From: Walter Oelwein [mailto:walterc1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 31, 2010 1:46 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Walter Oelweins SDEIS comments

Dear WSDOT,

I-311-001 Please find attached my specific feedback in regards to the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the 520 replacement project.

I have found several issues with the document that I would consider inaccurate, insufficient, problematic, not exploring alternatives, and biased toward the Option A, and against Option K. Many analyses make little sense and call into question the accuracy of the work behind the SDEIS and calling into question whether this document meets the requirements of the SDEIS: To inform the public of the environmental impact of the project. It does not accomplish this basic task, and in fact, appears to attempt to hide the environmental impact of the project.

Amongst my many issues with the document are the following:

I-311-002 **--The 520 project has no apparent designer.** It instead is default roadway expansion + occasional mitigation. This does not meet the level of "design", so all references to "design" need to be stricken and replaced with a more accurate term: "default roadway expansion". If you have an actual designer or firm who would like to take credit for the default roadway expansion, then this needs to be cited. Please observe how it is more accurate to use "default roadway expansion" instead of "design." Please make indicate in the SDEIS: "We did not enlist any expert design help, instead we just put down a wider road and tried to sell it to people. That is, until they offered ideas to improve it."

I-311-003 **--Safety apparently is not an issue.** If safety is the main justification for the project, as is repeatedly cited in the executive summary, then you need to take more seriously the "no build" option, and identify options for fixing the existing bridge.

I-311-004 **--No real improvement, calling into question the whole exercise.** There seems to be no indication of how this project actually improves things. I would expect that an investment at this level would actually improve things significantly. If you can't improve traffic, then at least improve the environment. A tunnel in the Portage Bay/Montlake area would do this, but this idea seems to have been rejected with no justification, although a study done in 2007 shows that it is indeed possible and would indeed make vast improvements in noise, visual quality, recreation, etc. This omission limits any opportunity for actual improvement of the area. There needs to be an argument in the document that

I-311-005 actually says that this will improve things. Noise levels should significantly improve, visual quality should significantly improve, recreation should improve, etc. Other than the proposed lids, I see nothing that would indicate that this is a 21st century transportation corridor.

I-311-001

The SDEIS provided a comprehensive analysis of effects based on the project design and construction information available at that time. Analyses presented in the SDEIS used accepted methodology based on WSDOT and FHWA guidance, as well as other guidance where applicable. The discipline reports describe the methodologies as well as policies and regulations applicable to the specific resource. As described throughout the SDEIS, Option K was found to have far greater effects to natural resources than Option A. Specific topics regarding the characterization of the SDEIS documentation and analysis are addressed in the responses to subsequent comments.

The identification and analysis of alternatives are crucial to the NEPA process and the goal of objective decision making. The identification of alternatives for evaluation in the EIS has lasted over 10 years and has incorporated extensive participation from stakeholder groups, neighboring communities, and the general public. As described in Chapter 1 of the SDEIS and in the Range of Alternatives and Options Report (Attachment 8 to the SDEIS), an extensive range of alternatives has been evaluated for this project. Alternative corridors, technologies (e.g. tubes and tunnels), and travel modes, as well as many design variations within the existing corridor, were evaluated as part of the Trans-Lake Washington Study and again through consultation and public/agency scoping after the initiation of NEPA review in 2000. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS provides additional information on how alternatives were developed and evaluated, and why some solutions were determined not to be reasonable alternatives. During the scoping process and other planning processes preceding it, certain alternatives were eliminated from further environmental study because they WSDOT determined they were not reasonable or would not meet the project purpose and need. The scoping process resulted in a reasonable range of alternatives to be analyzed in an EIS. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS provides additional information on how alternatives were developed and

I-311-006 **--Bus transportation seems much worse.** The new bus situation seems very flimsy. It appears that you will just work it out later. This is a major issue with the new freeway default roadway expansion (see – you can say "default roadway expansion" instead of "design" and it makes more sense. Try it!) In addition, you repeatedly cite that it is Montlake residents that made this suggestion to remove the freeway stop in order to narrow the corridor, as if to punish them for trying to identify ways to make the freeway design better. If you want to play that game, you have to cite who made the suggestion to make it a much wider freeway, who made the suggestion to not do the tunnel, who made the suggestion not to add light-rail, who made the suggestion to put a second drawbridge, who made the suggestion to add a 7th lane over the Portage Bay bridge, etc. It indicates that you don't have a proper designer, and instead are in combat with the constituencies rather than identifying great ways to improve the area. C'mon – you can't design a way to have a good way for the downtown buses to stop at Montlake?

I-311-007

I-311-008

I-311-009 **--Eastbound traffic backed up to I-405? C'mon!** The one area where you say this project will improve traffic significantly is flat out wrong. You cite that your traffic models show that traffic will back up eastbound 520 to I-405 with up to 90 minute delays, and that the new bridge configuration will reduce this significantly. Currently, there are never any back-ups to I-405 on eastbound 520 – ever. Never, ever. This is the one interchange that *doesn't* get backed up – ever–, yet you are using this scenario (somehow it will manifest) as a main argument for how things are going to improve traffic-wise. This default roadway expansion doesn't even make sense as expansion.

I-311-010 **--Visual Impact Study Flawed:** The visual impact study does not seem bourn of reality, and has peculiar pro-Option A bias, when it is clearly the worst design. I have attached my version of the visual impact study from a local resident's perspective. It also misses a major viewpoint area: E. Shelby Street in the Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Neighborhood.

I-311-011 **--Do you think it's time to study the impact of the Montlake Bridge going up?** This has been cited many times by others, but the fact that you haven't studied Montlake bridge traffic during off-peak times – precisely when the Montlake Bridge has to go up – indicates a faulty, incomplete SDEIS. Very commonly on weekends, traffic is backed up more than a mile, and pedestrians can walk faster than cars can drive. Yet you don't take this into account. This needs to be documented before you can move forward on the project. This is a major source of contention that demonstrates your anti-Option K and pro-Option A bias.

I-311-012 **--Foster Island worse-off with Option K? C'mon!** Somehow, Option K, with the land bridge over Foster Island, is repeatedly cited as having the worst environmental impact on the Island, while Option A, which doubles the size of the existing freeway on the island, is cited as having the least impact. This makes no sense and needs to be revised for the document to have any validity.

evaluated, and why some solutions were determined not to be reasonable alternatives.

In spring 2007, the Washington State Legislature passed Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 6099. The bill directed the Office of Financial Management to hire a mediator and appropriate planning staff to develop a 6-lane corridor design for the Seattle portion of the project area. Pages 1-17 through 1-19 of the SDEIS explain the mediation process and the three mediation design options that were ultimately agreed upon by the group and evaluated in the SDEIS. Since the SDEIS was published, FHWA and WSDOT have identified a Preferred Alternative that is similar to Option A, but refines the design to improve future traffic operations in the corridor and minimize potential effects. Through the analyses conducted for the SDEIS, WSDOT determined that Option K would result in more adverse effects on natural resources than Option A; see Chapter 2 for further discussion of how the Preferred Alternative was identified and Table 2-3 regarding design refinements that respond to public comments. If Options K or L were identified as the Preferred Alternative in the future, WSDOT would provide additional information as part of final design and permitting and ensure that negative effects associated with these options are mitigated to the extent practicable. The analysis of these alternatives and design options through the NEPA process, together with the analysis presented in this Final EIS, provides sufficient analysis for decision makers.

The responses to later comments in this letter provide further explanation about how the EIS, which includes the Draft EIS, SDEIS, and this Final EIS, complies with applicable regulations and policies regarding the range of alternatives.

I-311-002

The use of the word "design" is consistent with generally accepted usage for transportation and roadway projects. Design development is an

I-311-013

--The impact of tolling is not sufficient: Your analysis on tolling seems to indicate that this has a limited impact on actual traffic patterns. You need to indicate that this is pure speculation. It seems obvious to me that a $5 roundtrip toll would have an impact on traffic more than what your analysis indicates, and even without HOV, more people would carpool, making the existing footprint sufficient. This indicates that you have manipulated the results to diminish the impact of tolling to justify the larger default roadway expansion.

I-311-014

--Admit and document your mistakes: I would expect that WSDOT be more humble about the mistakes it has made in the past about 520. It was a tragedy that WSDOT put in a freeway through parkland, neighborhoods and left incomplete ramps for 50 years. This project should have been a concerted effort to re-design this corridor, and instead we get default-roadway expansion. WSDOT, where it has improved the designs, needs to indicate that it was not WSDOT who made the improvement suggestions, but concerned local residents. There needs to be an explicit statement that WSDOT did not make any design improvements until local residents suggested improvements. It also needs to indicate that this indicates that WSDOT has no design capacity and the local residents do. Really – why that dynamic? Didn't WSDOT know that it was a failed corridor already, and why didn't it start out of the gate with, "We want to make a design that makes sense for this space – we have enlisted top designers and here are the best ideas for it." Instead, we get a kicking and screaming WSDOT trying to shoehorn its default roadway expansion.

I-311-015

--What's up with your Pacific Street Analysis? Your analysis of the Pacific Street intersection does not seem bourn of reality. Option K makes provides much more through-put, has no delays due to bridge closures (for freeway traffic) and reduces the total number of stop-lights that a freeway bound car needs to deal with. Yet you seem to think that the Option A configuration is still better.

I-311-016

--The second Montlake bridge is awkward and ugly. Admit it. The second Montlake bridge is just going to look funny and ruin the now-historical views. Admit it.

I-311-017

--What about the surface streets that serve as a proxy for 520? You have no traffic analyses of the major surface streets (Fuhrman/Boyer and Delmar/Lynn) that people use currently as a proxy and cut-through for the freeway. With tolling, increased traffic, you need to indicate the impact of traffic on these streets. Really, I'd like to know!

I-311-018

--And many more! (see attached)

I have provided many specific comments on the SDEIS and accompanying discipline reports. Please review them with care so that the 520 project is one that reflects the values and hopes that an investment of this size would justify, and that a revised document that reflect the realities of the project can emerge.

All comments reference the .pdf page number.

ongoing process, and the design options presented in the SDEIS are at a sufficient level of detail to compare their environmental effects. Environmental impact assessments are begun early in the design process so that the design may be improved by input from stakeholders. The design is developed in parallel with mitigation planning, community comments, and permitting requirements. If the public had to wait for the final design before commenting, there would be no opportunity for their comments to influence the design.

While a single individual could put their stamp on a vision or concept for the SR 520 project, no single profession or designer could, or would be allowed to, design the entire project. The SR 520 is being designed by a team of licensed designers, including civil, structural, hydraulics, stormwater, noise, traffic, and geotechnical engineers; landscape architects; and architects—representing WSDOT and its consultants. The mitigation process also involves qualified biologists, including wetland specialists, and fisheries, water quality, and endangered species experts. There have been and will be many designers involved the project, and who will be given credit for their role.

The project is a replacement of an existing highway. It is a transportation project, with the purpose and need of improving safety and mobility for people and goods, as stated on page 1-3 of the SDEIS. Aesthetics and visual quality are addressed through urban design and context-sensitive solutions (CSS), and through NEPA analysis of these resources. Social elements, recreation, and nonmotorized transportation are other examples of the issues relating to urban design that are analyzed in the NEPA documents. Urban design considerations were developed prior to the scoping of alternatives, have continued to be developed during the NEPA process, and will continue to influence the project as design development progresses. Information regarding the visual quality analysis can be found in the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). Related issues were addressed in

Thank you,

Walter Oelwein
1414 E. Lynn St.
Seattle, WA 98112
206-568-3107

Attachments:
Walter Oelwein's SDEIS Comments for WSDOT.xlsx
Walter Oelwein's Visual Quality Analysis.xlsx

other discipline reports, such as Cultural Resources, Social Elements, Recreation, etc. (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). These reports were updated for the Final EIS (see Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

WSDOT has a strong commitment to developing projects in accordance with the context-sensitive solutions philosophy. The SR 520 Program's Context-Sensitive Solutions process is both collaborative and interdisciplinary, and places great emphasis on understanding the relationship between land use form and function and transportation design, as well as engaging and involving community stakeholders in the design process.

One of the first steps in the SR 520 Program was the formation of the Design Advisory Group, whose purpose was to explore and articulate an aesthetic vision for the new SR 520 facilities. The Design Advisory Group was an important step in the ongoing community information and outreach process that began with the Trans-Lake Washington Study and will continue through design and construction. The result of the Design Advisory Group's work, between January and June 2006, was the Corridor Aesthetics Handbook. See the following website for more information regarding the SR 520 Design Advisory Group Handbook: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/library-technical.htmhttp://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/library-technical.htm.

The Corridor Aesthetics Handbook is a statement of the communities' preferences for the aesthetic character of SR 520. The preferences are expressed as thematic visions and aesthetic goals and principles, and were an important first step in the process to establish urban design guidelines. The handbook will be used by WSDOT as the primary reference for community aesthetic preferences as WSDOT further develops and defines the aesthetic guidelines for the facility and its corridor. Development of the aesthetic guidelines will include the work of

I-311-019

WashDOT's incorrect assessment

		Existing	A	K	L
Roanoke	Vividness	2	2	2	2
Roanoke	Intactness	1	2	2	2
Roanoke	Unity	3	2	3	1.5
Portage Bay Bridge	Vividness	3	3	3	2.5
Portage Bay Bridge	Intactness	2	2.5	2.5	3
Portage Bay Bridge	Unity	3	3	3	3
Montlake	Vividness	3	3	2.5	2.5
Montlake	Intactness	1	1.5	1.5	1
Montlake	Unity	1	1.5	1	1
West Approach	Vividness	3	3	3	3
West Approach	Intactness	3	3	2	3
West Approach	Unity	3	3	2	3
		28	29.5	27.5	27.5

I have converted WSDOT's visual impact assessment (found on section 97 of part 1 of the Visual Quality discipline report) to numeric values, with 1 being high negetive impact , 2 being neutral and 3 being positive impact.

It is absurd that Option A gets the highest score.

WSDOT's assessment is incorrect throughout and needs to be changed for this SDEIS to be correct. Please compare WSDOT's assessment to Walter Oelwein's and you will see the difference.

I have also added an analysis of what a tunnel through Portage Bay/Montlake would do. This was not taken into account and makes the SDEIS incomplete and limits the possibilities for this project.

Now you can see numerically why the local residents think the existing default roadway expansion ideas are so bad, and consideration of the tunnel should be put back on the table.

W. Oelwein's (local resident's) assessment

		Existing	A	K	L	Tunnel
Roanoke	Vividness	1	1.5	2	2	3
Roanoke	Intactness	1	2	2	2	3
Roanoke	Unity	1	1.5	2	1.5	3
Portage Bay Bridge	Vividness	1.5	1	1.5	1.5	3
Portage Bay Bridge	Intactness	1.5	1	1.5	1	3
Portage Bay Bridge	Unity	2	1	2	1.5	3
Montlake	Vividness	1	1	2	1	3
Montlake	Intactness	1	1	2	1.5	3
Montlake	Unity	1	1	2	1.5	3
West Approach	Vividness	1.5	1	2	1	3
West Approach	Intactness	1.5	1	2	1	3
West Approach	Unity	1.5	1	2	1	3
		15.5	14	23	16.5	36

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document.

bridge designers, architects, landscape architects, lighting designers, and other specialists who will be preparing the final design packages for the project. It is important that WSDOT and the Design Advisory Group provide the overall aesthetic direction for these specialists as project design development progresses. This work provides the foundation for what will ultimately become the urban design guidelines for a Preferred Alternative. The guidelines will integrate community values, urban design principles, and WSDOT standards and will address such elements as:

- corridor walls
- lid edges and portal entries
- bridge pier walls and abutments
- community lid landscape and architecture elements
- color
- pedestrian barriers
- structures
- illumination
- wayfinding and signage
- planting
- transit facilities
- viewing platforms

The designs presented in the Draft EIS, SDEIS, and Final EIS represent an ongoing process, not a finalized design, at a level of detail consistent with NEPA guidelines to compare and analyze the effects of different options.

I-311-003

Safety is one of the reasons for the project; the other is mobility, as articulated in the project purpose and need. The potential for retrofitting the existing bridges was evaluated during the Trans-Lake study (see the text box on page 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

Because the following pages of this item are difficult to read, a full page version of this item is included at the end of the response to comments on the SDEIS in the printed version, and in a separate PDF file in the DVD and online version.

	Section	.pdf page number	Comment Number	Commentor Name	Comment	Objection
I-311-020	Executive Summary	151 locations	1	Walter Oelwein	The term "desgin" is used 151 times in the SDEIS. However, the term "designer" is used zero times. The term "architect" is used zero times. This means that there was not a designer or an architect. Therefore, the "design" options cannot be called a design. A design requires a designer. A different term such as "default roadway schemes provided by transportation department staffers" should be to be used.	No support
I-311-021	Executive Summary	Overall	2	Walter Oelwein	Anywhere there is a discussion of the safety issues, you should be advocating just tearing down the bridge as an alternative, as has been articulately described by Knute Berger in the www.crosscut.com blog on March 4. After all, if the bridge were to have a collapse, and not exist, we should know what it would look like. A serious analysis is in order. It may be that this would, in fact, be the best situation: The local built and not built environment would improve, publich transportation options would improve across I-90, and a sudden de-emphasis on cars would ensue. Employment centers would shift. This SDEIS, since it poses the likely scenario of a bridge failure, must provide this analysis for this document to be complete. Call it the "bridge no more" scenario.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-022	Executive Summary	Overall	3	Walter Oelwein	There is no analysis of how this bridge reflects the values of the state and city. There is discussion on how there are economic and transportation needs, but there is no discussion on why this bridge is the best way to meet these needs and it squares with the image the city and state project. It is my understanding that Washington State and Seattle want to be viewed as enviornmentally friendly, socially forward, economically advanced and technology smart. In what way does this bridge reflect these. It seems to say more, "1950's-style reliance on cars, mitigated by buses for lower income people, no regard to car exhaust or pollution." I believe that a discussion needs to be included to understand why a bridge and not some other set of solutions? The debate is purely on the level of cars, more cars or most cars (and some busses).	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-023	Executive Summary		4	Walter Oelwein	There is no discussion on how a freeway going through a sensitive area is the best way to meet economic and transportation needs. It appears that no analysis was done as to what impact a large roadway has on a local community and parkland, and whether this adds or detracts value. There is an a priori assumption that a large freeway is of economic benefit, when this isn't necessarily the case. Vancouver has no large freeways going through its downtown, yet the city has thrived over the years, in many ways exceeding Seattle. Portland has demonstrated that adding transit and not roads and managing growth has not had a negative impact on economic growth. San Francisco has not cut open large sections of its neighborhoods, and yet still is able to manage transportation and achieve growth. There needs to be analysis as to why a freeway going through parks and residential neighborhoods is actually necessary, and what the alternatives could be.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-024	Executive Summary	Section 1:3	5	Walter Oelwein	Omission: In the "introduction and project overview" section, page 2, it indicates deficiencies with the 520 bridge (vulnerable to earthquakes, aging). It omits other major deficiencies: The aesthetic design was poor. It was an affront to parkland and neighborhoods, is noisy, creates environmental damage, and is considered a failure as an urban freeway.	Omits or ignores important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

Evergreen Point Bridge and bridge approach structures to current standards was determined not to be a viable option under the No Build Alternative or separately 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. The potential for retrofitting the existing bridges was discussed again during the mediation process and was again dismissed from further consideration (see pages 1-17 through 1-19 of the SDEIS). 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% of its original design life.

