

From: Melnikoff & Garrison [mailto:melngar@mindspring.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 10:16 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: FW: FABNIA Comment Letter on WSDOT SR 520 Supplemental EIS
Importance: High

From: Melnikoff & Garrison [mailto:melngar@mindspring.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 9:58 PM
To: 'SDEIS@WSDOT.wa.gov'
Cc: 'anne.preston@kerry.com'; 'Chopp.Frank@leg.wa.gov'; 'Pedersen.Jamie@leg.wa.gov'; 'Murray.Edward@leg.wa.gov'; 'Christine.Gregoire@gov.wa.gov'; 'mike.mcginn@seattle.gov'; 'richard.conlin@Seattle.Gov'; 'sally.bagshaw@seattle.gov'; 'tom.rasmussen@seattle.gov'; 'nick.licata@seattle.gov'; 'jean.godden@seattle.gov'; 'sally.clark@Seattle.gov'; 'bruce.harrell@seattle.gov'; 'tim.burgess@seattle.gov'; 'mike.obrien@seattle.gov'; 'kcexce@kingcounty.gov'; 'larry.gossett@kingcounty.gov'; 'fran@roanokecap.com'; 'ted@thomaslaneassoc.com'; 'pete@delanay.com'; 'wendy@delanay.com'; 'carls@huitt-zollars.com'; 'landmarkLLC@earthlink.net'; 'kirkmckinley@yahoo.co'; 'bob.kelley@seattle.gov'
Subject: FABNIA Comment Letter on WSDOT SR 520 Supplemental EIS

Jennifer Young
Environmental Manager
SR 520 Program Office
600 Stewart Street, Suite 520
Seattle, WA 98102

Jennifer,

I am submitting the attached comment letter on the WSDOT SR 520 Supplemental Impact Statement for FABNIA. (The Fuhrman-Boyer Avenue Neighborhood Improvement Association). The letter is signed by Anne Preston, the FABNIA President, who is currently out of town. Please send any response to her at ann.preston@kerry.com.

Can you please confirm that you received this letter?

Thanks, Ron Melnikoff

Cathy Garrison and Ron Melnikoff
Seattle, Washington 98102
melngar@mindspring.com
206-329-3188 H
206-499-4579 C - Cathy

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

April 15, 2010

Jenifer Young
Environmental Manager
SR 520 Program Office
600 Stewart St., Suite 520
Seattle, WA 98101

E-Mail: SR520Bridge_SDEIS@wsdot.wa.gov

Dear Ms. Young:

FABNIA is a community Non Profit organization formed in 1995 to work on traffic and community development issues in the Fuhrman-Boyer Street corridor in the Portage Bay – Roanoke Park and Montlake neighborhoods. SR 520 bisects Fuhrman-Boyer Avenue, Delmar and 10th Avenue East.

We have worked with City of Seattle Parks and Transportation Departments to install street calming traffic circles/ bulb-outs, improve bicycle and walking opportunities on Fuhrman-Boyer Avenue and to improve south Portage Bay's natural area shoreline and its recreational use adjacent to the Montlake playground.

Land use in Portage Bay - Roanoke Park and nearby parts of the Montlake Community is primarily single family with some multiple housing along Fuhrman-Boyer and Harvard Avenues. Recreational pedestrians, runners, and bicyclists use the neighborhood's residential streets plus the Delmar, Boyer-Fuhrman and Harvard arterials. Our neighborhood is served by Metro route #25. Increased traffic congestion on Harvard and Roanoke Avenues results in part from their access to I-5 and SR 520. Fuhrman-Boyer Avenue also has increased traffic volumes resulting from commuters moving east-west from the U-District, Wallingford, and Eastlake to the SR 520 Montlake interchange. It also has increased traffic from vehicles that avoid the peak hour and weekend traffic congestion that results from the Ship Canal bridge back-ups on the I-5 south bound ramp access to eastbound SR 520.

We previously submitted a set of comprehensive comments in a letter prepared with the Portage Bay Roanoke Park community council in the fall of 2006 on Draft NEPA Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). In the letter we noted that our neighborhood adjacent to SR 520 will have very significant construction and long-term operational impacts. We assume that all comments submitted on the original draft EIS along with those now submitted on the draft supplemental EIS will be reviewed. We assume that they will be incorporated into the final project EIS. The impacts identified in that letter have not substantially changed.

