

Jennifer--Thanks for your previous communications. I went to the website and I believe I submitted the following comments on the EIS. However, I'm not certain they went through.

Here are the comments I submitted

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

I-300-001

I find it disturbing that there is no map showing the permanent destruction of wetlands around Foster Island. Only a number--7 acres and 1.3 buffer acres--with no baseline numbers.

It wouldn't have been hard to come up with a graphic of the current 520 and the current marsh, in color, that showed exactly how much will be lost permanently when the current project is overlaid upon it. It's no secret that the DoT prefers a big project, and I think the reason this graphic isn't presented is it would create a strong argument for scaling the whole thing back.

These wetlands are Seattle's last and best, and I personally will be saddened that they will be so degenerated for the rest of my lifetime.

I-300-002

The reality that species displaced are "common" is legalistic. It's interesting that many species that were formally named "Common" in the 1800s are now beginning battles with extinction: the Common Nighthawk, Common Tern and the Common Eider among them. Great Blue Herons, which use the Union Bay marsh would have been considered common in Seattle just 6 years ago. Now there is a real question whether they will survive in the city. Similarly, the Pacific Tree Frog is suddenly embattled. Causes of decline are numerous, but the belief by every jurisdiction that the little best marsh they own is not important enough to save could be a factor.

I-300-003

I don't make the argument that because this project will be ugly,--for that reason alone--that we shouldn't do it. But as a professional artist for the last 27 years, who has painted and issued a limited edition print of Union Bay Marsh, I have a strong feeling about aesthetics--I believe that what aesthetics can do is provide a clue. As I see it this project will degenerate perhaps the most beautiful place in Seattle and replace it with the most mind-numbingly ugly substrate in our arsenal --a vast expanse of concrete. And this is the not-so-subtle clue that it's the wrong thing to do.

For me, it would be ashamed to go ahead with this project, as it would cost a lot of money and it would make Seattle, in general, a worse place to live.

I-300-004

We should do a reasonably-priced safety retrofit over just the in-danger portion of 520 that crosses the lake, and postpone any big project until the Viaduct situation and the finances are resolved.

I-300-001

Effects to wetland from operation and construction are shown in Exhibits 5.11-2 and 6.11-2 in the SDEIS. In addition, please refer to the Final EIS Sections 5.11 and 6.11 for updated exhibits which show effects to wetlands from the Preferred Alternative.

I-300-002

There are no listed species within the project area. However, construction of the project could affect non-listed wildlife and their habitat. Many of the animals that occur adjacent to the highway corridor are accustomed to living in urban areas and may not be disturbed by construction-related activity and habitat alteration. Individuals that are more sensitive to disturbance would be displaced to other areas of suitable habitat. Refer to the Ecosystems Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS) and the Ecosystems Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

I-300-003

Comment noted.

I-300-004

Retrofitting the Evergreen Point Bridge and bridge approach structures was not determined to be a viable option under the No Build Alternative or separately. The bridge has had a number of safety and maintenance retrofits to date and further retrofits are not feasible due to structural and pontoon flotation limitations. Hollow columns support the west approach to the Evergreen Point Bridge, the Portage Bay Bridge, and on-and off-ramps in Montlake and the Arboretum. These columns are vulnerable to damage from earthquakes and could not be effectively retrofitted to accepted seismic protection levels. The No Build Alternative evaluated in the Draft EIS did assume that minor retrofits associated with maintenance and safety would continue, however, because a "retrofit

alternative” is not structurally feasible, it was not determined to be a viable option.

Again, I appreciate the chance to comment.

Sincerely,

Ed Newbold Seattle Wildlife Artist since 1983 at the Pike Place Market

Thanks, Best wishes,

Ed Newbold
206 767 7169

--- On **Mon, 4/12/10, SR 520 Bridge SDEIS**
<SR520Bridge_SDEIS@WSDOT.WA.GOV> wrote:

From: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS <SR520Bridge_SDEIS@WSDOT.WA.GOV>
Subject: RE: SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program Feedback
To: ednewbold1@yahoo.com
Date: Monday, April 12, 2010, 5:14 PM

Dear Ed,

Thank you for submitting your comments on the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS).

Your comments will become part of the official public record and will be published, with responses, in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Please check the [SR 520 Program Web page](#) for additional project information and to stay informed about the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Jenifer Young

SDEIS Environmental Manager

I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

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

From: ednewbold1@yahoo.com [mailto:ednewbold1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2010 1:19 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge Replacement & HOV Project
Subject: SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program Feedback

Sent from: Ed Newbold
Address: 4972 17th Ave. South
City: Seattle
State: WA
County: King County
Zip: 98108
Email: ednewbold1@yahoo.com
Phone: 206 767 7169

Comments:

I oppose the DoT's plan for 520. It is astonishing to me that with all the various comments about the project, so few people are zeroing in on the fact that there is no plan as to how to pay for it. ANY other project being proposed for the region would need to have a full financing plan in place first. This is entirely irresponsible, but it is in keeping with the tone and tenor of the entire project. The world is finally turning against big 50's-style highway projects for many reasons, yet the DoT has planned the biggest possible highway it could ever imagine stuffing down Seattle's throat, which it seems to be quite successfully doing right now. I'd prefer to see the DoT prioritize security-only by looking for temporary measures that could retrofit the bridge for safety during storms and earthquakes. Thanks for your time, Ed Newbold

I-300-005

I-300-005

Section 1.10 of the Final EIS provides updated information on project and program funding. The total program cost for the SR 520, Bridge Replacement and HOV program, which includes the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project, the SR 520, Medina to SR 202 project, and the SR 520, Pontoon Construction project, is \$4.65 billion. The unfunded portion of the program is currently \$1.98 billion. Section 1.10 and Section 2.8 provide further discussion on funding and how WSDOT has planned for a potential shortfall with potential phasing for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project. Please see the project website for up-to-date information on project financial information, including state and federal funding sources, and tolling information:
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/financing.htm>.

The potential for retrofitting the existing bridges was discussed during the mediation process and was dismissed from further consideration at that time (see pages 1-17 through 1-19 of the SDEIS). The No Build Alternative evaluated in the Draft EIS did assume that minor retrofits associated with maintenance and safety would continue. However, retrofitting the Evergreen Point Bridge and bridge approach structures to current standards was determined not to be a viable option because the bridge has had a number of safety and maintenance retrofits to date, and further retrofits are not feasible due to structural and pontoon floatation limitations. Although it might be feasible to seismically retrofit the hollow columns supporting the west approach to the Evergreen Point Bridge, the Portage Bay Bridge, and on- and off-ramps in Montlake and the Arboretum, such a retrofit is likely to have similar costs to new construction, similar or greater impacts, and a shorter design life. Thus, it would not be cost-effective compared to building new structures.

Seismic restrainers were added to the bridge joints in the late 1990 to help keep the bridge spans on the piers during an earthquake. The columns are essentially impossible to fix since they are half full of mud

and the tips of the columns are not embedded into the solid ground where they need to be for adequate restraint. A retrofit scheme was looked at that would place new columns outside of the existing ones, encapsulating the existing crossbeam with a new one. This retrofit scheme essentially replaces the old foundation with a new one alongside it and would cost in excess of 60% of the price of a new bridge. This approach is questionable when you factor in that the bridge would still have many other structural/functional deficiencies and is already in excess of 50 percent of its original design life.