I-311-004

Part of the purpose of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project is to “improve mobility for people and goods.” To this end, all traffic analyses for the project have measured not only vehicle trips in the corridor, but person trips, which represent users of transit and carpools as well as single-

I-311-025	Executive Summary	Section 1:4	6	Walter Oelwein	Omission: "The new design options are the result of a public process created to address concerns about the original range of alternatives and design options." The SDEIS omits the actual designers and design process to creating a great freeway design. This statement implies that the mitigation group was the designer. This cannot be correct, since the group provided design criteria for designers to work with in proposing designs.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-026	Executive Summary	Section 1:4	7	Walter Oelwein	Omission: "The Supplemental Draft EIS contains additional detail on construction techniques and on mitigation measures". This omits the design efforts made to meet the requirements agreed by the mediation group. It skips from design requirements from the mediation group to mitigation. Therefore there was no actual design. The options provided cannot be called "designs" and has to use a different word (i.e., default standard roadway) or indicate who the designers are and when annd how their design process took place.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-027	Executive Summary	Section 1:4	8	Walter Oelwein	Omission: "Today, the 4-milelong project corridor includes the interchange at Montlake Boulevard and ramps connecting to Lake Washington Boulevard, both in Seattle." This omits that there are several "ramps to nowhere" that have invaded the arboretum (parkland) space and have been ignored by WashDOT. This description is incomplete in that it implies that the ramps are all functional, and not the result of botched efforts by previous efforts by WashDOT.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-028	Executive Summary	Section 1:4	9	Walter Oelwein	Omission: "Narrow shoulders and the lack of an HOV lane mean that a single breakdown can snarl traffi c for hours, while buses and carpools creep along with general-purpose traffic in the resulting congestion." This omits another point: There is no high-speed transporationon or rail options in this this critical corridor with high demand. This statement implies that the only possible method for crossing the bridge is via car, HOV, or bus, when this is not the only way to get people across the bridge.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-029	Executive Summary	Section 1:4	10	Walter Oelwein	Omission: "In addition, the Portage Bay Bridge and both the west and east approaches to the Evergreen Point Bridge are supported by hollow columns that are especially vulnerable to damage in an earthquake." Whoever designed this made a big mistake. It must be indicated that the same organization who made this mistake will not be making the same mistake. You must include who made the mistake, and what expertise is being employed to make sure it doesn't happen again and how WashDOT has sufficient expertise now to prevent a similar mistake.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-030	Executive Summary	Section 1:4	11	Walter Oelwein	Omission: Neighborhoods and the region as a whole must be better served by reliable infrastructure, yet the built and natural environment must be protected as much as possible from the potential effects of a major transportation corridor." This is not correct. This implies that the project is doing as much as possible to protect the natural and built environment. The members of the mediation group identified ways that this is not applicable, and several ideas that would expand and improve the natural and built environment were rejected without study (such as a tunnel/tube) by WashDOT. A more apt statement would be, "The WashDOT staffers will consider the natural and built environmnet, but are placing a higher priority to expand the tranporation cooridor, and will be sacrificing the natural and built environment, as this reflects the priorities of WashDOT. You could also add, "WashDOT is uniquely qualified to lay down roads, but is not qualified to protect the natural and built enviornment." This is a more accurate statement.	Error or Incorrect

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

occupant vehicles. The addition of high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes to the corridor, with no increase in the existing number of general-purpose lanes, is intended to improve the speed and reliability of transit service, thus providing an incentive to use transit. As noted in the discussion of project need on page 1-6 of the SDEIS, the prospect of substantially increased travel times in 2030 "…makes it imperative that commuters be provided with travel choices that allow them to avoid driving alone, and that the proposed project be built to support increased use of transit and HOVs." As shown in SDEIS Exhibit 5.1.8, HOV and transit commuters would experience substantial travel-time benefits in 2030 with the addition of the HOV lane.

In 2006, citizens from the Madison Park and Roanoke neighborhoods suggested constructing the segment of SR 520 that extends from I-5 to the western end of the floating bridge as a tunnel. WSDOT reviewed the tunnel concept, investigated engineering, evaluated key environmental considerations, and identified preliminary cost ranges. This work is documented in the Assessment of Tunnel Concept I-5 to Lake Washington report of April 17, 2006 (available at http://www.wsdot.wa.govNRrdonlyresB81AC988-E033-4255-AFCE-0D38DF05E52D0AssessmentofTunnelConceptI5toLakeWashington41706.pdf). The assessment found that major engineering challenges are associated with construction of a tunnel through this area. The tunnel concept would provide fewer opportunities for local traffic to access SR 520. Maintaining correct roadway geometrics would require significant excavation on Marsh Island and Foster Island for the tunnel to transition above ground and connect to the Evergreen Point Bridge, and would likely require substantial open water fill that would be regulated under the Corps of Engineers Section 404 permitting process. Effects to the ecosystems of the Arboretum and Marsh and Foster Islands would be substantial; restoration of the natural environment would take decades. There is a strong likelihood that resource agencies with jurisdiction would be unwilling to issue required permits for tunnel construction, and the

I-311-031	Executive Summary	Section 1:4	12	Walter Oelwein	Omission. Two reasons are cited for why the project is needed now. You should add a third: New opportunities in high-speed rail transit (namely Sound Transit at Montlake) have emerged since the original project was conceived, and we need to maximize the effectiveness of this opportunity with this project. You should add a fourth: New technologies that have been used in other parts of the world allow for integrating transportation cooridors with environmentally sensitive and valuable locations, and this project afford to take care of this. You should add a fifth: It is time to rectify the 50 year old poor design that has created noise, pollution, poor aesthetics that have detracted from the historical character and parkland of the space, and has been an overall negative for the Seattle area in terms of prestige and quality of life.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-032	Executive Summary	Section 1:4	13	Walter Oelwein	Omission: There is no mention as to why NOT to do the project now. For example: We do not have a design that meets the project needs. We have not tried to find a design that meets the project needs. The nearby residents do not believe that WashDOT has sufficiently considered options that meet the design needs. The interchanges being proposed do not solve the problems outlined. The project has not considered how to integrate or expand Sound Transit's light rail line. These are good reasons NOT to do the project, and needs to be stated if you are stating reasons to do the project.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-033	Executive Summary	Section 1:6	14	Walter Oelwein	Omission: It makes it clear that the bridge can be rehabilitated to withstand greater wind speed. However, it is not stated why the entire bridge needs to be re-built. It is not stated why replacement is needed instead of doing another rehabilitation to get to the design standard. This would certainly be less expensive and faster to accomplish (thus safer).	Omits or ignores important info; Confusion over long term and short term
I-311-034	Executive Summary	Section 1:7	15	Walter Oelwein	Omission: By saying columns are vulnerable to earthquakes, this indicates that columns are a bad design to begin with. This section implies that columns are the only option to replace the bridge, when a tube or tunnel (potentially less vulnerable to earthquakes) are an option. The omission: With all of our proposed designs, we are repeating the same bad designs (high columns) that created this crisis.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-035	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	16	Walter Oelwein	Omission: "This makes it imperative that commuters be provided with travel choices that allow them to avoid driving alone, and that the proposed project be built to support increased use of transit and HOVs." It needs to be stated that WashDOT has made no effort to identify the best transit for the project, and has assumed HOV and Buses as the only options. This failure has caused delays to the project.	Omits or ignores important info; Confusion over long term and short term
I-311-036	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	17	Walter Oelwein	"Congestion generates pollutants from idling vehicles, which are much less effi cient than vehicles operating at higher speeds." This implies that cars are the primary and encouraged mode of transporation, versus other options. This is not necessarily true. No car would cause less pollution than a car. This section needs to explain that WashDOT has assumed that cars are the preffered method of transport, and is discouraging less polluting options (such as rail) in the design process. In doing this, WashDOT has assumed in increased pollution via cars over the next 50 years. A better discussion would be to say, this bridge replacement has the opportunity to reflect our values going forward, and not in the past." Or, it could say, "WashDOT sees cars as the only viable transportation options."	Omits or ignores important info; Confusion over long term and short term

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

tunnel concept would add billions of dollars to the SR 520 project costs. Designing the project to coordinate with the Sound Transit tunnel, the Portage Bay Bridge, the interchange connection to I-5, and on- and off-ramps to the local street network also present unique design challenges and would be expensive to engineer and construct. The reduction in access could result in increases in street congestion in some locations. Based on these issues related to feasibility, design, environmental effects, and cost, WSDOT eliminated the I-5 to Lake Washington tunnel from further consideration as an alternative and did not evaluate it in the Draft EIS.

I-311-005

The Preferred Alternative would reduce effects on the environment, compared to Option A, while meeting the purpose and need for the project. In agreement with FHWA, WSDOT continues forward to complete NEPA documentation by analyzing the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS.

The Preferred Alternative responds to concerns from neighborhoods through a number of design enhancements. These enhancements include a considerably larger Montlake lid, which is a full rather than partial lid and runs from the Montlake interchange to the Lake Washington shoreline; and a number of noise reduction strategies such as 4-foot concrete traffic barriers with noise-absorptive coating (see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS). 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, except potentially along I-5 in the North Capitol Hill area where the reasonableness and feasibility of a noise wall is still be evaluated. This noise reduction approach would also avoid the aesthetic impacts of noise walls in this area. Information on noise modeling results for the Preferred Alternative can be found in the Noise Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) and in

I-311-037	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	18	Walter Oelwein	This section misrepresents the accomplishments. It states that these are accomplishments, but only lists the features. An accomplishment is a measurable change in a key metric. So "designed to current wind standards" should change to "Move the bridge from wind 77mph wind standard to 92 wind standard." (or whatever the new metric the bridge would be) -- it's unknown since it's vague and not listed.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-038	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	19	Walter Oelwein	This section misrepresents the accomplishments. It states that these are accomplishments, but only lists the features. An accomplishment is a measurable change in a key metric. So "New Portage Bay and west and east approach bridges designed to current seismic standards." should change to "Change the ability to withstand a 6.0 earthquake to a 6.8 earthquake." (or whatever the new metric the bridge would be) -- it's unknown since it's vague and not listed.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-039	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	20	Walter Oelwein	This section is misrepresents information. It states the accomplishments, but only lists the features. An accomplishment is a measurable change in a key metric. So "Four general-purpose lanes and two HOV lanes, providing increased mobility and reliability for transit and carpools as well as for general-purpose vehicles." should change to "Current throughput of x cars and y busses to a cars and b busses. (or whatever the new metric the bridge would be) -- it's unknown since it's vague and not listed.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-040	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	21	Walter Oelwein	This section misrepresents the accomplishments. It states that these are accomplishments, but only lists the features. An accomplishment is a measurable change in a key metric. So "Four general-purpose lanes and two HOV lanes, providing increased mobility and reliability for transit and carpools as well as for general-purpose vehicles." should change to "Current throughput of x cars and y busses to a cars and b busses. (or whatever the new metric the bridge would be) -- it's unknown since it's vague and not listed.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-041	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	22	Walter Oelwein	This section misrepresents the accomplishments. It states that these are accomplishments, but only lists the features. An accomplishment is a measurable change in a key metric. So "Landscaped lids over sections of the highway to reconnect neighborhoods." should change to "Create X acerages of parkland where there are currently freeway crevasses (or whatever the new metric the bridge would be) -- it's unknown since it's vague and not listed.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-042	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	23	Walter Oelwein	This section misrepresents the accomplishments. It states that these are accomplishments, but only lists the features. An accomplishment is a measurable change in a key metric. So "A regional bicycle/pedestrian path across Lake Washington with connections to existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities." should change to "Create 2 miles of bike lanes where there are currently no bike lanes creating an estimated x bike commuters across the lake" -- it's unknown since it's vague and not listed.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-043	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	24	Walter Oelwein	This section misrepresents the accomplishments. It states that these are accomplishments, but only lists the features. An accomplishment is a measurable change in a key metric. So "Stormwater treatment to improve the quality of runoff from SR 520, which is currently not treated." should change to "Reduce runoff of x polluted gallons per year" -- it's unknown since it's vague and not listed.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-044	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	25	Walter Oelwein	This section misrepresents the accomplishments. It states that these are accomplishments, but only lists the features. An accomplishment is a measurable change in a key metric. So "Noise reduction features, which could include noise walls and/or quieter, rubberized asphalt pavement" should change to "Reduce noise in the surrounding neighborhoods by x %" -- it's unknown since it's vague and not listed.	Error or Incorrect

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

Section 5.7 of the Final EIS.

Operation of the Preferred Alternative would result in benefits to recreation, including a bicycle/pedestrian lane across the floating bridge, a pedestrian crossing beneath the Montlake lid that would link the Arboretum to East Montlake Park, and improved connections between the Arboretum and other regional trails such as the Burke-Gilman Trail (see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS and the Recreation Discipline Report Addendum in Attachment 7 to the Final EIS). Changes in visual quality would vary by location; however, many areas would experience improvements to visual quality compared to existing conditions due to design enhancements such as lids, column spacing, and pedestrian and bicycle amenities. In the near term, overall visual quality ratings for the Preferred Alternative would be slightly lower than existing vividness, intactness, and unity ratings and comparable to those of Option A. In 10 to 20 years, when trees and shrubs will have grown and filled in, overall vividness, intactness, and unity for all views would be similar to or higher than their current ratings. Section 5.5 of the Final EIS and the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) describe the character and degree of visual effects.

I-311-006

See the response to Comment I-311-004 regarding benefits to HOVs that would result from the project. The removal of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station remains a component of the Preferred Alternative. Please see the Range of Alternatives and Options Evaluated Report (Attachment 8 to the SDEIS) for a detailed discussion about why removal of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station is being considered.

The Preferred Alternative would add new bus stops on the Montlake lid, and a number of refinements that address transit connections. The bus stops on the lid would accommodate both eastbound and westbound buses, replacing the current Montlake Freeway Transit Station stops for

I-311-045	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	26	Walter Oelwein	In this section, it lists the accomplishments, but what does the project not accomplish? This omission needs to be included: Does not restore the arboretum from the land-grab of the 60's. Does not maximize the historic character of the neighborhoods. Does not interconnect the Sound Transit station. There are many things that this project design fails to do, and they need to be listed.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-046	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	27	Walter Oelwein	In this section, it lists the accomplishments, but it does not list the metrics that it makes worse: It introduces more cars in to the neighborhoods and the arboretum, it increases the amount of break dust into the air, it increases the carbon footprint that the bridge brings, it introduces an ugly bridge to a historic vista, it creates greater shadows and footprint on sensitive lands. These need to be included in the executive summary, with metrics.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-047	Executive Summary	Section 1:8	28	Walter Oelwein	You need to include the "good" things that could happen by not building: "Can identify ways to further reduce the carbon footprint of freeways." "Can adopt more modern designs, such as tube and tunnels, that reclaim Arboretum parkland, improve views and increase flow in interchanges." "Can better integrate with Sound Transit." "Keep a narrower footprint on portage bay, Arboretum, and Montlake." These are all valid reasons not to build, or further improve the deisgns, but are omitted.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-048	Executive Summary	Section 1:9	29	Walter Oelwein	"The SR 520 Pontoon Construction Project would construct new pontoons that would be used to restore the existing traffi c capacity of the Evergreen Point Bridge in the event of a catastrophic failure." This implies that pontoons are the only option for a revision. In fact, it makes it required that it be pontoons that would replace the bridge, rather than a tube or tunnel. Why not create a tube or tunnel in the case of catostrophic failure. By doing this project, you have solidified an inferior design option as the only design option, and without a public comment period. This makes this Supplemental Draft EIS invalid.	Error or Incorrect; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-049	Executive Summary	Section 1:9	30	Walter Oelwein	"This project is part of the Lake Washington Urban Partnership, a collaborative effort between WSDOT, King County, the Puget Sound Regional Council, and FHWA to explore innovative ways to help manage congestion on SR 520." This is the first mention of "innovative" management of congestion. This idea is very incomplete and needs to be explored more. In the sections prior, there is no mention of the impact that tolling could have on congestion. It implies that cars can cross for free at any time in the future, when there have been no experiements on whether tolling will discourage trips on their own. This SDEIS is thus inconsistent, in that it implies that larger freeways (4 + 2) is the way to go, when you can work on tolling to mediate traffic, congestion, carbon footprint, impact to neighborhoods.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-050	Executive Summary	Section 1:9	31	Walter Oelwein	"Innovative management of congestion." By mentioning tolling as the only "innovative management of congestion", this reveals that innovative elements about the design have not been made. This is another reason why "not" to do the project (also omitted). WashDOT has not made any effort to identify innovative ways to reduce traffic, congestion, pollution, noise, carbon footprint, or pursued innovative efforts to restore parkland (in fact, this SDEIS later tries to make the argument that the option that improves parkland has the worst environmental impact), improve the historic character of the neighborhood, better integrate and expand mass transit. This needs to be called out in the SDEIS.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

buses traveling between the University District and the Eastside. The Montlake lid has been enhanced and expanded compared to Option A. The Montlake lid stop would also function as a flyer stop during the off-peak periods so that passengers could access the SR 520 buses traveling between the eastside and downtown Seattle. University Link light-rail service, expected to be operational in 2016, will accommodate some of the trips that now use the bus stops.

WSDOT has collaborated with the University of Washington, City of Seattle, King County Metro, and Sound Transit as part of the design refinements and transit connections workgroup required by Engrossed State Senate Bill (ESSB) 6392 to determine transit connections can be improved. The workgroup evaluated the transit connections at the Montlake interchange, and identified preferred bus stop locations and made specific design recommendations to ensure an adequate level of midday service between the University/Montlake and the Eastside after the closure of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station. These recommendations are included in the ESSB: Design Refinements and Transit Connections Workgroup Recommendations Report (Attachment 16 to the Final EIS). Chapter 2 of the Final EIS describes the Preferred Alternative, and Chapter 8 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) describes the effects of the Preferred Alternative on transit service, facilities, ridership, transit travel times, and rider connections.

I-311-007

WSDOT considered a wide range of alternatives before narrowing them down to those evaluated in the Draft EIS, SDEIS, and Final EIS (see the response to Comment I-311-001). Reasonable alternatives include those that are practical or feasible from the technical and economic standpoint, rather than simply desirable from the standpoint of the applica. What constitutes a reasonable range of alternatives depends on the nature of the proposal and the facts in each case. FHWA guidance provides

I-311-051	Executive Summary	Section 1:10	32	Walter Oelwein	It mentions Option A. However, Option A+ is not mentioned at all. This is the option that representatives of WashDOT were advocating prior to the release of the SDEIS. So which is it, Option A or Optoin A+, and what is A+? This needs to be fully integrated into the SDEIS or else the SDEIS is incorrect.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-052	Executive Summary	Sectoin 1:10	33	Walter Oelwein	"6-Lane Alternative with the following design options that were developed in 2008 through a mediation process". This reveals that these "designs" were not designed at all. They were negotiated. This means that the word "design" should be replaced with "Negotiated roadway placement". To use the word design implies that there were designers who made a conscious effort to create something that meets the various needs of the project. No designers are listed, and the resulting roadway placements relfect an uninspired, unmindful project. It is an error to call these designs. It's like customers "negotiating" what a car looks like with the manufacturer. The car manufacture cannot claim that it was "designed."	Error or Incorrect; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-053	Executive Summary	Section 1:10	34	Walter Oelwein	"For these reasons, the No Build Alternative is inconsistent with WSDOT's standards for safety and reliability." This implies that WashDOT has standards for safety and reliability. What about other standards: Impact to the local community, aesthetics, encouraging alternate forms of transportation. The SDEIS needs to include all standards that a highway should have and whether the current design meets these.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-054	Executive Summary	Section 1:11	35	Walter Oelwein	The two diagrams (1-4 and 1-5) are direct comparisons, yet they are not to scale. This makes it difficult to understand the difference. It appears that the diagram 1-5 is a much smaller scale, yet it is still significantly wider. This needs to be shown in full scale so that the reader can actually see wha the environmental impact is.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-055	Executive Summary	Section 1:12	36	Walter Oelwein	The lids are mentioned as being developed "through mediation." Again, these are not by design, but through negotiation. This means that WashDOT did not do any design work to make this a quality, designed freeway. It proposed default roadway placement, and waited for people to complain about the bad job they did. WashDOT needs to acknowledge in the SDEIS that it did not make any effort to create a "well designed freeway/bridge" that elevates the community and transportation situation. It stared with the bare minumum, and begrudgingly added features. This is why it does not earn the right to be called "Designed." All references to "design" need to be restated as "default roadway placements by WashDOT staffers."	Error or Incorrect; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-056	Executive Summary	Section 1:12	37	Walter Oelwein	"as they do along much of the SR 520 corridor and as they would continue to do under all alternatives without mitigation." This omits that a designer (not default roadway placer) would have identified technologies and placements that eliminate noise altogether (such as a tube/tunnel) so that mitigation wouldn't be necessary. The SDEIS needs to be corrected to say, "WashDOT did not invest in identifying ways to elminated noise altogether, and assumed that mitigation was the only way to go."	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-057	Executive Summary	Section 1:12	38	Walter Oelwein	"Option A was defined as including noise walls and/or quieter, rubberized asphalt pavement." This is vague-- which is it and or or? The answer would have an environmental impact, making this document incomplete.	Omits or ignores important info;

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

additional discussion of the relationship between purpose and need and alternatives consideration, analysis and selection, and states that "alternatives which meet the purpose and need for the project at an acceptable cost and level of environmental impact relative to the benefits which will be derived from the project" should be considered. (http://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/projdev/tdmneed.asp)

The Range of Alternatives and Options Evaluated Report (Attachment 8 to the SDEIS) describes the history of alternatives development for the SR 520 corridor and provides the framework, context, and supporting details for understanding how the project has evolved. It also explains the screening that has occurred to narrow and define the scope of the alternatives and the legislative actions that have influenced the project. The information contained in this report was summarized in pages 1-9 through 1-22 of the SDEIS. Additional information about alternatives is included in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS.

As explained in Chapter 1 of both the Draft EIS and the SDEIS and documented more fully in the Range of Alternatives and Options Examined report (Attachment 8 to the SDEIS), the SDEIS design options were the product of an alternatives analysis that had already considered multimodal solutions and a Draft EIS that evaluated No Build, 4-lane, and 6-lane alternatives. This process identified the 6-Lane Alternative—four general-purpose lanes plus two HOV lanes to serve transit and carpools—as best meeting the project purpose of improving mobility for people and goods. See also the response to Comment I-311-004 regarding the benefits of adding continuous HOV lanes to the corridor.