C-034-001

Please see Attachment 12 to the Final EIS for responses to comments submitted on the Draft EIS.

Since the SDEIS was published, FHWA and WSDOT have identified a Preferred Alternative that is similar to Option A, but includes a number of design refinements that minimize the effects presented in the SDEIS. These refinements respond to community and stakeholder reaction to the SDEIS, as well as WSDOT's work with many project stakeholders through the Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 6392 process. In early 2010, the Washington State Legislature passed and Governor Gregoire signed ESSB 6392, which directs WSDOT to work with regional agencies to refine components of the Preferred Alternative. Please see Section Chapter 1 of the Final EIS for a description of the workgroup planning and coordination process, and Chapter 2 for a description of the Preferred Alternative. WSDOT will continue to engage communities as we move forward with the SR 520, I-5 to Medina Bridge Replacement and HOV Project.

C-034-001

C-034-002

We request that we receive information that will allow us to comment on the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) that will be prepared for any 6(f) property acquisition process.

C-034-003

Our concerns on the Supplemental Draft EIS are largely the result of having more time to review the project as well as focusing on option A+ that is likely to be selected as the preferred alternative. Impacts in options L or K-M would affect our neighborhood area in a similar fashion. However, option K-M does include useful additional mitigation in the form of sound reduction pavement. The use of sound reduction pavement along with lighter, less costly and more aesthetic Plexiglas noise walls still deserves consideration. We do not understand why these methods that have proven their viability in European cities cannot be adopted here.

C-034-004

We are disappointed that these revised options do not even include an expanded ramp connection between SR 520 and southbound I-5. This ramp traffic is in part using Fuhrman-Boyer Avenue and other area arterials to avoid the peak hour and weekend traffic Ship Canal I-5 Bridge congestion.

C-034-005

We have also reviewed the recent draft City Consultant Report on SR 520 design options. We applaud the report's inclusion of a city street intersection design in place of the proposed Option A+ intersection design at the nearby SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange. The removal of Option A+ slip lane ramps with a traffic light street intersection design will allow pedestrians and bicyclists to safely cross the intersection. It will also allow for a smaller intersection area saving the adjacent grocery store and creation of a larger intersection related lid.

This option may likely reduce traffic speeds through the intersection as well as into or out from SR 520. The report consultant has noted that the intersection generates about 55% SR 520 project corridor traffic. A review of the SR 520 draft Supplemental EIS Transportation Discipline Report (Exhibits 5-3, 5-8 and 5-12) shows that the total or peak traffic volumes in Seattle of SR 520 do not vary greatly between the year 2030 no-build or build alternatives. This being the case the change in intersection design would likely change traffic flow and the peak hour travel time on the Portage Bay Bridge.

C-034-006

With the proposed 6-lane expansion of the SR 520, the westbound traffic will likely back up at the I-5 intersection. There is also a greater likelihood with the Montlake intersection design change that there may be a similar eastbound SR 520 backup into this key intersection. It does not make sense to pay for a 6-lane Portage Bay Bridge expansion that may create a peak hour parking lot. This increase of non-working capacity could also lead to future demands for the widening I-5 and adjacent Seattle arterials. There needs to be a more thorough review of the provision of a 4 lane Portage Bay Bridge. The traffic flow analysis should further demonstrate both the policy and cost effectiveness advantages of having a 4-lane Portage Bay Bridge option.

C-034-002

WSDOT provided a copy of the Section 6(f) Environmental Evaluation as requested in this comment. Please see Attachment 15 to the Final EIS for a revised version of that document, based on public comments received.

C-034-003

As WSDOT reviews the results of the traffic noise modeling effort and considers reasonable and feasible noise walls, as defined by WSDOT Policy, the SR 520 program will invite the affected community members to participate in a polling process to determine which recommended noise walls to include in the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project. Comments on the SDEIS indicated that use of noise walls is controversial for aesthetic reasons, even if they are warranted and meet the specific FHWA criteria. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative includes a number of noise reduction measures such 4-foot concrete traffic barriers with noise-absorptive coating (see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for a description of the Preferred Alternative).

