEIS noted that it would experience an effect as a historic resource. The project would result in effects that would diminish the integrity of the bridge as a historic resource; however, effects would



From: Brad Smith (LCA) His email is: bradsmi@microsoft.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2010 10:11 AM
To: All Employees of MS in Puget Sound
Subject: Replacing the 520 Bridge

Only rarely do we reach out to employees and provide information on public policy issues, but in this instance we felt it was appropriate to do so.

One of Microsoft's top public policy priorities during the current legislative session in Washington State is the timely replacement and expansion of the SR-520 bridge across Lake Washington. More than 5,000 Microsoft employees use this bridge to commute to and from work each day. The current bridge is almost 50 years old, has twice as many vehicles using it as intended, and is overdue in its need to be replaced.

During the next couple of weeks lawmakers in Olympia will decide whether to continue to move forward with the work to construct a new bridge. Three years ago, the legislature approved a replacement design calling for a six-lane span – four general purpose and two HOV lanes – funded in part by state revenue and in part by tolls. Now the legislature will decide whether to start construction. While some work still must be

be mitigated as stipulated in the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. See Section 5.6 of the SDEIS and Final EIS for further information, and the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement in Attachment 9 to the Final EIS.

All of the Options evaluated in the SDEIS were shown to reduce traffic on Montlake Boulevard E in the Shelby-Hamlin vicinity. Option K would result in the greatest decrease at that location, but would increase traffic north of that area on NE Pacific Street and Montlake Boulevard NE. Option K would also result in increased traffic through the Arboretum. Although Option A would a smaller decrease in traffic on Montlake Boulevard E, it would also result in decreases on NE Pacific Street, Montlake Boulevard NE, and through the Arboretum. Improvements in traffic operations in the SR 520 corridor as a result of improved shoulders, lane configurations, and ramp designs would benefit traffic operations on Montlake Boulevard by reducing the level of congestion from SR 520 that affects Montlake Boulevard traffic flow. Further, the second bascule bridge would create lane continuity between the Montlake Cut and the SR 520 Montlake interchange, which would improve traffic operations compared to the No Build Alternative. See the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for further information.

The Preferred Alternative includes a considerably larger Montlake lid than any of the SDEIS options. The lid would run from Montlake Boulevard to the Lake Washington shoreline.

To help improve the connection between SR 520 and I-5, the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project includes a new reversible HOV ramp that will connect to the existing I-5 reversible express lanes south of SR 520. Section 5.1 of the SDEIS and Chapter 5 of the Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS) describe the effects of Option A on this interchange. Section 5.1 of the Final EIS and the Final Transportation

done to finalize a compromise on the span's western configuration, we believe it's important to keep the project on track.

Because the issue is at a critical juncture, we're taking the unusual step of asking for your help in encouraging the legislature to keep the 520 bridge project moving forward. And even if you have a different view, as always we encourage everyone to share their views with their elected representatives. To learn more about the issue and how you can follow up, please click here: (<http://520bridge.posterous.com>)

Thanks.

Brad Smith
Senior Vice President and General Counsel

Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) update this information for the Preferred Alternative.

I-291-007

Comment noted.

From: oppa3@aol.com [mailto:oppa3@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 10:22 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Social and Cultural Issues

I-291-008 The SDEIS does not address the impact of the proposed 520 Bridge on traditional cultural and social events such as the Annual Easter Egg hunt on the lawn of the Seattle Yacht Club.

Picture these pictures with a wider, nosier and closer Portage Bay Viaduct



I-291-008

The Final EIS and Final Cultural Resources Assessment and Discipline Report address historically significant activities at the Seattle Yacht Club, and the effects of the project on these activities. See Sections 4.6, 5.6, and 6.6 of the Final EIS.

See Sections 5.5 and 5.7 of the Final EIS for descriptions of effects on visual quality and noise, respectively.



*** eSafe2 scanned this email for malicious content ***
*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***