Attachment 8 to the SDEIS explained the considerations that led to inclusion of a new bascule bridge over the Montlake Cut in Option A. Attachment 8 also explained the considerations that led to the inclusion of an auxiliary lane on the Portage Bay Bridge in Option A. However,

I-311-058	Executive Summary	Section 1:12	39	Walter Oelwein	"Option K was defined as including only quieter, rubberized asphalt pavement for noise reduction." It is not clear why Option A would have noise walls, but Option K would not. Perhaps it is because the noise walls would be so exceedingly ugly that it is unfathomable that anyone would put such a monstrous bridge in a population center, and that neighbors through the mediation process proposed and identified better ways to reduce the monstrocity of a noise-walled super-bridge, which the WashDOT default roadway placers put in. Either state this as the reason for why Option A has noise walls and other options do not.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-059	Executive Summary	Section 1:12	40	Walter Oelwein	"they do not affect FHWA's and WSDOT's responsibility to identify and consider effective noise abatement measures under existing laws." While WashDOT may not have responsibility under the law, it has responsibility to make the project as effective as possible. This statement needs to be clarified, "WashDOT has not made an effort to design in significant noise reduction and is interested only in doing the minimum that the law requires. WashDOT has not made an effort to thoroughly investigate ways to avoid creating massive amounts of noise altogether."	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-060	Executive Summary	Section 1:12	41	Walter Oelwein	"Noise modeling done for the project indicates that noise walls would meet all FHWA and WSDOT requirements for avoidance and minimization of negative effects." This makes it seem that noise is the only consideration in noise walls. It needs to also state that noise walls have the detrimental effect of being eggregiously ugly, unpopular on a free-standing bridge, and something that will be met with resistance. It also needs to be stated that given that mitigation efforts create bigger problems than they solve, more creative expertise needs to be invested in order to find ways to achieve all objectives, such as creating a tube or tunnel.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-061	Executive Summary	Section 1:12	42	Walter Oelwein	"Quieter pavement has not been demonstrated to meet these requirements in tests performed in Washington state, and therefore cannot be considered as noise mitigation." This leaves an incomplete story. What did the tests reveal? Did they reveal that they do have some impact? That they would make a better experience for the residents in some way? The way this is written implies an anti-quiter pavement bias by WashDOT, and needs to be corrected to show a willingness to use every technology imaginable to make this bridge replacement an improvement over the failures of the existing bridge.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

based on comments received on the SDEIS and in order to reduce the footprint of the Portage Bay Bridge, the Preferred Alternative includes a managed shoulder instead of a seventh, auxiliary lane.

Light rail on SR 520 is viable as a future undertaking, although it is not being studied for implementation as part of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project. 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.Table 2-2 of the Final EIS illustrates the history of regional decision making on east-west mass transit routes, which began in 1967 when the Comprehensive Public Transportation Plan for the Seattle Metropolitan Area identified a rail corridor from Seattle to Bellevue and Redmond on I-90. Subsequent studies and agreements over the next 40 years have all continued to identify I-90 as the preferred rail transit corridor, with predicted ridership similar to or more than SR 520 and substantially lower costs and environmental effects. However, while WSDOT believed that the design of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project already accommodated potential future light rail, through coordination with Sound Transit, WSDOT has designed the Preferred Alternative to have enhanced compatibility with potential future light rail compared to the SDEIS design options. Light rail could be accommodated either by converting the HOV lanes for rail use or by adding new light-rail-only lanes. 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. See Chapter 2 of the Final EIS and the response to Comment C-021-001 for further information.

Throughout the course of SR 520 planning, several stakeholders have suggested that placing the highway in a tunnel might be preferable to

I-311-062	Executive Summary	Sectoin 1:10	43	Walter Oelwein	"WSDOT and FHWA will work with the affected property owners after a design option is selected to make a fi nal determination of reasonable and feasible mitigation measures for projectrelated noise effects." This is a vague statement. It implies that mitigation efforts are the only option, when good design is not covered. i.e., design a freeway that does not create noise in the first place. This is imaginable in the case of a tube-tunnel. The SDEIS is incomplete in that it implies that "default roadway placement with mitigation" is what is being evaluated for environmental impact, when other alternatives -- with good design, could be included.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-063	Executive Summary	Section 1:13	44	Walter Oelwein	"What are the 6-Lane Alternative design options A, K, and L?" Again, using the word "design" implies that there was a conscious designer. It needs to be revealed who made these default roadway placement. It it my understanding that "option A" was proposed as a default roadway placement by WashDOT. Other options came from concerned residents about the deficiency and uncreativity of the default roadway placement, and offered new "designs." In all cases, it appears that WashDOT did not make a concerted effort to create a great design, and instead defaulted from the previous, unsuccessful, damaging roadway placement and negotiated with concerned citizens for improvements. This process needs to be made more explicit, since it needs to be understood why these are considered the best options and worth the investment in a SDEIS or billions of dollars of construction.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-064	Executive Summary	Section 1:14	45	Walter Oelwein	"All options place an emphasis on multimodal transportation by decreasing reliance on single-occupant vehicle travel and facilitating transit connections." This cannot possibly be true. Each "option" has 66% lanes + increased size of breakdown lanes for single-occupant vehicles. This creates a greater emphasis on the SOV, not less. If designs were proposed that started with rail transit, reduction of cars through tolling, etc., then you could claim this. Instead I would revise this sentence to "All options place an emphasis on SOV cars, with the increased shoulder and the effort to encourage greater throughput of cars in the coming years."	Error or Incorrect
I-311-065	Executive Summary	Section 1:14	46	Walter Oelwein	"The project features for each design option are described under the geographic area headings". Again, this implies that these options were designed. They were not, they were first default roadway placement (Option A), and then new options were suggested by creative and concerned neighbors. This is not deisgn.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-066	Executive Summary	Section 1:14	47	Walter Oelwein	Nowhere in this section is the connectivity to the Montlake Sound Transit station mentioned. What are the benefits and impacts of each default roadway placement on this? This reveals that the impact of the Montlake Sound Transit station was not even considered in this SDEIS, and needs to be included.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-067	Executive Summary	Section 1:15	48	Walter Oelwein	In the Option A drawing (page 14), it mentions a "7th lane." This is not mentioned in the description of the various alternatives and needs to be removed. Using the term "6-lane" alternative becomes incorrect. The SDEIS needs to remove this 7th lane from the bridge on option A, or else the term "6-lane" alternative needs to be revised to "WashDOT insertion of extra lanes without regard to mediation."	Error or Incorrect

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

rebuilding it at ground level and/or on bridges. The Trans-Lake Study Committee reviewed options for tunnels and submerged tubes under Lake Washington early in its development of options for SR 520 (1997-1999). Tunnel options evaluated included bored tunnels below the lake bottom, sunken tunnels placed on the lake bottom, and floating tunnels suspended below the lake surface. The feasibility of using a tunnel depends on many design considerations, including tunnel technology, the feasibility of constructing interchanges, soils stability, safety, and ventilation. Tunnels would be extremely difficult and costly to engineer in the SR 520 corridor (see pages 3-5 and 3-6 of the Draft EIS). Lake Washington is approximately 200 feet deep, with a thick layer of peat deposits that make the bottom unstable. A bored tunnel across the lake would have to be engineered at more than 300 feet deep. To satisfy geometrics requirements, the east and west tunnel entrances could need to extend as far as I-5 and I-405 with no access in between. Sunken and floating tunnels would create extensive surface disturbance at the transitions from tunnel to highway and could interfere with fish passage. A cross-lake tunnel would also eliminate the proposed regional bicycle/pedestrian path between Seattle and the Eastside unless a separate structure was built.

Please see the response to comment I-311-004 regarding a tunnel from I-5 to the western end of the floating bridge. WSDOT eliminated cross-lake tunnels and the I-5 to Lake Washington tunnel from further consideration as alternatives for in the Draft EIS based on the issues described above and in the response to comment I-311-004 regarding feasibility, design, environmental effects, and cost.

See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding design considerations in development of the project.

I-311-008

See the response to comment I-311-006.

I-311-068	Executive Summary	Section 1:18	49	Walter Oelwein	"Should a decision be made to pursue any new design variations with signifi cantly greater environmental effects than Options A, K, or L, they would need to be evaluated in another supplemental environmental document, which would change the project schedule." What about design options that significantly less environmental effects (such as a tube/tunnel)? Would they need to be evaluated, or could they be adopted.	Error or Incorrect; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-069	Executive Summary	Section 1:18	50	Walter Oelwein	Table 1-2 says that it is "6 lanes". This can't be true, since the drawings explicitly says 7 lanes. The summary is hiding something -- if it can add an extra lane in this section, can it add more lanes elsewhere?	Error or Incorrect
I-311-070	Executive Summary	Section 1:19	51	Walter Oelwein	This section implies that only option A is affordable. However, it does not state how option A also exceeds the 4.65 billion cap set by the legislature, when you count the costs of the bonds. All alternatives are too expensive, and this needs to be stated outright	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info
I-311-071	Executive Summary	Section 1:19	52	Walter Oelwein	"As discussed previously" This was not discussed previously	Error or incorrect
I-311-072	Executive Summary	Sectoin 1:19	53	Walter Oelwein	Is discussion of the budget supposed to be part of the enviornmental impact? It actaully seems out of scope from the purpose of the project. The scope should be to discuss the enviornmental impacts of the project, and this section detracts from this, and implies the best option is the cheapest one. The "environmental impact statement" should have the focus be on the environmental impact, not the budget impact.	Error or incorrect
I-311-073	Executive Summary	Section 1:19	54	Walter Oelwein	"However, the funding for the full corridor program falls over $2.65 billion short of the $4.65 billion total. WSDOT and the legislative workgroup are working to identify additional funding sources, including federal stimulus funding under the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act." The charts earlier imply that Option A is the only one that is affordable. But this statement demonstrates that all options are not funded. Therefore, it needs to be clearly stated at this point, "No options are fully funded."	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-074	Executive Summary	Section 1:20	55	Walter Oelwein	"To address the potential for phased project implementation, the Supplemental Draft EIS evaluates the vulnerable structures separately as a subset of the "full build" analysis. This subset is referred to in the Supplemental Draft EIS as the Phased Implementation scenario." This needs to be clearer: If the different phases are not funded, will the project proceed? Will portions of the projects (such as lids) be removed? If so, then the SDEIS needs to address the enviornmental impacts of this.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-075	Executive Summary	Section 1:21	56	Walter Oelwein	"WSDOT is leading the highway design efforts". This is the first reference to who designed it, but it is not a designer, it is a department. This explains why the initial designs advocated by WashDOT are so uninspired. This section can be improved by describing how WashDOT decided to go about the initial design-- did they hire someone experienced in urban freeways?	Omits or ignores important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-009

As mentioned on page 2-1 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report “SR 520 often becomes congested when there are backups on I-5 through downtown Seattle and on I-405 at the ramps to and from SR 520. Congestion points include 'weave' areas where entering and exiting traffic is changing lanes at the same time, places where a lane ends (for example, the end of the westbound HOV lane before the SR 520 bridge), and locations where a high volume of exiting vehicles causes traffic to back up onto the freeway mainline.” Additionally, the report discusses how conditions will worsen by the year 2030. For updated information regarding freeway operations and how they would improve under the Preferred Alternative, please see Chapter 5 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

I-311-010

The visual quality analysis was conducted in accordance with FHWA’s visual quality and aesthetics impacts assessment methodology and WSDOT’s Environmental Procedures Manual, using the checklist provided in Exhibit 459-1 of the manual. The purpose of adhering to an approved and established methodology is to conduct an objective, unbiased evaluation. The WSDOT Evaluation Matrix was used to conduct the quantitative assessment, the results of which were summarized in text form in Exhibit 1-1 of the SDEIS Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report.

The purpose of the visual quality assessment is to disclose how the existing visual quality conditions will change due to the location, size, and character of the new facility. Disclosing effects helps to identify what needs to or can be mitigated through the design process. The aesthetics of a finished design will be an important part of the design development process that follows the NEPA Record of Decision.

Views from East Shelby Street in Roanoke were evaluated and it was

I-311-076	Executive Summary	Section 1:23	57	Walter Oelwein	"In 2005, after the 6-Lane Alternative had been developed and discussed with project stakeholders neighborhoods adjacent to the highway expressed concern that the 6-Lane Alternative, as then confi gured, was too wide in the Montlake interchange area." This needs to be taken out of the passive voice. Who was it who developed the 6-lane alternative? Why did it assume that the wide footprint would somehow be acceptible? What expertise went into this decision, other than existing assumptions that it would be a larger bridge? This appears to be a key design decision flaw that needs to be better articulated. Why did WashDOT think that the neighborhoods would think that the proposed "designs" would be acceptible? This seems very naive. Why didn't WashDOT propose creative designs rather than wait for the neighborhoods to come up with their own?	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-077	Executive Summary	Section 1:23	58	Walter Oelwein	"The impacted communities on the west end of the project need to determine what design from Union Bay and westward to I-5 will best serve the neighborhoods, the University of Washington, and parks and natural resources. City and community leaders and residents need to come together and develop a common vision on the best solution that fi ts the character and needs of the local communities. I have asked WSDOT to provide support when requested for such a process." Obviously Option K should be the only option considered, because this is the option that was supported by the community leaders and residents that reflected the common vision. Additionally, why didn't WashDOT create a great design that would attempt--in advance--to achieve this goal, rather than force the residents to negotiate in any positive features?	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-078	Executive Summary	Section 1:25	59	Walter Oelwein	Again, nowhere in this section does it state what WashDOT did to bring to the table designs that would be considered positive by the stakeholders. This implies that it did not have sufficient experiese, bring in consultants with deep knowledge of how to create urban freeways. Instead, it relied on hearing concerns from stakeholders, and then doing mitigation. It would have been better if WashDOT got the expectations/concerns from the stakeholders, brought in top expertise to design creative ways to achieve the design, and exceed the expectations of the stakeholders with great design (such as a tube/tunnel). Instead, it relied on the mediation process to integrate and scratch and claw for improved design.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-079	Executive Summary	Section 1:26	60	Walter Oelwein	"The workgroup received extensive input from mediation participants about ideas for modifying the design options. These ideas were intended to reduce costs and/or better achieve project objectives." Again, this is backwards design methodology. WashDOT's poor ability to understand the stakeholder needs and design in great options rather than provide poor options and let people fight for mitigation has made this a poor process. This needs to be called out in the SDEIS	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-080	Executive Summary	Section 1:26	61	Walter Oelwein	"The workgroup also solicited advice from resource agencies, local jurisdictions, the Seattle Parks Department, the Coast Guard, and other stakeholders." Again, no mention of identifying an expert in urban bridge and freeway design. This needs to be called out, since it is an obvious flaw in the design process.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-081	Executive Summary	Sectoin 1:26	62	Walter Oelwein	The call out should indicate geographically (using a map) where these people reside. This will show where the interests are, and whether they adequately represent the stakeholders	Omits or ignores important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

determined that the second bascule bridge under Option A would not change the vividness, intactness, or unity ratings of the view and that the Option L bascule bridge would change the view slightly. The view from the Roanoke ridge is panoramic and expansive, and the new bridges would be very small parts of this vista because they are below the horizon, small when seen from the distance of Roanoke, and surrounded by tall, mature trees.

The visual quality effects of the Preferred Alternative would be similar to those of Option A; for updated information see the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS). Additionally, a new viewpoint was added to the addendum (see Exhibit 2-25), which shows the view from East Shelby Street Looking north toward the Montlake Bridge.

I-311-011

Please see Chapters 6 and 8 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for detailed information regarding the effects of the Preferred Alternative on local street traffic operations in the Montlake interchange area, including analysis of the effect of bridge openings during the off-peak.

I-311-012

As described throughout the SDEIS, Option K would cross Foster Island with a land bridge. The width of Option K through the west approach and over Foster Island ranges from 192 to 250 feet. The bridge span through the west approach and over Foster Island from Option A includes a raised bridge, and width ranging from 147 – 205 feet. As evidenced throughout the SDEIS and Final EIS, Option A would have a narrower footprint over Foster Island than Option K, and the bridge span would be raised with Option A. The height and clearance over Foster Island with Option A would benefit adjacent wetlands and open space--benefits that would not be realized through Option K. Option K would require

I-311-082	Executive Summary	Section 1:27	63	Walter Oelwein	"At each meeting, people expressed support for a variety of choices, including Option M, Option A+ with and without the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps, a transit-optimized 4-Lane Alternative, and retrofi tting the seismically vulnerable bridges to allow more time to develop a long-term solution." This mischaracterizes the feedback. The neighborhoods most closely impacted by the project were overwhelmingly in favor of Option M, and opposed to Option A+. This needs to be included in the SDEIS for it to be correct.	Error or incorrect
I-311-083	Executive Summary	Section 1:27	64	Walter Oelwein	"On December 8, 2009, the legislative workgroup reconvened and confi rmed their earlier recommendation that Option A+ should be the preferred design option for the 6-Lane Alternative." Again, this needs to be improved to be correct. The sentense, "This went against the overwhelming support for Option M provided by the close-in neighborhoods. It also went against the deep opposition by the adjacent neighborhoods to Option A+ "	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-084	Executive Summary	Section 1:27	65	Walter Oelwein	"Option M is similar to Option K; however, the proposed method of tunnel construction has substantially different impacts than those described in the Supplemental Draft EIS, and would require additional environmental evaluation—likely in the form of another Supplemental Draft EIS—if the legislature chose to pursue further study of it." By definition, this makes the SDEIS incomplete. Option M needs to be included in this report as much as Option A+ in order for it to be given the appropriate weight.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-085	Executive Summary	Section 1:29	66	Walter Oelwein	The "transportation" row needs to include a statement that the options do not adequately integrate or allow for mass transit expansion of Sound Transit, and the analysis of this is incomplete	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-086	Executive Summary	Section 1:29	67	Walter Oelwein	"The greatest effect on traffi c volumes would occur in the Montlake Boulevard interchange area." Earlier in the document you mention the increased usage of the bridge in general in the coming years. However, there is no mention on how this increased capacity of the bridge is going to affect the local neighborhoods (Montlake, Portage Bay, Roanoke Park, etc.). It is easy to imagine that more people will cut through the area to access the (non-integrated) transit or the freeway. This makes this summary incomplete to intimate that local traffic is only a "Montlake Cut" issue.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-087	Executive Summary	Section 1:30	68	Walter Oelwein	"This increase refl ects the effect of tolling on mode choice, the reversible connection to the I-5 express lanes and other corridor improvements." In the Transit row, there is no mention that tolling may reduce demand overall, whereas earlier in the document, it says that demand is going to increase. This is contradictory.	Error or incorrect
I-311-088	Executive Summary	Section 1:30	69	Walter Oelwein	"Under Option A, traffic volumes north and south of the Montlake Cut would be similar to the No Build Alternative, except on Lake Washington Boulevard south of the SR 520/Arboretum ramps." This is incorrect. It should say, "Taffic capacity" would be similar, but volumes will increase. That means more delays and congestion. This is an omission that needs to be corrected and called out, since this is a major reason for having the other alternatives -- to improve flow in the Montlake area. Earlier in the document you make the argument that congestion adds pollution, yet you ignore this argument here, exactly where there is the most population.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info
I-311-089	Executive Summary	Section 1:30	70	Walter Oelwein	"Under Options K and L, traffic volumes north and south of the Montlake Cut would increase when compared to the No Build Alternative and Option A." Similar to the line item for Option A, this is an incorrect statement. It should state, "Traffice capacity" will improve, allowing for less congestion and pollution. This needs to be called out as a major difference between Options A and K,L, since people will be wondering about the price tag difference.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

significant alteration of the natural landform of Foster Island due to the substantial grading and fill, as well as vegetation removal. The land bridge would significantly alter the user experience, as it would be very different from existing conditions and would be a less natural landscape than what is there currently.

Additionally, Foster Island is recognized as a Traditional Cultural Property and a culturally significant place to area Native tribes. WSDOT has engaged in negotiation with the affected tribes to minimize the impact to Foster Island from the new structure. During these discussions, the tribes indicated a preference for the raised bridge design over the island. For these reasons, WSDOT has determined Option A to have a lesser impact to Foster Island than Option K. Revisions to this conclusion are not included as part of the Final EIS.

I-311-013

Tolling in the SR 520 corridor is proposed to finance the replacement of the SR 520 floating bridge, and to make safety and capacity improvements in the SR 520 corridor. The intent of the traffic modeling was not to isolate the effect of tolling, but rather to capture the relative effects of tolling in concert with other design elements of the project to determine the overall transportation performance for the no build and design alternatives. Tolling costs to the public were included in the quantitative input of the travel demand model. However, the effects of a toll were not isolated from the effects of including an HOV lane, versus not including an HOV lane, making it difficult to conclude or provide support for the assertion that more people would carpool if a toll were implemented, but an HOV lane were not.