Updated noise modeling for the Preferred Alternative indicates that these measures 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. In the Fuhrman-Boyer neighborhood, the Preferred Alternative would reduce the number of residences where noise levels exceed FHWA noise abatement criteria, compared to the No Build Alternative. The noise reduction strategies would also avoid the aesthetic effects of noise walls on this natural area. For information on noise modeling results for the Preferred Alternative, please see the Noise Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS), as well as Section 5.7 of the Final EIS.

Quieter concrete pavement is included as a design feature for Option A,

C-034-006 | We would also like to review a cost benefit analysis of replacing the 4 lane Portage Bay Bridge with a 6-lane bridge. We do not understand how the cost of a 6-lane bridge can be justified over that of a 4-lane bridge if the traffic flow forecasts are very similar. We also do not understand how the proposal to add a 7th lane on Portage Bay Bridge meets the 6 lane legislative guidelines.

C-034-007 | An increased size of the Portage Bay Bridge will cause greater construction and long-term impacts. These impacts will affect residents living on or near Boyer Avenue, the Queen City Yacht Club, recreational boat users and the wetland and shoreline habitat of South Portage Bay.

C-034-008 | The Construction Activities section of the supplemental EIS contains some additional information on construction impacts. However, no specific information is provided on mitigation needed to offset the disruption caused by from the overlapping construction period for replacing SR 520 crossings of 10th Avenue East, Delmar and Boyer Avenues (Supplemental Draft EIS, Chapter 3, Exhibit 3-6). We do not understand how Delmar, Roanoke and 10th Avenue detour traffic and construction vehicle traffic will all be able to use Boyer Avenue. Boyer Avenue will also have temporary construction closures. The condition of the street's pavement will be impacted by the increased traffic that will include heavy construction trucks. Additionally, the neighborhood's METRO route 25 bus service and likely bicycle use will be eliminated or curtailed during the multi-year construction period.

C-034-009 | During construction noise levels along Boyer Avenue near SR 520 are shown to exceed 90 db (Supplemental Draft EIS, Chapter 6, Exhibit 6.7-3). There is still no statement in the draft supplemental EIS concerning the need to provide mitigation for any residence sound proofing or vibration damage (Supplemental Draft EIS Noise Discipline Report, page 107).

C-034-010 | The supplemental EIS recommends that construction period traffic use 11th Avenue East where it is a steep narrow one way residential street that provides the only access to the Seattle Prep parking garage (Supplemental Draft EIS, Chapter 3, Exhibit 3.2). This route would be both a safety and logistical nightmare. It might be possible to construct a temporary connection across WSDOT owned property on the south side of I-5. This would connect 10th Avenue East and the 11th Avenue intersection of Delmar during the period of the Delmar street closure.

A smaller bridge along with temporary truck construction access directly to SR 520 ramps directly to SR 520 will help reduce the extent of these impacts. This improvement in construction vehicle access would also be enhanced through the applicable use of barges on Portage Bay. There must be some areas in Portage Bay where the water would be deep enough to use this method.

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.

C-034-004

Comment noted. As described in the SDEIS, SR 520 would connect to I-5 in a configuration similar to the No Build Alternative. Improvements to the I-5/SR 520 interchange would include a new reversible HOV ramp connecting the new SR 520 HOV lanes to existing I-5 reversible express lanes. The project will not preclude future modifications to the SR 520/I-5 interchange.

C-034-005

Following the ESSB 6392 workgroup process, the proposed design refinements described in this comment are retained in the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS. The intersection design refinements at the Montlake interchange would not affect operations on the Portage Bay Bridge. Analysis of the Preferred Alternative shows improved travel times on the SR 520 corridor and increased vehicle throughput of 6 to 13 percent on the Portage Bay Bridge, compared to No Build. Please see Chapters 5 and 6 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for a description of the effects of the Preferred Alternative on traffic flow and peak-hour travel times on the Portage Bay Bridge.

C-034-006

As stated in this comment, there would still be some congestion in the SR 520, I-5 to Medina corridor following implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Please see Chapter 5 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS), which describes the effects of the Preferred Alternative on SR 520 traffic volumes compared to the No

C-034-011 | A smaller 4-lane bridge will also less intrude into the unique wetland habitat of South Portage Bay. Our organization has worked for several years to improve the shoreline of South Portage Bay adjacent to the Montlake Playfield as well as street end parks located adjacent to Fuhrman-Boyer Avenue corridor. We have worked with the Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation restoring this habitat. This work effort has included removing Nutria and replacing invasive flora with native plants. We have also installed a shoreline nature trail and a kayak boat launch at the Montlake Playfield.