Additional analysis and information regarding the effects of tolling are included in the Final EIS. Section 1.11 discusses how tolling will be used on SR 520 with the Preferred Alternative and how and why the assumptions and scenarios for tolling have been updated since the

I-311-090	Executive Summary	Section 1:31	71	Walter Oelwein	"All options would remove the Montlake Freeway Transit Station and replace its function at other nearby transit stops. Loss of the transit station would require passengers to change their current travel routes and these changes could include using light rail, additional bus transfers, and finding alternate bus routes to get to the same destination." This contradicts the row above. It says that transit is improved, but then in this row it says that passengers have to change travel routes. This section seems intentionally vague, since it is conter-intuitive that removing one of the most popular stops where there is a new Sound Transit station, and multiple downtown to Eastside freeway routes can somehow improve transit options. You need to be explicit that you have no plan outlined for how the Montlake Freeway Station's functionality will be replace. This appears to be a major flaw in the "design", and is another indicator that this is not actually a "design", but a default roadway placement.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info
I-311-091	Executive Summary	Section 1:31	72	Walter Oelwein	"Option A would require the least amount of new right-of-way (11.1 acres). This option would result in seven full parcel acquisitions, and would remove two additional residences, the Montlake 76 gas station, and nine of the 11 buildings on the south campus of NOAA's Northwest Fisheries Science Center" This is written to imply that Option A has the least impact, when it appears that it has the most. It should be written to state that it has the least amount of acerage, but the most amount of business and building closures (this evaluative piece is left out, showing an apparent bias toward Option A).	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info
I-311-092	Executive Summary	Section 1:31	73	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would require the most new right-of-way (15.7 acres). This option would result in six full parcel acquisitions, and the University of Washington's Waterfront Activities Center (WAC) would be relocated for a multiple-year period." Just as the comment about Option A having the "Least acerage", but omitting that Option A has the most business and building impact, this comment on Option K implies that it has the "most acerage" while omitting the fact that it has the least business and building impact. The acerage it requires to obtain is not buisiness and buildings, but parking lot. This reveals bias against Option K	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info
I-311-093	Executive Summary	Section 1:31	74	Walter Oelwein	"Estimated property tax effects would be similar across all options, and result in a less than 0.01 percent decrease in tax revenue." This is an incomplete statement, as it assesses the loss in tax revenue of only the loss of the parcels purchased for the right of way. But what about the tax revenue of creating a ugly second Montlake bridge? Or a doubling of size of a freeway that shouldn't even be going through a residential neighborhood? This section implies that this is the only impact of the tax revenue. This is incorrect and implies that increasing the size of the freeway has no impact on the tax base in the neighborhood, which cannot possibly be true.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info
I-311-094	Executive Summary	Section 1:31	75	Walter Oelwein	"All 6-Lane Alternative options include lids that would benefi t community cohesion by reconnecting neighborhoods originally bisected by SR 520 and I-5, providing linkages between adjacent and nearby parks, improving views toward the highway from nearby residences, and providing safe passage across I-5 and SR 520." This is an incomplete statement. Residents for years have stated that having a freeway go through the residential neighborhoods has been a blight on the city and the social impacts. The additions of lids is nice, but you fail to mention that you are doubling the size of a freeway in dense, sensitive neighborhoods, as though this is an acceptible action and has no social impact. It has amazing social impact: It reflects a city and state that puts a bias of cars over people, is unable to design transporations systems for the future, and likes to build things on the cheap. The impacts are lower quality of life, lower tax base, and stunted economic growth.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

SDEIS. Section 2.4 provides information on consideration of a tolled 4-lane alternative.

I-311-014

WSDOT has enlisted design professionals throughout the development of project alternatives and will continue to do so as design development progresses. Please see the response to Comment I-311-002 regarding the use of the word “design” in environmental documentation of transportation projects.

I-311-015

Options K and L would result in level of service (LOS) F conditions at the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection as compared with LOS E conditions with Option A and it suboption, because the additional traffic being serve by four new lanes of capacity across the Montlake cut (with Options K and L) would still converge at the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection. As shown in Exhibit 6-2 in the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report, PM peak hour traffic volumes across the Montlake Cut and using the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection would increase by approximately 2,000 vehicles per hour (vph) with Option K and 3,000 vph with Option L compared to the No Build Alternative in the year 2030. Traffic volumes across the cut would be higher with Option L than with Option K because no access to the SR 520/SPUI from Lake Washington Boulevard southbound would be provided due to the left-turn restriction. Drivers would continue north on Montlake Boulevard to the Montlake Boulevard/NE Pacific Street intersection and turn right onto the new bridge that connects to the SR 520/SPUI. Even with this additional volume, PM peak hour delays at the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific intersection would be slightly better with Option L than with Option K because a northbound right-turn lane would be added to serve the additional northbound traffic crossing the Montlake Bridge to access the freeway.

I-311-095	Executive Summary	Section 1:31	76	Walter Oelwein	"Low-income populations would experience disproportionately high and adverse effects as a result of tolling. The most affected low-income populations would be those that are car-dependent and populations living in areas with limited transit service." You fail to mention that the bridge fails to provide improved access to low-cost transition options, such as Light Rail, and this omission in design is just as eggregious to the low income population as it is adding tolls.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-096	Executive Summary	1:31	77	Walter Oelwein	"Loss of parkland would occur for right-of-way acquisition of all or part of up to five recreational properties (depending on the option). The largest acquisitions would occur at McCurdy and East Montlake Parks. There could be negative effects related to visual quality and aesthetics where widening of the roadway would bring the project footprint closer to parks." This statement implies that parkland is purely an experiential element, and not an economic element. I find this document incomplete, since there is an economic value to adding parkland, and an economic destruction to having encroaching freeways in parkland. It should be stated outright that WashDOT has proposed only options that destroy parkland, rather than proposing options that correct the encroachment of freeways onto urban parkland. This makes the document incomplete. A better designer would have started with the idea to recover ALL of the parkland, and propose project ideas that would submerse the bridge entirely, and restore the parks and habitats, while allowing throughput (and possibly increasing safety). Omitting this idea makes this document incomplete, and reveals a bias for destroying habitat and parkland.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-097	Executive Summary	1:31	78	Walter Oelwein	"Trails across these lids would further improve connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians." You should mention what you are planning to do to improve Delmar Drive, which is an unsafe speedway for cars, pedestrians and bicyclists. With the lid, you are improving one area, but not the immediate approach to it.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-098	Executive Summary	1:31	79	Walter Oelwein	"And, there is no feasible and prudent alternative that would avoid the use of all Section 4(f) properties." In either the Draft EIS or SDEIS, I have yet to see an adequate analysis for why a tube/tunnel wouldn't be feasible and prudent. This glosses over an obvious design improvement, and makes this document incomplete.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-099	Executive Summary	1:31	80	Walter Oelwein	"Foster Island, located in the Washington Park Arboretum, would be affected by all options and is considered a Traditional Cultural Property eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)." This glosses over that only option K makes an effort to improve Foster Island, while the other options further destroy Foster Island. This needs to be added.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-016

Two analyses (one for visual quality and one for cultural resources) were done regarding the new bascule bridge parallel to the existing Montlake Bridge. The visual quality analysis determined that the new bascule bridge under Option A would not change the visual quality of the area because the new bascule bridge of Option A would not be visible from most locations in Montlake.

However, with the cultural resources analysis, WSDOT has acknowledged that the new bascule bridge parallel to the Montlake Bridge would significantly diminish the integrity of the setting and feeling of the existing historic bridge's integrity of setting and feeling if not mitigated. Therefore, stipulations are provided in the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (Attachment 9 to the Final Cultural Resources Assessment and Discipline Report) to ensure that the design and proximity of the new bascule bridge does not diminish the integrity of the existing Montlake Bridge.

The design of the new bascule bridge would be context sensitive to minimize its effect on the setting and view of the historic Carl F. Gould Montlake Bridge. The design would complement the historic bridge and would not detract from the views through the Montlake Cut. The Programmatic Agreement is being used as the formal, legally binding document between FHWA, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), WSDOT and the other Section 106 consulting parties for mitigation of the project's adverse effect on historic resources.

I-311-017

Both the SDEIS and Final EIS local traffic operations analysis focused on areas near SR 520 interchanges that could be affected by changes in travel patterns and traffic volumes associated with the project alternatives. Therefore, the SDEIS traffic analysis was conducted for

I-311-100	Executive Summary	1:32	81	Walter Oelwein	"At differing capacities all options would temporarily occupy Interlaken Park, Montlake Playfield, and the Bill Dawson Trail." This appears to be an incomplete thought. What does this mean, "temporarily occupy?" I interpret this to mean that construction and the final bridge will occupy these parklands. So we can't use these during and after construction? This is the first mention of these spaces in the analysis, so it is hard to follow.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-101	Executive Summary	Section 1:32	82	Walter Oelwein	"The Section 6(f) Evaluation assesses parks and other recreation facilities acquired and/or developed using funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, which are protected from conversion to non-recreational uses." This section is incomplete. I don't understand what it is trying to say. It appears to say that the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 disallows conversion of parkland to non-recreational uses (and appears to be a response to the bad freeway design of the original 520 bridge), yet WashDOT is proposing a new bridge that doubles in size, and precisely converts parkland to non-residential uses. So this section needs to be rewritten to be more clear about why WashDOT feels comfortable proposing only options that encroach on parkland, and has not even bothered to pursue options that restore parkland. This is one of the big mysteries surrounding this project.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-102	Executive Summary	Section 1:32	83	Walter Oelwein	"Visual Quality": This section is entirely inadequate. It mentions the lids as improving visual quality, but it does not mention the visual quality of a bridge more than twice the size in an narrow corridor. The bridge is substantially higher, and with noise walls, would look even more visually unappealing. A specific statement about the quality of the bridge aesthetics needs to be made here. Additionally, a justification for why there is no designer of the bridge, just default roadway placement needs to be included. This section seems to say, "We're adding a $5 billion bridge here, but we are making no effort to make the bridge an architectural achievement, as the area is not worthy of this investment." Obviously, with the highly populated area, the UW, the parklands, etc, this is precisely where WashDOT needs to enlist architectural and design expertise, rather than just rely on staffers to place roadway dimensions in a corridor. The only mention is the columns difference.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-103	Executive Summary	Section 1:33	84	Walter Oelwein	"All options would result in changes to the visual character and quality in the Montlake area." This is a misleading opening statement. Only Option K would preserve the historic views and character of the Montlake Cut. The other optons would fundamentally change this forever.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-104	Executive Summary	Section 1:33	85	Walter Oelwein	"However, Option K and L would include additional structures in the McCurdy Park and East Montlake Park areas that would be most visible to motorists and park users. These structures would dominate views much more than the existing ramps and mainline." This must be an error. It seems to say that adding parkland would be worse than looking at ramps. A bit more explanation that the local residents are tired of the neighborhood being used as a freeway ramp is in order, rather than implying that the "mitigation" somehow makes the views worse.	Error or Incorrect;

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

local streets and intersections near the SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange, I-5/East Roanoke Street interchange, and the I-5/NE 45th Street interchange. In the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report, the local traffic effects near the SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke Street interchange area were described in Chapter 6, and included an evaluation of traffic volume forecasts and travel patterns, and the effects of the project's on intersection performance at the 12 intersections, shown in Exhibit 6-7. The Fuhrman/Boyer Avenue E and Delmar Drive/East Lynn Street intersections were not included in the analysis because the project would result in little to no change in traffic volumes (less than 5 percent) and operations at these locations. The response to Comment I-311-324 provides further information on how the local study area was determined. The Final EIS evaluation reviewed the local study area with the Preferred Alternative. As described in Chapters 4 and 6 of the Final EIS Transportation Discipline Report, traffic operations analysis was conducted at intersections where the total approaching traffic is forecasted to increase by 5 percent or more with the Preferred Alternative. Traffic volume changes in the I-5/East Roanoke Street interchange were too low to meet the criteria. Therefore, the intersections evaluated in this area for the SDEIS were not included in the Final EIS evaluation.

I-311-018

Please see the responses to your specific comments below.

I-311-019

Please see the response to comment I-311-010 regarding the Visual Quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Visual quality assessments are conducted by landscape architecture professionals who are trained in using the industry-accepted FHWA and WSDOT assessment methodology. Also see the response to comment I-311-004 regarding the construction of a tunnel for the SR 520 project.

I-311-105	Executive Summary	Section 1:33	86	Walter Oelwein	The box for visual quality for Option A is blank. However, Option A is where a second drawbridge is going to be built. Why ignore this fact here? This by definition, has massive visual impact over the historical views of the local area, both when the bridge is down and up. This appears to be an omission that reveals the author's bias against the other options, as the other options specifically call out some minor columns, but Option A doesn't call out a second bridge.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-106	Executive Summary	Section 1:33	87	Walter Oelwein	In the Option K visual summary, there is no mention about how Option K preserves the current views of Montlake Cut, and no other options provide this. This appears to reveal a bias against citing the virtues of Option K, as the only thing mentioned are the additional columns and walls of Option K.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-107	Executive Summary	Section 1:33	88	Walter Oelwein	"Under Option K, the land bridge at Foster Island would remove naturalized woodlands on both sides of SR 520." This does not characterize the visual impact correctly. Currently, an unobstructed freeway cuts through parkland. With the new design, this freeway is hidden from view and adds parkland where it had been taken away. The way this reads, it appears that the Foster Island land bridge is a visual blight. This appears to be written as a bias against Option K.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-108	Executive Summary	Section 1:34	89	Walter Oelwein	The Cultural Resources section needs to be presented as a grid separating the options, similar to the previous sections. As it is presented now, it appears that they are all equal in some capacity, this shows an anti-Option K bias, since Option K is the one that best preserves the Cultural Resources, but this is hard to discern in this presentation.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

Further, according to the evaluation matrix for the SDEIS, Options K and L had the greatest local negative effects on visual quality. This was due to the substantial and negative effects at MOHAI (tunnel for K and bridge for L) and the demolition of north Foster Island for the land bridge. Option A had its own effects at Montlake but they were small relative to the MOHAI effects of K and L.

I-311-020

See the response to comment I-311-002. The use of the word “design” is consistent with generally accepted usage for transportation and roadway projects.

I-311-021

WSDOT considered a wide range of alternatives before narrowing them down to those evaluated in the Draft EIS. Removing and not replacing the bridge would not meet the purpose and need of the project. The Trans-Lake study discussed in the response to Comment I-311-001 considered and dismissed a wide range of concepts, such as tunnels and other ways of meeting mobility needs such as ferries. Please also see the response to comment I-311-007 regarding the range of alternatives evaluated for the SR 520 project.

The transportation analysis conducted for the Final EIS accounts for many improvements in public transportation that will be in place in 2030 (the analysis year), including East Link light rail across I-90. Additional analysis conducted since the SDEIS was published still finds that an SR 520 corridor of four lanes would not meet the project purpose and need (see Section 2.4 of the Final EIS); thus, removing the bridge entirely also would not meet the purpose and need.

WSDOT currently has comprehensive regional plans to account for an emergency event such as a catastrophic bridge failure. The SR 520 Catastrophic Failure Plan (Summer 2008) is available for download at

I-311-109	Executive Summary	Section 1:34	90	Walter Oelwein	"Foster Island presumed Traditional Cultural Property – experiences potential adverse effect under Option K" It is not clear to me why the author keeps calling out Option K as having an adverse affect on Foster Island, when Option K is the only option that tries to do something to preserve the character of Foster Island. The other options double the size and increase the height of the exposed freeway through Foster Island, yet the SDEIS keeps saying that Option K creates advers effects. This appears to be an anti-Option K bias revealed here. At least call out that Option K tries to cover the freeway, improving Foster Island, while the other options further erode Foster Island.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-110	Executive Summary	Section 1:34	91	Walter Oelwein	"Residences Exceeding the Noise Abatement Criteria" In this section, it shows that many residences exceed the NAC. Why is this acceptible that WashDOT propose options like this? Why didn't WashDOT propose three designs that eliminate noise, or reduce the noise criteria. This shows a bias for cars over that of the local enviornment, rather than proposing a design that corrects the wrongs of the past. A statement needs to be included, "WashDOT does not have the capacity to design a freeway that improves the local noise situation. We have not invested adequately in identeifying deisgn and engineering resources that can do this. Instead, we are simply repeating the same mistakes of the past." This would more accurately described the enviornmental impact of this project.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-111	Executive Summary	Section 1:34	92	Walter Oelwein	Residences Exceeding the Noise Abatement Criteria: This section shows an anti-Option K bias. How can Option A, with 7 lanes and not 6, have less noise. And how can having a second drawbridge reduce noise compared to a tunnel. This makes no sense, and does not seem to be justified in the document.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-112	Executive Summary	Section 1:34	93	Walter Oelwein	"All options would meet air quality standards. The modeled concentrations of air pollutants are well below the 1-hour and 8-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standards for all design options." This omits an important other option: How much would a tube or tunnel decreased air pollution in a highly populated area? This needs to be stated explcitly, as this should be an important consideration for any project going into the 21st century. The way this is written reveals that it is somehow acceptible to have a freeway going through neighborhoods. This is not reflective of the local area's values.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-113	Executive Summary	1:35	94	Walter Oelwein	"Adding the suboptions to Option A would result in a slight increase in carbon monoxide concentrations at the Montlake Boulevard/Pacific Street intersection." This should be rewritten to state the following: Option A is the only option that increases air pollution. Instead, it is written to appear to minimize the impact of Option A compared to the other options. This reveals a bias against the other options.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-114	Executive Summary	1:35	95	Walter Oelwein	Air Quality (continued): It does not make sense that you would fail to mention that Option K, with its tunnel and lower congestion in the Montlake area (due to cars not idling waiting for the draw briedge) would not be somehow reduced, or a better option than the other options. Failing to mention this in the executive summary seems to show a bias against Option K.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-115	Executive Summary	1:35	96	Walter Oelwein	"Energy and Greenhouse Gases" This section seems incomplete. It should indicate which option has the MOST greenhouse gasses. I'm guessing that Option A would have the most greenhouse gasses, since it will create cars idling for the TWO Montake bridges every day, increasing congestion and pollution. The fact that this is not called out appears to be a bias against Option K.	Omits or ignores important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/vulnerability.htm. As part of its emergency planning, WSDOT is preparing for potential emergency replacement of pontoons to restore the floating section of the SR 520 floating bridge in case of a catastrophic failure. WSDOT recently awarded a design-build contract to Kiewit-General Joint Venture to build a casting facility and pontoons, and to store these pontoons until needed. More information on the Pontoon Construction project is available on http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/sr520bridge/.

I-311-022

The SR 520, I-5 to Medina project has been considered through mandated state and regional transportation planning processes. As stated on page1-2 of the SDEIS, it “is designated as a strategic project by the Puget Sound Regional Council and is included in WSDOT’s 2009-2012 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.” Development of project alternatives and design has included extensive coordination with state and local agencies (see the Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Discipline Report and Addendum in Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

While WSDOT has coordinated closely with regional and local agencies, the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project is a state transportation project, and must meet the project purpose to improve safety and mobility. Reflecting the “image of the city” is not part of the project purpose and need. Environmentally friendly design, urban design, and technologically innovative design are all important aspects of the project and are addressed through various analyses conducted through the NEPA process. Chapter 5 of the SDEIS and Final EIS describe the project’s effects on the environment.