C-034-012 | It is stated in Supplemental EIS Attachment 6Draft Section 4(f)/6(f) Evaluation on page 33 that construction and long-term impacts should not impact recreational activities within the Seattle Parks owned section of south Portage Bay. Part of this area would be acquired for the proposed 6 lane Portage Bay Bridge. This is not the case as canoeists and kayakers now have access to use these waters. It also refers to a 2005 Seattle Parks Document (Vegetation Management for Seattle Parks Viewpoints) that notes that invasive plants and overgrown vegetation restrict the views toward Portage Bay. This is no longer the situation as view blocking invasive plants have been cleared from the western section of the shoreline including the kayak area. Visitors to the Montlake Playfield may take their canoes, kayaks or rubber rafts under the bridge area to reach several street end parks and larger City owned parks along the nearby ship canal.

C-034-013 | The construction activities and their associated dust and noise will impact beavers, herons, eagles and other native animals that now use the adjacent south Portage Bay wetlands and wooded shoreline. It will also deny or limit shoreline recreational uses. Restoration meeting 4(f) requirements will be required to return this unique habitat to its current state.

C-034-014 | FABNIA requests that the applicable sections of the SR 520 final EIS and 4(F) documents include the following three mitigation commitments for both unavoidable short term construction impacts and long term operational impacts.

(1) The development of a park for the area under and adjacent to SR 520 from Delmar to the Portage Bay shoreline has been discussed with WSDOT representatives. The park can also include any stormwater treatment wetlands if provided at the shoreline. It needs to include the Frolund residential property that will be acquired for temporary bridge construction.

C-034-015 | (2) Post-construction wildlife and plant restoration will be necessary in the South Portage Bay wetlands and its adjacent shoreline.

C-034-016 | (3) Funding needs to be included to help complete the FABNIA and Seattle Department of Transportation developed plan for traffic calming on Fuhrman-Boyer Avenue. Funding should include street intersection traffic calming measures such as traffic circles and bulbouts.

Build Alternative. A 4-lane Portage Bay Bridge would not allow for HOV lanes, which would provide express lane connectivity, or for a managed shoulder in the westbound direction, which would address congestion. The SDEIS and the Final EIS describe project effects on I-5 interchanges in the project area. See Section 5.1 of the SDEIS and Final EIS, and Chapter 6 of the Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 of the SDEIS) and Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 of the Final EIS). Additionally Final EIS Section 5.1 and Chapter 6 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report describe effects of the project on I-5 operations.

The 6-Lane Alternative, as its name suggests, includes 6 lanes: 4 general-purpose lanes plus 2 HOV lanes. Standard engineering terminology includes only through lanes, not ramps or shoulders, in describing the number of lanes in a facility. Thus, Option A, with an auxiliary lane on the Portage Bay Bridge, fit within the definition of a 6-lane alternative. However, based on stakeholder reaction to the design options presented in the SDEIS, the Preferred Alternative design includes a Portage Bay Bridge with a managed shoulder, rather than an auxiliary lane. The managed shoulder would be open during certain periods to help manage traffic flow. Please see Section 5.1 of the Final EIS and Chapter 5 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report for a description of freeway operations and positive effects of the Preferred Alternative on travel time. Please also see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS, which provides discussion of project alternatives, including the reasons why some alternatives were not studied further.

C-034-007

WSDOT analyzed the advantages and disadvantages of raising or lowering roadway profiles and reduced the footprint of the Portage Bay Bridge where possible while complying with safety and operational standards. Please see the response to comment C-034-006 regarding why the Portage Bay Bridge could not be four lanes. The Portage Bay

C-034-017

The extent of this needed mitigation could be reduced with the construction of a 4-lane SR 520 section between I-5 and the Montlake interchange.

Sincerely,

Anne Preston

President
FABNIA (The Fuhrman-Boyer Avenue Improvement Association)

Bridge will have a reduced speed limit of 45 miles per hour and a 6-foot wide landscaped median planter box to reduce noise effects and improve aesthetics. (Please see the response to comment C-034-003 for more information on the long-term reduction in noise that would occur with the Preferred Alternative compared to the No Build Alternative.) With the Preferred Alternative, there would be no adverse long-term effects on recreational boating in Portage Bay. Permanent fill effects on wetlands in the Portage Bay area would be slightly less than with Option A. The Preferred Alternative would also shade less open water (including aquatic wetlands) than Option A, but more than Options K and L. The area of substrate occupied for columns would be less than with Options A, K, and L presented in the SDEIS.