The addition of a dedicated lane for transit and HOV, along with the reduction in general-purpose demand achieved by tolling, would provide similar GHG benefits to those with light rail transit. As discussed in

I-311-116	Executive Summary	1:35	97	Walter Oelwein	"Energy and Greenhouse Gases" This section fails to mention the improved improvement of greenhouse gasses by further lowering the bridge into a tunnel and tube and the technologies that could be used to capture and recycle CO2. Instead, it operates on the model that it is OK to continue using combustion engines to send greenhouse gasses into the atmosphere 100% of the time. This set of designs appears to be a failed opportunity to be innovative in finding ways to further reduce greenhouse gasess.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-117	Executive Summary	1:35	98	Walter Oelwein	"Energy and Greenhouse Gases" : This section also fails to mention what the impact on greenhouse gasses improved linkage to the Sound Transit Light Rail station would have. The current designs ignore that this important link has been created, and the opportunities it provides for improving the tranportation corridor. What if Light Rail were added to 520 -- how much would this further decrease greenhouse gasses? This needs to be added to the analysis, or else it is incomplete, and misses a big opportunity to make this a positive project, rather than a damaging project.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-118	Executive Summary	1:35	99	Walter Oelwein	"All options would increase the amount of land covered by pollutant-generating impervious surfaces in the project area (Option A – 35 percent increase, Option K – 45 percent increase, and Option L – 44 percent increase)." This is written in an unclear manner. I'm not sure if increases of "land covered by pollutant-generating impervious servaces in the project area" is a good thing or a bad thing. This needs to be clarified. It if is a bad thing, it needs to be more clear about what the impact is -- Option K is the only option that restores parkland on Foster Island -- is this why it increases "pollutant-generating impervious surfaces"? This appears to be another section where a good thing is being presented as a bad thing in the analysis.	Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-119	Executive Summary	1:35	100	Walter Oelwein	Ecosytems: This section needs to be broken out into separate commentary like previous sections, otherwise it makes all Options appear equal. Clearly Option K is the superior choice when it comes to Ecosystem, so this needs to be called out in the Option K column.	Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-120	Executive Summary	1:35	101	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would result in the overall greatest loss of fish habitat due to the filling for the depressed SPUI." This needs to be quantified better, since it implies that Option K is a big destroyer of Fish Habitat versus the other options. That is the way it is written. What is the percentage difference? The way this is written implies anti-Option K bias.	Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-121	Executive Summary	1:35	102	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would result in the greatest loss of wildlife habitat." This is a consistent theme in this SDEIS: By adding parkland, it destroys things. By creating a twice as large exposed bridge, it doesn't. This doesn't make any sense. It is written as though the one option that is designed to best preserve Foster Island is also the design that most ruins Foster Island, when the other designs (A, L), show no regard to the habitat of Foster Island and in fact further cut into it. Please re-write the analysis to demonstrate that only Option K attempts to best preserve the character and habitat of Foster Island, or else this analysis is disengenuous.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

Section 5.9 of the Final EIS, the Preferred Alternative would result in a 4 percent reduction in vehicle miles in the project area traveled compared to the No Build Alternative, with a corresponding 4 percent reduction in annual fuel consumption. This results in a reduction of approximately 10 percent in GHG emissions compared to the No Build Alternative, which is consistent with state legislation calling for such reductions and would contribute to other regional and national reduction efforts. It should be noted that this estimate does not take into account the estimated 60 percent increase in transit ridership that would be achieved if bus rapid transit is implemented in the corridor as part of the SR 520 High Capacity Transit Plan (see Section 2.4 of the Final EIS for discussion of that plan and how high capacity transit would be implemented on SR 520 in the near-term future).

I-311-023

Analysis of the effects on neighborhoods is included in Section 5.3 of the SDEIS and in the Social Elements Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). Effects on parks are discussed in Section 5.4 of the SDEIS and in the Recreation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). Updated information regarding effects of the Preferred Alternative can be found in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS.

Further, the Preferred Alternative responds to concerns from residential neighborhoods and stakeholders representing sensitive park land through a number of design enhancements that occurred since the SDEIS was published. See the response to comment I-311-005 for more information on design enhancements included with the Preferred Alternative.

Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (23 USC 138 and 49 USC 303) addresses highway projects that effect parks and other sensitive resources. Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (23 U.S.C. 138 and 49 U.S.C. 303) specifies

I-311-122	Executive Summary	1:35	103	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would fill 1.8 acres of wetland and 5.4 acres of wetland buffer." Again, this appears to reveal anti-Option K. Suddenly, when Option K looks the worst, you break out the analysis into the three options. However, you do not indicate what it is about Option K that fills in the most acres of wetland wetland buffer. Is it the fact that it actually restores parkland on Foster Island, while the other options allow for a doubling of size of the freeway through the park and habitat? This section continues to reveal anti-Option K bias.	Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-123	Executive Summary	1:35	104	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would be below the high-water elevation east of the Montlake shoreline, and much lower than the other options through Union Bay and east of Foster Island. It would result in filling approximately 2.7 acres of aquatic habitat and 10.3 acres of shading in the Montlake and west approach areas." This section is hard to understand. I'm not sure what this is trying to say in comparison to the other options. It specifically calls out the lower profile, yet this isn't mentioned as a benefit in the visual impact section (at least in a quantified manner).	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-124	Executive Summary	1:35	105	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would remove 19.5 acres of mostly the Urban Matrix cover type, with most in the Montlake area." Again, this seems to be a contradiction. Option K is the one that best recovers parkland, yet it is called out as removing the most amount of wildlife habitat. This analysis is incomplete or needs to be clarified.	Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-125	Executive Summary	Section 1:35	106	Walter Oelwein	"The risk of damage to the below-water facilities for Option K would be greater than if the interchange were constructed above water." I object to this specific call-out of Option K. In the introduction you state that the bridge is going to collapse because it is a poorly designed bridge. Yet here you are saying that the bridge has the least possibility of collapse. This shows an anti-tunnel bias, and reveals that WashDOT is actually not very comforatable with the Tunnel prospect, when this is precisely how you not repeat the mistakes that have made the existing 520 bridge so unsuccessful. This comment appears completely unjustified.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-126	Executive Summary	Section 1:37	107	Walter Oelwein	"Under Option K, operational restrictions on hazardous materials transport through the tunnel may be employed to minimize fi re and explosion risk." Again, this comment reveals that the authors of this SDEIS and WashDOT are not familiar or comfortable with Tube/Tunnel technology, which reveals that they are not capable of fully analyzing and documenting the project impact. I would expect a call-out on how the tube/tunnel of Option K would decrease the likelihood of spills and discharge into the ecosystem, since it's in a tunnel, not exposed to the world and able to spill directly into the water. Issues like this apparently were not considered in analyzing the tube/tunnel option in the first place, calling into question the qualifications of the default roadways placement staffers.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-127	Executive Summary	Section 1:37	108	Walter Oelwein	Navigation: There is no call out here that Option K would require the opening of only one bridge instead of two. This seems to be a major qualitative difference for boat navigation, as you would have to rely on the both bridges to open, and not just one. The fact that this isn't called out seems to minimize the benefits of Option K, while minimizing the impact of Options A and L.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

that FHWA may only approve a transportation project or program requiring the use of parks, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, or historic sites for transportation purposes if (1) there is no feasible or prudent alternative to use of the land, and (2) the project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property. As described in responses to comments further below, and as demonstrated in Attachment 6 of the SDEIS and Chapter 9 of the Final EIS, WSDOT has conducted the necessary and appropriate planning to comply with Section 4(f), including a Section 4(f) alternatives analysis.

I-311-024

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document and is purposefully brief. Further, NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report.

I-311-025

See the response to comment I-311-002. The use of the word “design” is consistent with generally accepted usage for transportation and roadway projects.

I-311-026

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document and is purposefully brief. The use of the word “design” is consistent with generally accepted usage for transportation and roadway projects.

I-311-027

The removal of the unused R.H. Thomson Expressway ramps is discussed throughout the SDEIS and the attached discipline reports. The

I-311-128	Executive Summary	Section 1:38	109	Walter Oelwein	Parks effects (acres): It is not clear if this means that it increases or decreases parks. This needs to be revised for this SDEIS to be correct.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-129	Executive Summary	Section 1:38	110	Walter Oelwein	Visual Quality: Not attempting to quantify the visual quality of the various options reveals an anti-Option K bias. Here's a go: Montake Bridge Visual Quality: A: Bad K: Good L: Bad. Additionally, it would be nice to see what the visual quality would be with the tube/tunnel of the project. The fact that this has not been analyzed reveals that WashDOT is leaving options on the floor.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-130	Executive Summary	Section 1:38	111	Walter Oelwein	Noise: I object to this analysis. It is incorrect, since Option A has more lanes through Portage Bay, how can it possibly be fewer residences.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-131	Executive Summary	Section 1:38	112	Walter Oelwein	Energy and Greenhouse Gases: This analysis is incomplete. It needs to reveal what the greenhouse gas increases would be as traffic idles for the TWO Montlake bridges as they wait to get on and off the freeway. I believe that this poor analysis reveals and anti-Option K bias	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce
I-311-132	Executive Summary	Section 1:38	113	Walter Oelwein	Water Resources: This section is non-sensical to me, since Option A is the option that most intrudes on our parkland, and does the least to mitigate, yet somehow it comes out in the analysis as the "best" in this area. How this is arrived at is not explained well at all, and reveals a bias for Option A.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-133	Executive Summary	Section 1:39	114	Walter Oelwein	Ecosystems: This analysis again seems corrupted. Option K is the one that the residents most support as being best for the local enviornment, yet your analysis attempts to show that it is the worst for the enviornment, probably because Option K is the one option that attempts to reduce the impact of having a giant freeway go through a park. Yet you support analyses that somehow imply that this is generally the best way to go. I find this document to be disengenous and incorrect.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-134	Executive Summary	Section 1:40	115	Walter Oelwein	"Options K and L would close NE Pacifi c Street for 9 to 12 months." Again, anti-Option K bias is revealed here. Somehow you are going to build a second Montlake bridge and not have an impact on Pacific street? But building a Pacific street tunnel/onramp requires closing Pacific street? This seems absurd and needs to be rewritten.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-135	Executive Summary	Section 1:40	116	Walter Oelwein	"Options K and L would use E. Shelby Street and E. Hamlin Street as haul routes during construction. During peak construction periods there could be as many as 5 to 20 trucks per hour, depending on which option is selected." Again, Anti-Option K bias is revealed here. It is as though the writers want to pursue Option A as the only alternative. I cannot believe that ONLY option K and L would use E. Shelby Street and E. Hamlin Street as haul routes during construction. This seems like a completely unjustified statement.	Error or Incorrect;

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

Preferred Alternative also includes the removal of these ramps and the revegetation of the areas previously occupied by them to improve the visual and environmental quality of the area.

I-311-028

Please see the response to comment I-311-007 regarding transit options and compatibility with potential future light rail.

I-311-029

As discussed on page 60 of the Geology and Soils Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS), “Seismic design was not a consideration in bridges designed prior to about 1972. Over the last several years, WSDOT studies have demonstrated that these aging spans are highly vulnerable to windstorms and earthquakes.” Additionally, technology and construction methods have improved since the original construction of SR 520 to create safer and more stable structures. Although the current structure is at risk of being damaged in a major earthquake, the new bridges would be designed to handle an earthquake without substantial damage, as required by current WSDOT standards.

I-311-030

WSDOT is committed to minimizing negative effects from project construction and operation as much as feasible, while still meeting the project purpose and need and not compromising safety. Each discipline report attached to the Final EIS (Attachment 7) contains a section titled “Mitigation” which discussed the ways in which the project will avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential effects. Additionally, several workgroups have been created to coordinate with WSDOT and FHWA in creating these mitigation measures and various design refinements included with the Preferred Alternative (see the Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Discipline Report and Addendum in Attachment 7 to the

I-311-136	Executive Summary	Section 1:41	117	Walter Oelwein	"The scale and intensity of construction-related effects within these areas would be greatest with Option K." Again, this calls out Option K unjustifiably. Option K is designed to best improve the experience in the local area, and is supported by the residents as such. The way this is written implies that Option K was designed to be the worst and most disruptive. This reflects the anti-tunnel building bias more than it does a good analysis of the impacts of construction.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-137	Executive Summary	Section 1:41	118	Walter Oelwein	"Effects on the University District and Montlake neighborhoods would be similar for Options K and L." The specific call-out about Option K and L seems unjustified and implies that Option A has no social impacts. This can't possibly be true. This section further reveals anti-Option K bias, and is written in a way to pursuade people to think that it is a bad option. In fact, this reveals that limited effort has been made to make option K a viable alternative, study consturction plans. Constucting a tunnel will take place underground, so intuitively, other than removing of dirt, there should be actually less impact with the tunnel construction. This whole section needs to be reviewed and corrected.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-138	Executive Summary	Section 1:42	119	Walter Oelwein	"Closure of NE Pacifi c Street associated with Options K and L could affect response times and emergency accesses to UW Medical Center." Again, I cannot abide with the concept that Pacific Street is not affected by Option A, but Options K and L are suddenly causing Medical response problems. This is a dangerous statement and needs to be revised such that Option A is adequately called out as a damage to emergency response.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-139	Executive Summary	Section 1:42	120	Walter Oelwein	"Overwater and in-water construction would affect tribal fi shing opportunities and fish habitat, although the risk of harming fish is lower for Options A and L compared to Option K." Again, somehow it is OK to put high shade-creating bridges and cutting freeways through parks, but somehow Option K, which reduces the damage the most is identified as the worst. This analysis is incorrect and needs to be changed.	Error or Incorrect;
I-311-140	Executive Summary	Section 1:42	121	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would result in 7.0 acres of construction effects on area parks. This option would temporarily close over 80 percent of East Montlake Park. Construction effects are likely to last for 54 to 60 months." These numbers look trumped up to make it appear that Option K is an onerous option. It actually reveals that WashDOT has not done enough due dilligence on how to design and manage this project. The SDEIS needs to be re-written such that Option K construction is better managed.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-141	Executive Summary	Section 1:46	122	Walter Oelwein	"Option K has the highest greenhouse gas emissions potential at roughly double that of Option A." Here you quantify greenhouse gasses precisely, yet the overall impact of having cars exposed, and idling for the Montlake Bridges to go up and down is not discussed. This makes the analsys deficient.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

Final EIS).

The SR 520 Parks Technical Working Group has evaluated the functions and values of project area parks and recreational areas and coordinated with WSDOT in developing appropriate mitigation for unavoidable impacts. Additionally, through the ESSB 6392 process, WSDOT has worked with various agencies and advisory boards to develop recommendations for transit improvements, as well as bicycle and pedestrian connections and amenities as part of the Design Refinements and Transit Connection Workgroup. The recommendations from this group can be found in the ESSB 6392: Design Refinements and Transit Connections Workgroup Recommendations Report (Attachment 16 to the Final EIS).

In May 2010, WSDOT began working with the Arboretum and Botanical Garden Committee—composed of representatives from City of Seattle, the University of Washington, and the Arboretum Foundation—to develop the Arboretum Mitigation Plan. This plan is included in Attachment 9 to the Final EIS.

I-311-031

Although these are all important aspects of the project, they are not specifically included as part of the project purpose and need.

Through the ESSB process, WSDOT has collaborated with the University of Washington, City of Seattle, King County Metro Transit, and Sound Transit, to determine how to improve transit speed and reliability between the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project and the Montlake Multimodal Center to allow for convenient transfers between SR 520 transit and University Link light rail. Improvements to the Montlake Multimodal Center (currently known as the Montlake Triangle) will be undertaken separate from the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project. The Montlake Multimodal Center is a concept established in the High Capacity Transit

I-311-142	Executive Summary	Section 1:46	123	Walter Oelwein	It appears that the greatest construction impact is on Option K. This also implies that it will have the best long-term benefit for Visual, Cultural, Economic, etc. This really isn't mentioned anywhere in the document, and demonstrates an anti-Option K bias.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-143	Executive Summary	Section 1:52	124	Walter Oelwein	"Another project element that has helped WSDOT avoid and minimize effects has been to engage the public in project planning and identifying community resources, values, and preferences. These activities include formal public scoping processes; public meetings and hearings; community briefi ngs; community, city-sponsored and project newsletters; a project Web site; and a project hotline" This seems to imply that WashDOT has sufficiently addressed neighborhood concerns. The consistent Anti-Option K bias in the analysis reveals that WashDOT wants to implement the option most damaging to the local area, and hide the fact that significant pro-K support exists in the local area. The analysis implies the opposite, and needs to change.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-144	Executive Summary	Section 1:52	125	Walter Oelwein	"Another project element that has helped WSDOT avoid and minimize effects has been to engage the public in project planning and identifying community resources, values, and preferences." There is no commentary in this section that shows that the community values NOT having an overland bridge cutting through their neighborhood. It shows that WashDOT has not sufficiently explored or offered designs that reflect the community values, and the subsequent "designs" are the result of negotiations to improve the poor design and find ways to make it better. Please change any wording that implies that WashDOT has tried to reflect the values of the local area and instead say, "WashDOT has ignored the values of the local area in proposing designs, and has had to negotiate compromises".	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-145	Executive Summary	Section 1:53	126	Walter Oelwein	"Mitigation measures identified for effects during project operation" I object to the premise of this section. It should have a section: "How WashDOT designed a great construction from the start." It can't have this section because instead of using a design process, it replaced existing default roadway placement and then mitigated. This is terrible urban development, and should have been done differently. WashDOT can instead start with a better set of design principles and expertise and create a great design, knowing the values of the area.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

Plan in coordination with King County Metro, Sound Transit, and the University of Washington.

WSDOT and FHWA have explored the various technologies available to effectively and safely minimize negative effects of the project. The Preferred Alternative will improve mobility, and will reduce negative effects compared to the SDEIS design options, based on a number of design enhancements. See the response to comment I-311-005 and Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for discussion of these enhancements.

I-311-032

WSDOT considered a wide range of alternatives before narrowing them down to those evaluated in the Draft EIS. Please see the response to comment I-311-007 regarding the range of alternatives evaluated for the SR 520 project. Also see the response to comment I-311-007 regarding compatibility with potential future light rail.

I-311-033

Please see the response to comment I-311-003 regarding why a retrofit of the existing bridge is not a reasonable alternative.

I-311-034

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-035

Please see the response to comment I-311-007 regarding potential future light rail.

WSDOT has worked with transit agencies to identify appropriate transit

I-311-146	Executive Summary	Section 1:59	127	Walter Oelwein	"With the build alternatives, SR 520 would be considerably wider throughout the corridor and somewhat higher across the Washington Park Arboretum (except under Option K)." This is the first time I see any indication that Option K has a less impact due to bridge size. Why is this? In reading the rest of the document, the metrics presented seem to imply that Option K has the most impact. Please fix the rest of the document to sufficiently support this statement.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-147	Executive Summary	Section 1:61	128	Walter Oelwein	"However, broad public and political consensus has not been reached in support of this recommendation." This needs to state more explicitly: Eastside interests like Option A, and Westside Interests like Option K. I find it controvertial that interests outside of the areas have such a say.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-148	Executive Summary	Section 1:61	129	Walter Oelwein	This section misses some other controversies: The notion that putting an elevated feeway through a wetland is acceptible in the 21st century. The limited thought on how mass transit integrates (especially with the Sound Transit station). The idea of adding a second Montlake bridge that essentially doubles the congestion and back-up. The lack of integrated initial design, and the preference to suggesting a bad design, and then mitigating; the fact that there is no identifiable designer, urban planner or architect that can holistically apply expertise and holistic design and benefits is a massive missed opportunity for this project. The lack of expertise in urban design, and instead the reliance on replicating existing bad design. The fact that WashDOT lied to the City Council at the hearing in December, saying that Option A+ had broad-based support, when everyone in the room was in support of Option M. The fact that it has been revealed that WashDOT has not studied the impact of cars waiting for the second draw bridge, and assumes in all traffic throughput models that the drawbridges don't go up. WashDOT should be aware of these controversies, and needs to acknowledge these in this section.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-149	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Overall	130	Walter Oelwein	This report reflects a bridge with 6 lanes, plus 10 ft shoulders, as depicted in Exhibit 3. However, WashDOT has requested bids for 6 lanes, 10 ft shoulders, and two mor lanes for light rail. That makes this SDEIS incomplete. It needs to describe the visual quaity of what it would look like to have a bridge that size. It also needs to explain somewhere in the SDEIS that this is an option, and where it came from, as the other options are provided. This is a serious omission that needs to be reconciled before any construction can begin, since all information is based on the "6 lane" option, when WashDOT is not operating as such.	Omits or ignores important info; other options not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

options for the project.

The vision for bus rapid transit in the SR 520 corridor has been identified in the SR 520 High-Capacity Transit Plan, which was endorsed in 2008 by the state, King County Metro Transit, and Sound Transit. This plan finds that-future demand for transit in the 520 corridor until at least 2030 would be met with bus-rapid transit that runs in HOV/transit lanes, complementing Sound Transit's East Link. The HOV lanes would allow for the near-term implementation of bus rapid transit, as called for in the SR 520 High-Capacity Transit Plan.

At the same time, the High-Capacity Transit Plan acknowledges that after 2030 significant increases in cross-lake travel may warrant dedicated HCT facilities in both I-90 and SR 520. Therefore, the new SR 520 bridge and associated interchanges will be built in a way that allows the structure to accommodate a two-way light rail line or busway at a future date. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS provides further discussion. Under the SR 520 High Capacity Transit Plan, Sound Transit would study the demand and necessity of light rail later in this decade. For more information, please see the SR 520 High Capacity Transit Plan at: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/Library/technical.htm.

I-311-036

Please see the response to comments I-311-007 and I-311-037 regarding how the project can accommodate bus rapid transit in the near time and potential future light rail. Completion of the project would result in improvements in air quality, as described in Section 5.8 of the Final EIS, even without implementation of high capacity transit in the corridor.