As the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project design has progressed, WSDOT has performed additional studies to identify alternative construction methods and opportunities to minimize the project's construction effects. Since the SDEIS was published, revised staging plans show that construction in Portage Bay could be reduced up to 1 year (from approximately 6 years to 5 years). WSDOT continues to look for ways to reduce the duration of construction in Portage Bay, and to reduce the effects of construction on the surrounding area. With the Preferred Alternative, project-wide construction effects on wetlands from wetland fill would be less than with Options A, K, and L. Construction effects on wetlands from shading would be more than Options A and L, but less than Option K. Please see the Ecosystems Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for additional information.

C-034-008

With identification of a Preferred Alternative, the closure of Delmar Drive described in the SDEIS is no longer planned. Therefore, detour traffic will not exist along Boyer Avenue. The effects on transportation during construction are refined and reported in more detail for the Preferred Alternative in the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to

the Final EIS). The addendum includes additional information about potential truck traffic volumes on Roanoke Street, Boyer Avenue, and Delmar Drive during construction. For additional information, please see Construction Effects, Chapter 10 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report.

Construction of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project is not expected to affect Metro Route 25. On some streets, bicycle use would be subject to temporary closures as described in the SDEIS, but it would not be prohibited.

C-034-009

During construction of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project, the effects of pile-driving would include noise levels in excess of 90 decibels along Boyer Avenue. WSDOT will implement steps to monitor and manage noise during construction as outlined in WSDOT's construction management procedures and the WSDOT Environmental Procedures Manual. WSDOT will comply with local noise regulations, although some variances may be sought to minimize the overall duration of construction. In addition, WSDOT is developing a Community Construction Management Plan (Attachment 9 to the Final EIS), which will also address construction noise effects in the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project area.

WSDOT will develop a construction vibration monitoring plan to avoid damage to sensitive properties and structures during construction in the Montlake and Portage Bay areas. Monitoring would take place if vibration from impact construction methods, such as pile-driving and vibratory sheet pile installation, is expected to exceed a certain threshold.

C-034-010

Construction assumptions developed for the project identify major

freeways such as I-5, SR 520, and I-405 as primary haul routes intended to carry most project truck traffic. However, there will be times when city streets will need to be used as secondary haul routes. Secondary haul routes for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project were identified based on criteria such as shortest off-highway mileage, and providing access to locations needed for construction where direct highway access is unavailable.

Local jurisdictions can limit the use of non-arterial streets for truck traffic; therefore, efforts were made to identify designated arterial streets for potential use as haul routes. Local jurisdictions will determine final haul routes for those actions and activities that require a street use or other jurisdictional permit. The permit process typically takes place during the final design phase and prior to construction.

Potential haul routes, estimated haul trips, construction road closures, and detour routes have been revised since the SDEIS was published. Please see Section 3.1 of the Final EIS for information on potential haul routes, road closures, and truck trips; 11th Avenue East is not identified in the Final EIS as a potential haul route or detour route. Please also see the response to comment C-034-009 for information on road closures and detour routes; and Section 6.1 of the Final EIS and Chapter 10 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for information on the effects of proposed haul routes, construction road closures, and detour routes. Use of both barges and trucks is anticipated to transport materials and demolished structures to and from the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project area. In areas where there is no water access or where since the SDEIS was published water access would not be of sufficient size or depth, barges cannot be used. Refinements to the Preferred Alternative since the SDEIS was published are intended to reduce disruption to adjacent communities as a result of construction activities.

C-034-011

See the response to comment C-034-006 regarding consideration of a 4-lane Portage Bay Bridge. The City of Seattle has not identified the “South Portage Bay Park” as a separate facility from Montlake Playfield, and therefore this area has not been addressed as a distinct resource in the SR 520, I-5 to Medina EIS. However, the Montlake Playfield is a publicly owned, documented recreation resource of significance for the City of Seattle and is addressed as such in the project’s EIS.