I-311-037

The heading "What would the project accomplish?" is based on standard English usage of the word "accomplish." The current design standard is for winds of 92 mph. The requested change was not made because the

I-311-150	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 4	131	Walter Oelwein	This shows what it looks like for Option A's second bascule bridge from above. However, there are no images in the other exhibits of what it looks like from street level. This is a serious omission, because it does not appear that the Montlake corridor could handle a second bascule bridge with more lanes. This needs to be addressed here in the Visual Quality report (what would it look like to have more lanes in Montlake?). This does not seemed to be discussed anywhere in the SDEIS, and is a significant part of the project. Other intersections, L and K, are examined as having visual impact, but for some reason Option A's second bascule bridge is not.	Omits and ignores important info.
I-311-151	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 4	132	Walter Oelwein	It appears that only Option K has an reasonable integration with the Sound Transit station. How is the visual impact of the pedestrians discussed in this document? Option A appears to be very ugly for the pedestrians at the Montlake level.	Omits and ignores important info.
I-311-152	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 9	133	Walter Oelwein	"effects related to aesthetics and visual quality are given due weight in project decision-making". I don't believe that due weight has been made, as options that would significantly improve the visual quality, such as the tube and tunnel, were not considered as viable.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-153	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 9	134	Walter Oelwein	"To ensure that potential changes to visual quality and aesthetics resulting from a transportation project are adequately and objectively considered during the NEPA process, it is critical that an accepted, systematic assessment process be used." There should also be a mention of the resources used to create the aesthetics to begin with. I have yet to see any information about what expertise, design or otherwise, was used to make sure this is the best design possible. In other major projects, an architecture firm, a contest, or a famous architect is used. Why wasn't one used here? It appears to be WashDOT staffers, not someone who would be qualified to make aethetic improvements. So it needs to be called out that a) WashDOT did not enlist aesthetic assistance. and b) there is no aesthetic expertise involved in creating the designs. This indicates that "due weight" has not been made in decision making. If this was the case, then option A would be removed immediately, as it is easily the poorest in aesthetic quality.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-154	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 10	135	Walter Oelwein	"Construction effects in the I-5, Portage Bay Bridge, and Lake Washington geographic areas would be the same for Options A, K, and L and for the Phased Implementation scenario." This cannot possibly be true, as Option K is a tunnel, and at least some of the construction effects would be underground. By definition, this is better aesthetically.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-155	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 10	136	Walter Oelwein	"Construction effects in the Montlake and west approach areas would vary among Options A, K, and L. Option A would result in the lowest number of visual changes. Option K would have substantial (high-level) effects on visual quality due to the presence of boring equipment for the Montlake Cut tunnel, removal and hauling of excavation materials, the presence of barges for construction of the land bridge at Foster Island, and the removal of swaths of vegetation for the tunnel, particularly along the shoreline. Option L would have effects on visual quality comparable to those of Option K. These effects would be due to the presence of construction barges for the proposed new bascule bridge (drawbridge) across the Montlake Cut." I don't agree with this assessment. This seems to say that creating a second draw bridge across what is currently a famous vista has the least impact, while the barges associated with building the tunnel, has much more impact? This appears to be anti-Option K bias, and is unjustified in this report.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info;

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

suggested level of detail is more than typically used in introductory information. An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document and is purposefully brief. Chapters 1 and 2 of the SDEIS discussed wind and seismic safety in greater detail.

I-311-038

The fixed structures in the SR 520 corridor would be designed to avoid collapse during the design seismic event. The design seismic event is a 1,000-year event where the magnitude of the earthquake would range from 8 to 9 on the Richter scale. This means that an earthquake of this magnitude has a 0.1 (one-tenth of one percent) probability of occurring in any given year. For a discussion of seismic hazards, see the Geology and Soils Discipline Report. The requested change was not made because the suggested level of detail is more than typically used in introductory information. Chapters 1 and 2 of the SDEIS discussed wind and seismic safety in greater detail.

I-311-039

Effects regarding person and vehicle throughput vary by alternative and design option, and are part of the results of the transportation analysis. Section 5.1 of the SDEIS provided this information. More detailed transportation information can be found in Chapter 6 of the Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS).

I-311-040

See the response to comment I-311-039.

I-311-041

Effects regarding parkland vary by alternative and design option, and are part of the results of the recreation analysis. Section 5.4 of the SDEIS and Final EIS provided this information. Proposed lids are not considered park land because they would be considered transportation

I-311-156	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 10	137	Walter Oelwein	"Under Option A, a new drawbridge parallel to the existing historic bridge would alter the setting of the historic bridge and change the visual quality of views along the canal when the established vegetation is removed." In prior sections you specifically call out Option K as being worse aesthetically, but here you say Option A is going to change the historic bridge setting, but fail to call out specifically that Option K was DESIGNED SPECIFICALLY to avoid this. It must be called out here, or else this appears to be anti-Option K bias.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-157	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 10	138	Walter Oelwein	"Under Option A, the bridge over Foster Island would be higher than the existing bridge and the bridge proposed for Option L." Again, you fail to mention that Option K is specifically designed to improve the visual character of Foster Island. Instead you compare Option A to the existing bridge and Option L. The fact that you fail to compare this to Option K indicates severe bias against Option K. Option K is designed to be the best visually, and this needs to be called out in your aesthetic impact report.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-158	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 10	139	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would result in substantial effects on visual character and quality in the Montlake area." Why the neutral language -- "effects". Why not use the term "substantial improvements"? This is what Option K was designed to do. The default roadway placement of the old and Option A interchanges were aesthetic nightmares, so to treat them as somehow acceptible or neutral is not correct.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-159	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 11	140	Walter Oelwein	"These structures would dominate views much more than the existing ramps and mainline because the layers of tree buffers would be gone, with limited ability to replace the trees." I cannot abide by this assessment. The option K interchange was specifically designed to improve the views and impacts. This is written as though exposed freeway ramps and interages are better than lids and hiding the interchanges. This does not make any sense and needs to be revised to reflect that Option K was designed to have the most pleasing impact. Why else would the local community support Option K and not Option A?	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-160	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 11	141	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would result in substantial effects on visual character and quality in the southeast campus of the University of Washington. The new Pacific Street/Montlake Boulevard intersection and a partial lid would create a complex, multi-layered visual field." So you're saying that a landscape architecht couldn't create a visual field better than a wide freeway, onramps, high bridge, etc.? This is not believable and calls into question this discipline report.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-161	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 11	142	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would result in the greatest effects on visual quality and character on Foster Island because of the removal of naturalized woodlands on both sides of SR 520 for the creation of the land bridge." This makes no sense again, and calls into question this entire report. You're trying to say that the creation of a land bridge that effectively hides a massive freeway is WORSE than a massive freeway soaring through a treasured park? You're saying that increasing and connecting the parkland is WORSE than a huge freeway? Why is it that the local residents support having such a lid. The aesthic impact analysis is very poor, and needs to be re-done. It is not credible.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-162	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 11	143	Walter Oelwein	"Option L would result in substantial effects on visual character and quality in the southeast campus of the University of Washington." This section is written to be similar to that of Option K's "substantial impacts." Nowhere in the comparison to you mention that Option K goes underground, and makes for a better visual impact in comparison to Option L's intrusion on the WAC.	Error or Incorrect; Omits or ignores important info;

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

facilities under WSDOT ownership, even if they provide some open space in which passive or active recreation could be enjoyed. The sizes of the proposed lids were included in the Description of Alternatives Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS).

I-311-042

The requested change was not made because it would not change the analysis or findings, and the suggested level of detail is more than typically used in introductory information. Information on bicycle and pedestrian trail connectivity can be found in the Sections 5.1 and 5.4 of the SDEIS, and in the Recreation Discipline Report and Chapter 7 of the Transportation Discipline Report (both in Attachment 7 to the SDEIS).

I-311-043

The requested change was not made because the suggested level of detail is more than typically used in introductory information. Further, it is a project effect. Detailed information on water quality effects can be found in Section 5.10 of the SDEIS and the Water Resources Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS).

I-311-044

The requested change was not made because the suggested level of detail is more than typically used in introductory information. Further, it is a project effect. Detailed noise analysis can be found in Section 5.7 of the SDEIS the Noise Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS).

I-311-045

The requested change was not made because it would not change the analysis or findings. NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report.

I-311-163	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Secction 11	144	Walter Oelwein	"The addition of sound walls under any of the options, if desired by the neighborhoods, would make the roadway look thicker at the locations approved for sound walls." What if the neighborhood putting the entire roadway underground. What impact would that have on visual quality? This is not assessed in the report, and this is a faulty report because you are offering only poor choices for visual impact.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-164	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 11	145	Walter Oelwein	"The apparent extra thickness". This does not indicate who has would actually design noise walls. This is not an aesthetic concept: "noise walls", so it should be called out that by proposing noise walls that reduce visual quality but improve sound quality, shows that this is not designed. A good designer would identify options and solutions that both are aethetically improved and reduce noise (like a tube/tunnel). The report shows little creativity or cability of designing an aesthtically pleasing freeway in a dense neighborhood.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-165	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 10	146	Walter Oelwein	"What are the key points of this report?" This section does not mention the fact that the freeway is substantially larger than the existing freeway, which is going to be a major aesthetic detriment. It mentions later in this section "defining character of driving across 520" for drivers. What is the "defining character" that this bridge brings to residents who are near it all of the time? This needs to be called out: The aesthetics of a bridge trippled in size from the existing span has a major negative impact on the local area. Why is this not discussed? This is the main complaint be local residents: that WashDOT is proposing to expand an already ugly, intrusive structure. This needs to be articulated in the Aesthetics Discipline report. If you do, it then obliges you to further consider alternatives that would actually REDUCE the visual (and noise) blight in the local area.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-166	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 10	147	Walter Oelwein	"Exhibit 3. 6-Lane Alternative Cross Section" This scematic seems to show a bridge that is twice the size of the exisiting bridge. You need to call out here, and everywhere in the report that this is an unacceptible intrusion on the visual quality and character of the local area, and does not fit to the scale of the area, and that this is a failure of deisgn, and other alternatives should be considered.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-167	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 15	148	Walter Oelwein	"Exhibit 3. 6-Lane Alternative Cross Section" Why is it so crucial that the shoulders be a full 10 feet? This seems to create a dramatically larger profile than the existing footprint. If a car breaks down, does it need the full 10 feet? This does not make any sense. An alternative that significantly slims down this profile needs to be considered in all sections of the SDEIS, including this one, because there is no justification I've seen for having such wide shoulders. I imagine that if there was an actual designer working on this, not a default roadway placer, this would have been modeled and proposed.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-046

Project effects were described in Chapters 5 and 6 of the SDEIS. The comment's characterization of effects is inaccurate. Please see the findings in Chapters 5 and 6.

I-311-047

Please see the response to comment I-311-003 regarding why the No Build Alternative and a retrofit of the existing bridge do not meet the project's purpose and need.

I-311-048

After the Draft EIS was published, the public had the opportunity to comment from August 18, 2006 to October 31, 2006. WSDOT accepted comments on the project's SDEIS from January 22 through April 15, 2010. Additionally, WSDOT has involved the public using accessible and available methods and venues; hosting public meetings and providing briefings to existing community groups; and staffing information booths where potentially interested members of the public are gathering. Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel or a tunnel for the westside portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project is not a reasonable alternative. Based on issues related to feasibility, design, environmental effects, and cost, WSDOT eliminated cross lake tunnels and the I-5 to Lake Washington tunnel from further consideration or evaluation in the Draft EIS.

I-311-049

See the response to comment I-311-013. Tolling is not assumed to be used primarily as a traffic management tool, as indicated by the comment. Tolling as authorized by the legislature in ESHB 2211 is primarily considered a finance tool, and effects on demand are expected as a result of tolling implementation. However, in 2010, based on SDEIS

I-311-168	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 18	149	Walter Oelwein	"However, because quieter pavement has not been demonstrated to meet all FHWA and WSDOT avoidance and minimization requirements in tests performed in Washington State, it cannot be considered as noise mitigation under WSDOT and FHWA criteria. As a result, sound walls could be included in Option K." This section reveals that WashDOT is not providing acceptible mitigation and is not working in good faith with the results of the negotiation. WashDOT should instead offer better designs that reduce noise, improve aesthetics, rather than keep saying, "Noise walls are ugly, but can be added, and quieter pavement doesn't work." You're not providing any options for a negotiated option, so this indicates anti-Option K bias, and that you are not trying to make this option work, even though this is the preferred alternative of the local residents.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-169	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 18	150	Walter Oelwein	"However, because quieter pavement has not been demonstrated to meet all FHWA and WSDOT avoidance and minimization requirements in tests performed in Washington State, it cannot be considered as noise mitigation under WSDOT and FHWA criteria. As a result, sound walls could be included in Option K." This section also neglects that Option A and L have similar contractictions and problems, but for some reason you neglect to call this out in the report. The report says that noise walls will be ugly and quiter pavement doesn't work. Doesn't this mean that the project is not fulfilling its goals of being respectful of the local area and assuring visual quality? In this case, WashDOT is required to provide adequate designs, not inadequate designs only. You are blaming the residents for not being able to design a freeway, and this is not appropriate. What would be appropriate is the acknowledgement that WashDOT has not been able to offer solutions that reflect needs of the project, aesthetically, noise-wise, and is proposing something that makes it go from bad (big freeway) to worse (bigger louder freeway).	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-170	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 27	151	Walter Oelwein	The concepts of intactness and utility are not used consistently in the summary in section 10. The summary needs to reflect the framework of the aesthetic assessment.	Error
I-311-171	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 29	152	Walter Oelwein	"WSDOT visited the project corridor several times to develop qualitative assessments and descriptions of existing landscape conditions." I feel like this introduces a conflict of interest. It seems to me that WashDOT is mostly concerned about putting in roads and increasing throughput. This is at odds with the act of qualitative assessments of landscape conditions, and would necessarily put a bias against doing a thorough or accurate job in this area. WashDOT needs to acknowledge this bias and general lack of skill set, and hire an independent body not influenced by WashDOTs goals of creating throughput, so that this assessment could be accurate. It seems impossible to me that a body doing a visual assessment would arrive at a blight like Option A as a viable option, and the fact that WashDOT even proposes such a poor default roadway placement reflects this.	Error; Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-172	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 29	153	Walter Oelwein	"community input". This is vague. At the beginning of the sentence it says that WashDOT made site visits, but then it introduces the concept of "community input." This is not described as to where this input came from, and could mean anything. In a detailed report like this, an omission like this reveals that WashDOT did not perform due dilligence in understanding the community's values regarding the aethetics of the impacted area.	Omits or ignores important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

comments regarding a transit-optimized 4-lane alternative or a 4-lane alternative with tolling for congestion management, WSDOT evaluated these potential alternatives using an updated traffic model. The results showed that these alternatives would provide substantially lower mobility benefits than the 6-Lane Alternative for both general-purpose traffic and transit, and therefore would also not meet the project purpose and need. Section 2.4 of the Final EIS provides more information on the analysis of these alternatives.

I-311-050

Congestion on SR 520 with the Preferred Alternative is expected to decrease compared to the No Build Alternative based on the implementation of several project components in addition to increasing the bridge to 6 lanes, including tolling and HOV lanes, as well as other transportation demand management strategies. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) includes a variety of strategies that provide alternatives to driving in single-occupant vehicles. TDM consists of ongoing programs rather than constructed project elements. WSDOT supports the planning and implementation of TDM through its Public Transportation Division, which coordinates extensively with corridor projects and provides a variety of assistance to other organizations that implement TDM programs throughout the state. The SR 520, I-5 to Medina project will provide new infrastructure that will allow corridor-operation programs such as TDM to be more effective.

Please see the response to comment I-311-005 and Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for discussion of design enhancements and noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative. Also see the response to comment I-311-007 regarding the range of alternatives evaluated for the SR 520 project.

I-311-051

As discussed in Chapter 1 of the SDEIS, Engrossed State Senate Bill

I-311-173	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 29	154	Walter Oelwein	"project analysts". Were these WashDOT representatives or an independent body? I believe that there is a conflict of interest here in that WashDOT's interests are not improving or understanding the visual character of the affected area, but in placing default roadways through a right of way, as the proposed options from WashDOT consistently represent.	Error; Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-174	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 31	155	Walter Oelwein	This analysis is incomplete. There is a new public park "south portage bay" that doesn't seem to have an assessed viewpoint. Also, it seems stranget that there are no viewpoints assessed for most of the correidor of South Portage Bay toward the impacted area.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-175	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Sectin 31	156	Walter Oelwein	The analysis is incomplete. There should be a viewable area from the south side of Foster Island, as well as the north side.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-176	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 31	157	Walter Oelwein	The analysis is incomplete. For some reason very few views from the Arboretum toward the freeway area (between 16 and 17 on the map) are provided (especially from the south side). Similarly, how come the views from Marsh Island (and the footbridge) are not assesed either?	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-177	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 31	158	Walter Oelwein	You totally missed an important view to assess. It is from E. Shelby Street in the Roanoke Park neighborhood (up and down the entire street). It looks directly toward Montlake Cut and directly at Montlake bridge. Since Options A and L are proposing creating a massive second structure across Montlake Cut, this is something with significant visual impact. However, Option K was specifically designed to make sure this view was managed. Strangely, this assessment was avoided, indicating an anti-Option K bias. This is a glaring omission that makes this assessment incomplete. This clearly indicates why Option K is called out in the summary as being not as attractive, when you have systemically avoided the precise viewpoint(s) that Option K is designed to improve.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-178	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 35	159	Walter Oelwein	At the end of this page you have the opportunity to note that in none of these landscape units is it appropriate to have a large scale freeway cutting through it. This is an omission that is not acknowledged in this discipline report. There is nothing about the landscape that makes a large freeway appropriate for it. The freeway is an intrusion to the visual character of the area, and this should not acceptable.	Omits or ignores imporant info
I-311-179	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 36	160	Walter Oelwein	"have identified specific views and viewpoints as important" This is another opportunity to acknowledge that WashDOT put a freeway into these views 45 years ago, and has made these views worse this entire time. These views would be significantly better were it not for the eggregious harm of bad freeway design that neglected issues such as aesthetics the first time they were built. I'm astonished that this is not acknowledged in this discipline report, as this is the most fundamental complaint of those who are in the local area: Someone put a massive freeway in the area and thinks that this is OK? The area is a treasure and an important tax base. It has stunning views, yet the transportation department has chosen to destroy this, and proposes to destroy it further. It is from this perspective that this discipline should be written.	Error; Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

(ESSB) 2211 created the SR 520 Legislative Workgroup; a group of legislators and transportation officials that presented recommendations on financing and a westside design for the SR 520 corridor to the Governor and Legislature. On November 17, 2009, the workgroup made a draft recommendation to forward Option A+ to the legislature and the Governor as its preferred design option for the 6-Lane Alternative. The workgroup's recommendations were presented to the Seattle City Council on November 24, 2009, and to the public in a town hall meeting that same evening. Both meetings provided opportunities to comment on the options and the workgroup's decision process. On December 8, 2009, the workgroup voted 9-3 to present its draft recommendations report to the full legislature. The full report reiterated the recommendation of Option A+ for the 6-Lane Alternative, and included a minority report by the three workgroup members who opposed the recommendation. The workgroup's final report was presented to the legislature in early January 2010. Final Recommendations Report for the SR 520 Legislative Workgroup at http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/partners/sr520legislativeworkgroup/recommendations.htm.

Option A+ consists of Option A with specific suboptions, all of which were addressed in the SDEIS.

I-311-052

See the response to comment I-311-002. The use of the word "design" is consistent with generally accepted usage for transportation and roadway projects.

I-311-053

FHWA and WSDOT do indeed have safety standards for highways. Highway lanes and shoulders are designed to safety standards regulated by FHWA and the Association of American State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) (see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS). The

I-311-180	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 37	161	Walter Oelwein	Again, you fail to mention that the viewable area includes the Montlake Bridge, with the potential addition of a second bascule bridge under Options A and L. The fact that this is missed calls into question the integrity and thoroughness of the report.	Error; Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-181	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 40	162	Walter Oelwein	"I-5 is generally not visible from homes north of East Roanoke Street because of recently installed sound walls." It should be noted that the Department of Transportation made an error in installing the sound walls, and they are much shorter than the design. There is no mention of this, and if you are going to credit yourself for improving the visual character of the area, you need to admit to the failures.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-182	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 40	163	Walter Oelwein	"Surface streets are in a grid pattern and densely lined with mature trees that form a near continuous matrix of canopy." It isn't noted that residents have invested heavily in protecting these trees (specifically the elms surrounding Roanoke Park) from disease to preserve the historic character of the local area; this should be noted so that reviewers understand that these trees aren't here by accident.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-183	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 40	164	Walter Oelwein	The Portage Bay landscape unit includes the bay, the shorelines around, and hillsides overlooking Portage Bay." This sentense omits that someone put a giant freeway through this area in the 60s, which has been reviled as poor freeway design.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-184	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 41	165	Walter Oelwein	"The Portage Bay Bridge is an important character-defining structure in the landscape unit." This needs to be elaborated to describe what kind of character it defines. Here are some suggestions: "It reflects the values of the 60s that felt comfortable altering the landscape significantly and negatively with a large freeway in a residential area." (Note: Why is it assumed that these are still the values?)	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-185	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 41	166	Walter Oelwein	"Other vegetation includes the marshes, wetlands, and tree and shrub buffer around the Montlake shoreline as well as the untended, overgrown area under the westernmost part of the bridge." This is incomplete. You need to add that the South Portage Bay park has recently been restored by the residents, and they have removed significant vegetation along the southern part of the Montlake Playfield area.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-186	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 41	167	Walter Oelwein	"The roofed docks of the Queen City Yacht Club at Boyer Avenue interfere with ground-level views." Why the specific call-out on the Queen City Yacht club, but not mention the massive, poorly designed bridge that dominates the views (and adds significant noise).	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-187	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 42	168	Walter Oelwein	"Husky Stadium is the dominant and iconic structure and a memorable part of most views inside and outside of the area." You fail to mention that this area -- the Montlake Cut is NOT affected by the current 520 footprint, and that it remains with the same views of the prior 100 years. This is significant, because Options A and L (but not option K) will dramatically affect the Montlake Landscape unit. (This is why the residents of Montlake support option K) Yet, you say in the summary that option K has the most impact. This needs to be revised to be correct.	Omits or ignores important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

project must either meet established safety standards or, when circumstances warrant a change from these standards, WSDOT must receive FHWA's approval of a "design deviation." WSDOT has already obtained approvals for design deviations for both lane and shoulder widths in response to community requests for a narrower roadway footprint. A complete analysis of how the project design meets established safety standards is beyond the level of detail required for NEPA analysis. More information on FHWA design standards can be found at: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/programadmin/standards.cfm. Issues such as community cohesion and aesthetics are addressed through the NEPA process. Analyses presented in the SDEIS used accepted methodology based on WSDOT and FHWA guidance, as well as other guidance where applicable. The discipline reports describe the methodologies as well as policies and regulations applicable to the specific resource. For example, see the Social Elements Discipline Report for a discussion on the effects of each of the options on neighborhoods and the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report for information on aesthetics and views (both in Attachment 7 to the SDEIS).

I-311-054

You are correct that Exhibits 1.4 and 1.5 are not at the same scale. They do, however, contain accurate information regarding the measurements of the bridge. Additionally, the same exhibits are located in Chapter 1 of the SDEIS and in this location, they are at the same scale.

I-311-055

Please see the responses to Comments I-311-002 regarding the meaning of "design," and I-311-222 regarding the purpose of conducting environmental assessments early in the design process. In early 2010, the Washington State Legislature passed and Governor Gregoire signed ESSB 6392, which directs WSDOT to work collaboratively with the City of Seattle, University of Washington, regional agencies such as King

I-311-188	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 43	169	Walter Oelwein	"a popular rock-climbing structure" Why does the rock climbing structure get adjectival treatment of "popular." Can we add popular to other things, then? How about the "popular historic Montlake bridge" or the "popular views from Shelby street of the Montlake bridge". I request that you put "popular" in front of all vista areas in which the 520 bridge has an impact.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-189	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 43	170	Walter Oelwein	"The visual character of this landscape unit is defined primarily by the bay itself and secondarily by the open spaces that ring the bay." Again, I can't understand how you can omit that there is a giant network of freeways and onramps that dominate and ruin the visual character of the space. Please add that this space has been ruined visually by soaring freeways and onramps, some of which have been abandoned and ignored by WashDOT for 40+ years.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-190	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 43	171	Walter Oelwein	"These structures are relatively small in scale compared to the expanse of Union Bay and while they contrast with the surrounding ornamental and native vegetation, they provide a textural and geometric counterpoint to water, sky, and vegetation." However, there is a massive freeway cutting through this area that is out of scale to the small scale structures and pristine environment.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-191	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 45	172	Walter Oelwein	"The Evergreen Point Bridge is the dominant man-made structure in the Lake Washington landscape unit." Here you mention that there is a massive freeway in the landscape unit, but you don't mention it elsewhere. You need to be consistent for this SDEIS to make sense, and understand why the residents on the West Side advocate for improved design from the OLD, Cheap design.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-192	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 46	173	Walter Oelwein	"The dark gray of the pontoons and road deck helps to soften the visual presence of the structure as seen from distant locations." You mention the visual quality of the bridge here, but you fail to mention that the bridge is not known for its visual quality, only its size. It was designed poorly and cheaply originally, and has no distinctive architectural qualities, and is never cited as an attractive structure, despite being in such a dense, highly populated cooridor. This needs to be called out that as design goes, the 520 bridge was a failure.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-193	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 49	174	Walter Oelwein	"The pleasant landscape at Roanoke Park" It should be added that this landscape is maintained and developed by local residents caring for the park.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-194	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 49	175	Walter Oelwein	Please note that the vistas from Shelby Street in the Roanoke Park neighborhood have high utility, intactness and vividness, all because this view of the Montlake Cut has not been destroyed by a giant freeway put in by WashDOT but will be if Options A or L are instituted. This is neglected because Shelby Street in Roanoake Park was not included in the visual study, making this SDEIS incomplete.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-195	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 52	176	Walter Oelwein	"In general, however, this is a vehicle-oriented environment and the aesthetic experience of pedestrians here is diminished by traffic, in particular at the Montlake Boulevard-Pacific Street intersection, the Montlake Boulevard overcrossing, and the Montlake transit stop under the Montlake overcrossing". . . You need to add, "due to the poorly planned original design that funnels all north-of-the-cut traffic across a two lane draw bridge that opens frequently, increasing congestion. Note that Options A and L repeat this same mistake, but Option K does not. This omission indicates an anti-Option K bias.	Omits or ignores important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

County Metro Transit and Sound Transit, the Seattle Department of Transportation, the City of Seattle Pedestrian Advisory Board, and the Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board, and other stakeholders to consider design refinements and transit connections within the Preferred Alternative. Design and treatment for the Montlake lid were developed through the ESSB 6392 workgroup process, and further coordination with the City of Seattle and surrounding communities. See the ESSB 6392: Design Refinements and Transit Connections Workgroup Recommendations Report in Attachment 16 to the Final EIS.

I-311-056

Each alternative and design option that is considered in the NEPA environmental review documents has been analyzed for potential adverse effects. WSDOT reviewed the alternatives and options to determine how effects could be avoided, reduced, or mitigated, and has proposed mitigation where appropriate. Proposed mitigation is only presented for those alternatives that have been deemed to be reasonable alternatives and to meet the purpose and need of the project. Please see the response to comment I-311-007 regarding the range of alternatives evaluated for the SR 520 project and the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-057

This line of the SDEIS discussed the recommendations from the mediation group, formed under ESSB 6099. As discussed in on page 2-4 of the SDEIS and the Noise Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS), Option A, like all of the design options, was analyzed both with and without noise walls. The Mitigation section of the Noise Discipline Report discussed the locations of the recommended noise walls under each of the options.

I-311-196	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 53	177	Walter Oelwein	"In the Arboretum itself, the bridge and west approach are only visible from the Foster Island shoreline and the boardwalk between Foster Island and Marsh Island." This seems to miss the fact that there is a large freeway bisecting Foster Island, and that you must go undeneath a feeway in order to get to the commonly used part of Foster Island. This addition of a freeway through a park is ruins many visual experiences.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-197	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 54	178	Walter Oelwein	"Because of the age of the west approach structure, vegetation and shorelines have settled into a visual balance with the bridge." I don't think it's a fair statement that anything in the Arboretum natural area has "balance" with a bridge, which is actually a massive freeway paying homage to cars. This needs to be restated to say, "vegetation and shorelines are still ruined by the massive unbalance that the bridge brings."	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-198	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 54	179	Walter Oelwein	I'm disappointed with this section because it operates under the premise that it is somehow acceptible to have a large freeway going through marshlands, parklands, residential areas, boating areas, etc. This assumption makes not effort to acknowledge the mistakes of the past and assumes that this is the acceptible baseline. When embarking upon an expensive massive project, the acceptible baseline should be a structure that is in harmony with the area, not an intrusion. The SDEIS needs to be improved so that it makes it clear what an accpetible visual impact would be for such an area. Instead, it frequently ignores the impact that a massive freeway structure has on an otherwise vivit, intact, and utile visual space.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-199	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 57	180	Walter Oelwein	"The "before" and "after" visual character were compared in order to determine the degree and type of potential effect, as defined by the criteria shown in Exhibit 13, adapted from FHWA guidelines (FHWA 1989)." This concept misses the point behind the opportunity of this project. By using the existing, failed structure as the before, it makes it somehow acceptible, or status quo. This project, especially at its price tag, needs to enhance the local area rather than accept failed design as the existing level of acceptability.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-200	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 57	181	Walter Oelwein	Your first bullet point should be, "The ongoing idea that a massive structure that puts a preference to cars in a sensitive area is being reinforced and accepted as the status quo." The point is that the visual impact study is avoiding the possibilities of a design that doesn't make this assumption.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-201	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 60	182	Walter Oelwein	There is no mention in the Portage Bay Land Unit the impact of creating new bridges across the Montake Cut. These are significant architectural features that need to be cited, or else the SDEIS is incomplete.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-202	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 62	183	Walter Oelwein	"Widening Montlake Boulevard north of the Montlake Cut would remove a portion of the UW Open Space, including many specimen conifers that now act as an informal gateway to the University of Washington campus and as the ground-level terminus of Rainier Vista." This isn't mentioned in the summary, the widening of Montlake Boulevard and the significance behind this. It appears that the impact of this is far understated.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-203	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 62	184	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would not affect the Montlake bascule drawbridge area, and visual effects in the NOAA campus area could be less than those of Option A" This is not mentioned in the summary. In the summary it repeats over and over that Option K has the worst visual impacts of the three options, yet in the actual analysis, it reads that Option K has less impact.	Error
I-311-204	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 62	185	Walter Oelwein	"The east end of the Portage Bay Bridge would be 11 to 12 feet narrower for Option K than for Option A, which might lessen the visual effects of demolition and construction." 11 to 12 feet is significant, yet it might lessen the visual effects of demolition? This can't be correct, unless you state more clearly that Option K will indeed lessen the visual effects of demolition.	Error

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

Quieter concrete pavement was not evaluated as a mitigation measure because this technology is still evolving and is not recognized by FHWA as meeting regulatory requirements of noise reduction. Forecasting pavement surface condition is difficult because the pavement surface changes from regular use and climate conditions. WSDOT is currently analyzing types of quiet pavement to determine which pavement materials and tires contribute least to traffic noise on other highways. 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.

As mentioned in the response to comment I-311-005, the Preferred Alternative includes a number of noise reduction strategies throughout the corridor. These include 4-foot concrete traffic barriers with noise-absorptive coating, encapsulating expansion joints, noise-absorptive materials around the lid portals, a revised profile in some areas, and a reduced speed limit on the Portage Bay Bridge. The Noise Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) explains how these strategies were considered in the noise analysis.

These noise reduction strategies would benefit the Montlake neighborhood by reducing the number of residences where noise levels would exceed FHWA noise abatement criteria, compared to the No Build Alternative.

I-311-058

Please see the response to comment C-311-057 regarding the SDEIS options and noise reduction strategies included in the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-205	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 63	186	Walter Oelwein	"Excavation of the tunnels under the Montlake Cut would not be visible but the freezing operation and mining machinery would be visible for several months." In the summary it is repeated that tunnel excavation has a significant impact, and even made it into the summary and the executive summar. Yet here, it says that excavation will not be visible. This is contradictory information, and this section, as well as the executive summary needs to be changed.	Error
I-311-206	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 63	187	Walter Oelwein	"The loss of tree buffers, the extreme change in landform, and the construction of ventilation towers for the tunnels and pump houses for stormwater would dramatically change the park-like character of this area." This implies that there is no design to make it as park-like as possible. How can this be, when the whole intent of this part of the plan is to preserve the historic character of the Montlake area. It implies that there has been no real design work for this, so the report writer needed to just say it would be bad. This implies that the design is incomplete. The design needs to be finished (by actual designers) and then the SDEIS can be written without speculation as is found here.	Error
I-311-207	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 64	188	Walter Oelwein	"but would add large above-ground bridge structures." This sentence is buried in the middle of the paragraph and at the end of a sentence. This should be the first point made. Option L creates a huge bridge.	Error
I-311-208	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 64	189	Walter Oelwein	Because you didn't do a study from Shelby St. in Roanoke Park, you are omitting important info. The creation of a large bridge where there is only the historic Montlake bridge has a huge impact on this view. This SDEIS is incomplete	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-209	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 65	190	Walter Oelwein	There is no mention that Option A doubles the size of the freeway in Foster Island. Won't this be doubly visible? (The later section of Option K mentions the creation of the land bridge, but this section does not mention the creation of a doubled-size freeway	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-210	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 69	191	Walter Oelwein	"The noticeably wider roadway". This omits that it would be taller and the noise walls, undesigned, have to be assumed to be of poor aesthetics.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-211	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 70	192	Walter Oelwein	"The new reversible HOV fly-over ramp" -- I believe that this is only an Option A feature, it needs to be called out as such.	Error
I-311-212	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 70	193	Walter Oelwein	"Visual quality would not change here because the new ramp would be consistent with the visual quality and character of the existing interchange." Again, this is insufficient. How is having a flyover exchange next to an elementary school acceptable? It was controvertial at the time I-5 was installed, and it is still controvertial. The freeway designers should not be allowed to rely on existing bad design as acceptable.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-213	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 70	194	Walter Oelwein	Again, you fail to comment on the view from E. Shelby to the cut, where the new draw bridges will be with Options A and L. This is a serious omission and needs to be added to the SDEIS for it to be valid or to further consider Option A or L.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-214	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 70	195	Walter Oelwein	"The character and quality of the new Portage Bay Bridge Wider spaces between columns and a wider road deck Landscaping under the Portage Bay Bridge west of Boyer Avenue" These three bullet points suppose that there is actual design to the bridge. I have not seen any evidence of a bridge designer associated with this project, only default roadway placements. From the content of the SDEIS, the actual look of the portage bay bridge is simply a guess of what it may look like, and not something that visual quality SDEIS writers can comment on. This makes it an incomplete SDEIS.	Omits or ignores important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-059

As discussed in the Noise Discipline Report and Addendum, WSDOT has explored alternative methods for reducing noise throughout the corridor. Please see the response to comment I-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies included in the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-060

The effect of noise walls on visual quality was evaluated under Option L. Visual effects are noted at the top of page 63: “If sound walls [on Portage Bay Bridge] were desired by the community, the walls would block lateral views and diminish the sense of panorama.” Please see the response to comment I-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies in the Preferred Alternative. Based on noise modeling that accounts for these noise reduction strategies, noise walls are not recommended in Seattle with the Preferred Alternative, except potentially along I-5 in the North Capitol Hill area where the reasonableness and feasibility of a noise wall is still be evaluated (see Section 5.7 of the Final EIS).

I-311-061

Please see the response to comment C-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies. As discussed on page 169 of the Noise Discipline Report, WSDOT has been studying the effectiveness of quieter pavement. For more information about quieter pavement types, please see the Noise Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

I-311-062

Each alternative that is considered in the environmental review document has been analyzed for potential adverse effects. WSDOT reviewed the project to determine how effects could be avoided, reduced, or mitigated, and proposed mitigation where appropriate. Proposed mitigation is only presented for those alternatives that have

I-311-215	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 70	196	Walter Oelwein	"•The character and quality of the new Portage Bay Bridge •Wider spaces between columns and a wider road deck •Landscaping under the Portage Bay Bridge west of Boyer Avenue" This section does not mention and diminishes the impact of having a bridge that is more than twice the width size of the original bridge. Also, there is no mention of the water capture elements, and what they look like. Finally, there is no mention as to what noise walls will look like and the impact a noise-wall-look would have of the views. This is a major complaint of the nearby residents, so it is strange that it is not mentioned in the SDEIS. It needs to be added in order for this SDEIS to be complete.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-216	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 71	197	Walter Oelwein	"This would not change visual quality because the bridge is already the dominant structure in the views in this area (Exhibit 2-4, Attachment 2)." This is simply not correct and needs to be changed. It cannot stand to reason that a bridge with twice the width does not have an impact on the quality of structure. Having a bridge twice the size of the original will have a significant impact on views. Secondly, it implies that an out of scale, out of place bridge is somehow acceptible in this natural and built environment, and seems to be making the argument that this is an acceptible thing to have here. An out of scale building replacing a different out of scale building is still out of scale. I have not seen any statement in this SDEIS that says that this freeway going through several neighborhoods and parklands is a problematic issue from visual quality.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-217	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 71	198	Walter Oelwein	"These changes would not change the overall visual quality ratings, but much depends on the design of the new bridge. If the design of the Portage Bay Bridge is noteworthy and architecturally appropriate in terms of style and scale for the setting, vividness and unity would remain high, and intactness could increase. On the other hand, a design that does not consider style or scale may adversely affect visual quality." This is a very appropriate statement to have in this SDEIS, and it is quite revealing. This states that the design of the bridge has not yet be completed, which means that this Visual Quality report, and other aspects of the SDEIS needs to be called into question. How can a visual impact assessment be made without having an actual design to review this. WashDOT needs to have proper designers create a design, and then you should create an SDEIS that assesses the impact. By admitting that you don't have a design, you have stated that this SDEIS is not valid. There have been no mention that I have seen that WashDOT plans to hire an architect that would make it "architecturally appropriate", so we have to assume that this bridge will be ugly like the last one.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-218	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 71	199	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would result in effects identical to those of Option A, except that Option K does not have the Option A auxiliary ramp, making the eastern half of the bridge 35 feet narrower than under Option A (Exhibit 2-1, Attachment 2). The decrease in width would noticeably decrease the effects on the NOAA campus (Exhibit 2-7, Attachment 2), but may not be discernible from most viewpoints (Exhibit 2-6, Attachment 2)." It appears that you are minimizing the impact of something specifically designed to maximize the impact. Option K is the best effort to design in a slimmer profile of the bridge. Then to say that it has no impact ("not discernible") needs to be revised.	Error

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

been deemed reasonable alternatives and meet the purpose and need of the project. Please see the responses to comments I-311-007 regarding the range of alternatives evaluated for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project, and I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-063

See the response to comment I-311-002. The use of the word “design” is consistent with generally accepted usage for transportation and roadway projects. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS discusses the alternative considered in the Draft EIS and the SDEIS and the process for evaluating them, as well as the development of the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-064

Please see the responses to comments I-311-007 regarding compatibility with potential future light rail, I-311-035 regarding high capacity transit on SR 520, and I-311-053 regarding the need for shoulders. The addition of HOV lanes to the corridor, with no increase in the existing number of general-purpose lanes, is intended to improve the speed and reliability of transit service, thus providing an incentive to use transit. It would also allow for near-term implementation of bus rapid transit. The project would not add general purpose lanes to the corridor.

I-311-065

See the response to comment I-311-002. The use of the word “design” is consistent with generally accepted usage for transportation and roadway projects.

I-311-066

The University of Washington light rail station at the Montlake Triangle and its relation to the project is discussed in Section 5.1 of the SDEIS

I-311-219	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 71	200	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would result in effects identical to those of Option A, except that Option K does not have the Option A auxiliary ramp, making the eastern half of the bridge 35 feet narrower than under Option A (Exhibit 2-1, Attachment 2)." This misses a significant issue: The fact that Options A and L have an additional Montlake Bridge is not mentioned here at all. The Montlake Bridge is highly visible from Portage Bay (as is the 520 bridge). The fact that Options A and L are not assessed on their visual impact on the Montlake Bridge vista is a significant omission in this SDEIS. (By the way-- Options A and L would have significant negative impact on the visual quality of the Montlake Cut. Hence Option K exists, but you wouldn't know it from the way this SDEIS is written).	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-220	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Overall	201	Walter Oelwein	There are very few arguments as to why this multi-billion dollar bridge will actually improve views. The lids are the main feature, and mysterious "architectural treatments", but beyond that there isn't much to say in favor of the visual quality of the project. This calls into question the default roadway placement, and makes the argument to have real designers work on this project, not engineers.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-221	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Overall	202	Walter Oelwein	"Option L would result in effects similar to those of Option K, except that the presence of sound walls at approved locations would make the roadway appear more massive when seen from outside of the roadway." First, you need to use the term "more massive" for many areas of this report, since that is what it will have on visual impact. Second, this sentence hides the fact that WashDOT has no ideas other than soundwalls to reduce noise. It makes every excuse not to use quiet pavement, or seek out information for making it work. It lacks credibility that noise walls is the only idea that WashDOT has to solve the noise problem. WashDOT needs to change from trying to railroad stale and bad ideas and move toward identifying cutting edge solutions that work elsewhere in the world.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-222	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 71	203	Walter Oelwein	"resulting in an overall reduction in the quality of views of experienced while driving across or looking at the Portage Bay Bridge." This statement is true, and it is also stated in the report that the architecture of the bridge has not been designed yet. Therefore, this SDEIS is premature and needs to be rewritten after the bridge has actually been designed, because this would have a big impact on the report -- actually knowing what the bridge would look like, and whether it would be an architectural achievement or a default roadway slab, as the SDEIS seems to assume it is.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-223	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 72	204	Walter Oelwein	"Presence of a new bascule bridge parallel to the historic Montlake Bridge" This is omitted in the Portage Bay Landscape Unit. It needs to be assessed for the Portage Bay Landscape Unit, or else this SDEIS is incomplete.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-224	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 72	205	Walter Oelwein	"However, if the stormwater treatment wetland were designed to blend naturalistically with the surroundings it could be a positive change." This is a consistent problem with this report. The various Options are not actual designs, but concepts created by WashDOT staffers and concerned citizens and no actual design has been created by qualified professionals. This makes this entire SDEIS suspect, and in need of revision after actual designs have been created. When there is no design, it ends up being all bad design, and thus this visual quality report is inaccurate.	Error or incorrect

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

and in the Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). See the response to comment I-311-031 regarding the coordination between WSDOT, FHWA, and Sound Transit.