C-034-012

The Final Section 4(f) Evaluation (Chapter 9 of the Final EIS) provides updates to the description of existing ownership of Montlake Playfield property and effects of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would require a permanent acquisition of some Montlake Playfield property, some of which is submerged land (see Exhibit 9-7 in the Final EIS). A total of 1.2 acres of land would be acquired, 1.0 acres of which would be submerged land on the north side of SR 520. The remaining 0.2 acre of acquisition is a sliver of land adjacent to SR 520 right-of-way in the northeast corner of the property. There would also be 3.2 acres of land used for construction easements for the duration of the project, 2.9 acres of which would be submerged land. WSDOT currently has a right-of-way easement partly within the limits of construction, and the terms of WSDOT’s easement is still under study at the time of writing of this Final EIS. Depending on the findings, WSDOT may identify the need for an additional construction easement on City of Seattle property between SR 520 and the limits of construction in this area. After consultation with the City of Seattle, WSDOT may adjust the right-of-way line along the northern boundary of the Montlake Playfield.

However, during construction there would be no physical impediment to launching and landing of hand-carry boats at the shoreline of the park, and with completion of construction, there would be no discernable long term difference to boating access around the bridge in this part of the

park, and no change to shoreline access for launching and landing of small boats from Montlake Playfield (see Sections 5.4 and 6.4 of the Final EIS).

The existing Portage Bay Bridge is supported by 131 columns, most of which are in water. There would be fewer but wider columns with the Preferred Alternative; the proposed Portage Bay Bridge would have 71 total columns, with only 59 of these columns in water, including the eastbound Montlake Boulevard off-ramp. With fewer columns, the boating experience would be enhanced. As discussed in the Recreation Discipline Report Addendum, there would be no physical impediment to launching and landing hand-carried boats at the shoreline of the park during construction or operation of the project. The ability to reach other parks from these launch points would remain.

The Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation's Vegetation Management Plan for Seattle Parks Viewpoints was drafted in 2005, and stated that restoring views at the Montlake Playfield was a "high priority." The City has now been implementing this plan for 5 years, so restoration of these views has now been completed, as indicated in this comment.

C-034-013

Construction of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project would directly affect wildlife and wildlife habitat; however, these effects would be minimal. Many of the animals that occur adjacent to the SR 520 corridor are accustomed to living in urban areas and may not be disturbed by construction-related activities and habitat alteration. Wildlife that is more sensitive to disturbance would be displaced to other areas of suitable habitat. Please see the Ecosystems Discipline Report and Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for further information on effects of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project on wildlife habitat, as well as the responses to comments C-034-007 and C-034-012 regarding effects on

shoreline recreational uses such as hand-carry boat launch sites.

As required by 23 CFR 774, WSDOT has identified the alternative that would cause the least harm to Section 4(f) resources and the least overall harm, compared to the other alternatives considered in the Section 4(f) evaluation. While some properties protected by the provisions of Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act would be affected, WSDOT would mitigate for this use. Please see the Final Section 4(f) Evaluation in Chapter 9 of the Final EIS for further information.

C-034-014

The definition of Section 4(f) protected properties does not cover all properties that may be perceived as parks, such as plantings in rights-of-way or informal open spaces not designated for park purposes. The open space under the Portage Bay Bridge does not constitute a significant public park and therefore is not treated as a Section 4(f) property and does not require mitigation as part of Section 4(f).

Under the Preferred Alternative, WSDOT would develop this area as a stormwater facility. The Seattle Parks and Recreation Department was consulted regarding potential development of the former Frolund property for replacement park use under Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, but the Bryant Building site was selected instead. Even though it would not be used as a park, however, the stormwater facility would provide a positive visual experience, due to the natural looking appearance typical of a constructed stormwater treatment facility and biofiltration swale.

C-034-015

WSDOT will mitigate the effects of construction on wetlands and shoreline. For a description of proposed mitigation of the effects of the Preferred Alternative, please see the Final Conceptual Wetland

Mitigation Plan (Attachment 9 to the Final EIS) and the Ecosystems Discipline Report and Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

C-034-016

Funding for the FABNIA and Seattle Department of Transportation's traffic calming measures on Furhman-Boyer Avenue are beyond the scope of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project. The City of Seattle provides some information on possible funding sources at http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/ntcp_fund.htm.

C-034-017

Please see the response to comment C-034-006 for information on consideration of a 4-lane alternative and Chapter 2 of the Final EIS, which provides discussion of project alternatives, including the reasons why some alternatives were not studied further.