Coordination under ESSB 6392 ensures that the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project will not adversely affect transit, pedestrian, and nonmotorized facilities and operations at the future Montlake Multimodal Center (currently known as the Montlake Triangle), nor will it preclude future transit facility and service improvements. The Preferred Alternative would improve transit reliability in this area by providing HOV lanes on Montlake Boulevard between SR 520 and the Montlake Multimodal Center and direct access HOV ramps to and from the east; the eastbound HOV access would be via the lid rather than the via the loop ramp. Chapter 8 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) provides updated information regarding the Montlake Multimodal Center and the effects of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project on transit connections in the Montlake area. Section 2.4 of the Final EIS describes how potential future light rail could connect to the University of Washington light rail station.

I-311-067

Option A included an auxiliary lane on the Portage Bay Bridge to improve traffic conditions in this area. Standard engineering terminology includes only through lanes, not ramps or shoulders, in describing the number of lanes in a facility. The 6-Lane Alternative, as its name suggests, includes 6 lanes: 4 general-purpose lanes plus 2 HOV lanes. For full disclosure of facility width at various locations, the SDEIS provided a number of cross-sections and dimensions, including ranges where appropriate (see, for example, SDEIS Tables 2-2 and 2-3). The Preferred Alternative has replaced the auxiliary lane with a managed shoulder, which would operate during the peak periods. This design reduces the overall width in this area, and would still help to accommodate the volume of vehicles entering from the Montlake

I-311-225	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 73	206	Walter Oelwein	"In the southeast campus area of the University of Washington, Option A would have effects on overall visual quality comparable to Options K and L but on different resources." This minimizes the differences on something that is significant. This section does not emphasize at all that a second draw bridge is out of scale for the area, and would look strange. The same goes for Option L, with an askew bridge in the same viewing area. Only option K maintains the look and character of the existing set up. I don't see this articulated in the report, when this is the spirit behind the different options.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-226	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Sectin 73	207	Walter Oelwein	"Vividness would remain high in the Montlake Cut area if the new bascule bridge is an appropriate architectural companion to the existing historic bridge." Once again, this SDEIS reveals that there is no actual design for the bridges. This makes the visual quality report incomplete and needs to be re-done once bridges are designed. I find it amazing that WashDOT feels comfortable discussing the visual quality of something that hasn't actually been designed. If it is an on-the-cheap default bridge, then it will look totally out of character. As there is no indicator of who is actually doing the designs, we have to assume that it is the least-designed option that will prevail. We cannot accept this SDEIS because it fails to understand the impact. This is a concern of the residents, and this SDEIS does nothing to illuminate the issues and only exacerbates them with the admission that there are no actual designs on the table.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-227	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 73	208	Walter Oelwein	"Even though the SR 520 roadway would be wider, intactness and unity for residential views in the Montlake area could potentially increase because they would be of landscaping and not the highway." This appears to be wishful thinking, and needs to be supported with something that indicates that WashDOT has actual urban planners and landscape architects and designs that support this. It should be noted "If there is landscaping" instead of assuming that there will be.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-228	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 73	209	Walter Oelwein	"Presence of tall retaining walls, columns for the mainline, and more road surfaces around the interchange". On previous pages, you mention "f the new bascule bridge is an appropriate architectural companion", which clearly states that there is no guarantee of this happening, and that the bridge has not yet been designed. However, when you get to Option K, you suddenly know the height of the walls and columns and the visual impact of this. It is easy to imagine that elisting architects and designers, much as you seem to assure will happen for the second Montlake bridge, would create an option K tunnel entrance that is low profile, fits with the surrounding area, and would be a net improvement over the existing space, due to urban design resources being devoted to it. How come you don't mention this opportunity for improved architecture for Option K, when you do for Option A? This shows an anti-Option K bias. The design alternative that is not being considered is the idea that you can hire a designer.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-229	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 73	210	Walter Oelwein	"more road surfaces around the interchange" By the way-- wouldn't there be "more road surface" for Option A? This is not mentioned in the option A section -- when it is creating 4 more lanes. This appears to be a signifiant omission.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-230	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 74	211		"The tunnel could change the character of the east mouth of the Montlake Cut." This statement is made for the tunnel, but not for a second bascule bridge?" It is clear that there is little understanding or expertise or design behind the tunnel entrance, and the default renderings are assuming the worst. This appears to have some serious anti-Option K bias compared the the repeated use of minimal impact with Options A and L, even though they create soaring double-wide bridges while Option K does what the rest of the project should be -- minimizing the emphasis on roads (and hiding them) and maximizing the emphasis on the natural area.	Omits or ignores important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

interchange as well as those vehicles exiting to I-5. It would also improve operations on both the SR 520 westbound mainline and on Montlake Boulevard compared to the No Build option.

I-311-068

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project. Based on issues related to feasibility, design, environmental effects, and cost, WSDOT eliminated cross lake tunnels and the I-5 to Lake Washington tunnel from further consideration as alternatives to be evaluated in the Draft EIS.

I-311-069

See the response to comment I-311-067 regarding the auxiliary lane included in Option A.

I-311-070

The executive summary text on pages 18 and 19 did not explicitly identify any of the options as being affordable or within the legislatively set program budget of $4.65 billion dollars. Page 18 of the executive summary, and page 1-32 of the SDEIS explicitly stated that “If a preferred alternative is selected for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project that exceeds this limit, it is assumed that legislative action would be taken to revise the limit and/or that additional revenue sources would be identified to fill in the gap.” The text goes on to outline that current program funding is approximately $2.65 billion short of the $4.65 billion program cap set by the legislature. While costs are extremely important to consider, other factors that weighed heavily on WSDOT and FHWA’s decision to identify a Preferred Alternative included minimizing environmental effects such as impacts to wetlands, parks, and cultural resources. Chapter 1 of the Final EIS provides additional discussion about project costs and budget

I-311-231	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 74	212	Walter Oelwein	"At SR 520, the SPUI and tunnel configuration would create a walled canyon for motorists." This has too much value-judgement associated with it. Motorists would be able to cross the Montlake Cut and not have to look at a second bridge (this is not mentioned, for some reason). Secondly, moving into a tunnel and re-emerging on the bridge would be an overall pleasant experience for a driver, especially if you avoid having to sit and wait for the bridge to go up. Walled canyon seems to be overstating an entrance to a tunnel, and I'm sure the designers-- if you had them-- would make it so that it doesn't have this feel.	Error.
I-311-232	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Overall	213		There is no mention on the aesthetics and visual quality of what it will look like when two bridges go up in Options A and L. This makes this SDEIS seem significantly incompplete. Two bridges going up at the same time will certainly increase congestion (especially as traffic rates increase over time), and motorists and pedestrians will not like the visual quality of sitting and looking at traffic. Having to draw bridges go up at the same time would also have a silly, bloated look to it. Also, do they go up at the same time, or do they do it in sequence? This, too, would look kind of askew and make views worse, not better. I'm surprised that this isn't addressed at all. Of course, this is highly visible from all throughout the Portage Bay neighborhood, so this is an important aesthetic consideration for the residents.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-233	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 74	214	Walter Oelwein	"These structures would dominate near views much more than the existing ramps and mainline do because of the walls in the water for the SPUI ramps, and because the tree buffers would be gone (Exhibit 2-21, Attachment 2). These structures would be visible to motorists and park users, with the highest level of visual effects on views from the Arboretum Waterfront Trail at Marsh Island." There's a lot of negative discussion about the entrance to the tunnel, but no discussion of what it looks like when thousands of cars sit idle waiting for two draw bridges go up and down, and what a second draw bridge does from the view from Marsh Island. I (and proponents of Option K) think that it would look bloated and weird to see two draw bridges, especially since this changes a historic Montlake cut. But this impact not mentioned, reflecting anti-Option K bias.	Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-234	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 74	215	Walter Oelwein	"The tunnel could change the character of the east mouth of the Montlake Cut. Even though the structure itself would not be visible, the tunnel entrance would change the landform at the former MOHAI parking lot and require ventilation towers and stormwater pump stations in East Montlake Park. The taller structures could also be visible from some residences on both sides of the interchange." This section seems to underestimate what a good landscape architect could do here. It implicitly states that there is no actual design ("could also be visible" instead of "will also be visible"). This is a lot of negative text talking about an opportunity area for a former parking lot (and a not very attractive one at that).	Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-235	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 75	216	Walter Oelwein	"This new configuration would create a complex, multi-layered channel that would block views to the University of Washington and Rainier Vista from the viewpoints of the motorist and transit rider." This section has revealed that there area no actual designs of the bridge architecture, but there isn't much discussion on how there are no actual designs of the "complex, multi-layered channel." Why the negative verbiage surrounding the channel, when it hasn't actually be designed yet? It should have a more neutral or optimistic text (as you have in describing the second Montlake Bridge), "architectural complement to the area" rather than denegrating it as a complex, multi-layered channel.	Error or incorrect

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

shortfalls, and discusses briefly how WSDOT is exploring how to make up the budget shortfall.

In 2008, a very detailed cost evaluation was performed for Options A, K, and L through the Cost Estimation Validation Process (CEVP®). The methodologies used to generate costs were the same for all options evaluated, thus allowing for comparison across the options. During the CEVP process, analysts use systematic project review and risk assessment methods to identify and describe cost and schedule risks, and evaluate the quality of the information available. An important part of the process is that analysts examine how risks can be lowered and cost vulnerabilities can be managed or reduced. Costs estimated during the process account for a host of project components and risks, including design, construction, mitigation efforts, potential delays at each step of project delivery, costs for legal challenges and litigation, and inflation. The process provides opportunities for WSDOT to improve final cost and schedule results. The output of the CEVP® process is a probabilistic range of costs. The range accounts for uncertainties defined in the workshop for cost and schedules. By WSDOT policy (IL 4071.01) the 60th percentile estimate number is used for the budgeting process.

This process conforms to industry standards for cost estimating and is suitable for comparing design options during project planning. The cost estimating process does not account for financing of the project (the cost of bonds, as mentioned in the comment). The $4.65 billion program cap is a capital cost limitation for WSDOT and is consistent with the exclusion of financing costs from the cost estimating process.

I-311-071

This text has been revised in the Final EIS Executive Summary.

I-311-072

I-311-236	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 75	217	Walter Oelwein	"Intactness and unity would decrease in the Montlake residential area because the massive, depressed SPUI is not in balance or consistent with the residential scale and the natural character of the parks and shorelines around it." It appears that only option K gets the "negative" score for the SPUI as "not in balance with the residential scale." I have several issues with this. First, You fail to mention in this report that having a giant freeway that goes through parkland and residential areas is out of scale and balance. This needs to be stated in the report repeatedly and explicitly, if you are going to be comfortable discussing the SPUI. Second, the second Montlake Bridge is not in scale and part of the natural character, yet this is not mentioned. Third, as has been revealed in many sections of this document, there have not actually been designs of the bridge(s), and we can extend this understanding to the SPUI. Calling it out of scale and out of balance rings false, when a proper designer would be able to work on this, and this SDEIS is incomplete until you actually do have someone do this. Fourth, the second bascule bridge, additional lanes, and onramps in Option A would have the same rediculous out of scale and out of balance issues. In fact, the existing interchange at Montlake has that as well. The fact that this is called out for Option K, but not Option A shows some serious anti-Option K bias. This bias in the detailed report is amplified in the report summary and in the executive report and needs to be revised to be more accurate about the visual problems of Option A (of which there are plenty) and the visual benefits of Option K.	Error or incorrect
I-311-237	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 75	218	Walter Oelwein	"The SPUI over the mainline and the new bridge through East Montlake Park would be a dramatic change in visual character and visual quality in this area (Exhibits 2-14 and 2-15, Attachment 2)." Agreed. How come you don't mention the second bascule bridge as being "dramatic" with Option A? This clearly shows pro-Option A bias. Please understand that Option A opponents see having a second bascule bridge over Montlake as an unsightly, out of scale, out of balance addition to a historic landscape.	Error or incorrect
I-311-238	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 75	219	Walter Oelwein	"Option L would result in very high levels of change to visual character and quality in the Montlake area." I did not see a similar statement in relation to Option A, when adding a second draw bridge would surely have a similar impact.	Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-239	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 75	220	Walter Oelwein	"The new bridge could be noticeable from a number of viewpoints in the Montlake neighborhood, Foster Island, and Laurelhurst." Again, you forget about Portage Bay area. Most residences and many streets and street-end parks in Montlake have amazing views of the Montlake Cut. Adding a soaring bridge in Option A and L would have a big impact. This is an omission that makes this SDEIS significantly insufficient.	Omits or ignores important info;
I-311-240	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 77	221	Walter Oelwein	"The lid will be designed to respond to the existing landscape and this may ameliorate the enclosing effect of the sound walls by creating new connections and viewpoints." Again, the concept of design is introduced as something that is to take place later, yet this SDEIS is commenting on the aesthetic impact of. . ."designs". This undermines the concept of the document, and it is by definition incomplete, since we don't actually know the designs, so it impossible to comment of the impact of the designs. Also, this reminds us that the actual options developed were not from designers, but from default roadway placement and helpful suggestions from concerned citizens. Please have proper designers design the concepts from the start, rather than throw something together and expect us to understand the visual quality of them.	Omits or ignores important info;

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

Cost and funding information is included in the EIS to provide the public with a more complete understanding of the project.

I-311-073

Please see the response to Comment I-311-070 regarding project funding.

I-311-074

The SDEIS discussed the possibility of constructing the project in separate phases over time, with the vulnerable structures (the Evergreen Point floating bridge, west approach bridge, and Portage Bay bridge) built first. This “Phased Implementation scenario” was analyzed for each environmental resource. As discussed in Section 2.8 of this Final EIS, due to the funding shortfall, FHWA and WSDOT still believe it is prudent to evaluate the possibility of phased construction of the corridor should full project funding not be available by 2012. Currently committed funding is sufficient to construct the Evergreen Point floating bridge and landings; a Request for Proposals has been issued for this portion of the project, with proposals due in June 2011. Accordingly, this Final EIS discusses the potential for the floating bridge and landings to be built as the first phase of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project. This differs from the SDEIS Phased Implementation scenario, which included the west approach and the Portage Bay Bridge in the first construction phase. Sections 5.15 and 6.16 of the Final EIS describe effects associated with potential phasing.

The lids are integral to the project design and would be constructed at the same time as the section of the SR 520 corridor in which they are located (e.g., the Montlake lid would be completed at the same time as the Montlake interchange improvements). WSDOT has never proposed to defer the lids until after completion of the SR 520 roadway improvements.

The Preferred Alternative does not include a lid over I-5 (see Chapter 2

I-311-241	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 77	222	Walter Oelwein	"The surface lid could create a less cluttered pedestrian environment that is also compatible with the urban character of the Pacific Street area and complement the University Link Light Rail station. The depressed intersection could also create a less cluttered situation for motorists but longer distance, orienting views and street landscapes would not be available." This was worded less positively in the Option K section. There wasn't a mention of a complement to the University Link Light Rail station, and the surface lid was not described as a "less cluttered pedestrian environment." This reveals anti-Option K bias in this section.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-242	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 78	223	Walter Oelwein	"The permanent removal of the Aurora Borealis sculptures at the entrance to Union Bay near Madison Park would not have an effect on visual quality, but the marking of a threshold or gateway would be lost." This hides a story. The gateway quality of the sculptures exists because of the narrow roadway that currently exists. The much wider roadway destroys the scale, making it impossible to have a "gateway" or "threshhold". The scale of the freeway is in essence too large of a scale to make it inviting to Seattle. This omisison reveals a commentary that needs to be included -- the freeway is much bigger than before (higher, bulkier and wider), creating scale problems.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-243	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 78	224	Walter Oelwein	"The primary effect on visual quality and character from operation of the facility would be due to the noticeably greater width and somewhat noticeable greater height of the west approach." This point seemed to be diminished or avoided in the Portage Bay section. Why?	Error or Incorrect
I-311-244	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 78	225	Walter Oelwein	"The new path under the bridge could be a more comfortable and pleasant experience than going through the tunnel as it does today because of the complete openness." This makes the new path seem too rosy. The path is by definition twice as long, and it is still under a massive freeway. Using the words "pleasant" and "comfortable" are pushing it. Instead you should say, "somewhat less odious if the designers take care in this path, but if they took the same care as they did in the 60s, it will be twice as worse." I notice that whenever it is Option A, you try to make it sound acceptible, while Option K emphasizes the downsides.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-245	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 78	226	Walter Oelwein	"The Arboretum and Foster Island in general will not be affected by the presence of the new bridge." I couldn't disagree more. Why would local residents propose a landbridge over the freeway and a lower profile of the freeway if they didn't consider the presence of the bridge compeletely odious? Then to say that a bridge double the size does not affect the Arboretum and Foster Island? This is an incorrect assessment and cannot possibly be true. Additionally, the current bridge affects the Arboretum and Foster island significantly, so it cannot be true that the "new bridge" does not affect the Arboretum and Foster Island. This assessment surfaces in the executive summary, and needs to be stricken and revised for this SDEIS to be correct.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-246	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 78	227	Walter Oelwein	"Of the three options, Option K would result in the highest level of change to the visual quality and character of Foster Island." This surfaces in the executive summary as a negative. Only Option K specifically makes an effort to significantly improve the visual experience on Foster Island, yet the SDEIS says that it has the "highest level of change", with all supporting statements describing how it makes it worse, yet the other options are treating a large freeway through a public open space as benign. This is not correct and needs to be changed for this SDEIS to be correct.	Error or Incorrect

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

of the Final EIS). Instead, the proposed I-5 lid has been replaced by an enhanced bicycle and pedestrian crossing. However, the lid over 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East, and the Montlake area lid, are part of the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-075

See the response to comment I-311-002. The use of the word “design” is consistent with generally accepted usage for transportation and roadway projects.

I-311-076

See the responses to comments I-311-001 and I-311-007 regarding the range of alternatives considered for the project. Attachment 8 to the SDEIS provides more information on the range of alternative and how they were developed. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS provides additional information on how alternatives were developed and evaluated, and why some solutions were determined not to be reasonable alternatives. The 4-Lane Alternative was analyzed in the Draft EIS and it was not determined to meet the project purpose and need. In 2010, responding to public comment regarding a transit-optimized 4-lane alternative or a 4-lane alternative with congestion management, WSDOT performed additional traffic analyses and confirmed that these concepts also would not satisfy the project purpose and need. The results of these analyses are documented in Section 2.4 of the Final EIS.
See the response to comment I-311-001 regarding the extensive planning process for the project.

I-311-077

See the responses to comments I-311-001 regarding the extensive planning process for the project, and I-311-002 regarding the urban design considerations in thedevelopment of the SDEIS options. WSDOT received a number of comments in support of and in opposition to all

I-311-247	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 79	228	Walter Oelwein	"The four corners of the land bridge would likely always be somewhat visible from parts of Lake Washington, Union Bay, and Husky Stadium because the marsh and wetland vegetation might not be tall enough to completely screen the walls." It is admitted that the design is not complete for other aspects of the project (such as Option A's second bascule bridge), yet here it is assumed that the design is complete of Option K's lid -- and it affects visual quality. Why wouldn't a well designed landbridge enhance the area rather than affect it negatively? Why not call out that it hasn't yet been designed? This section is pure speculation, and indicates that Option K's impact is worse rather than better without any supporting evidence.	Error or Incorrect; No support
I-311-248	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 79	229	Walter Oelwein	"From the park user's perspective, the north portion of Foster Island would be a somewhat more formalized recreation area depending on the design of the picnic and swimming area". Again, it hasn't been designed yet, so you cannot specualte the degree to which it is formalized. And how is it acceptible to not call out the level of formalization for the other options, which have a large, car/transportation-centric structure soaring through it. Is this not formalized? And formalized declaration of lack of respect for the natural enviornment and parkland? This needs to be called out more explicitly. Consistently in this SDEIS you call out the negative aspects of the efforts to improve the area and make it better despite a freeway going through it, yet ignore the negative aspects of having a massive freeway go through natural spaces.	Error or Incorrect; No support
I-311-249	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 79	230	Walter Oelwein	"The south portion of Foster Island would retain most of its woodland character and the new path to the lid could be more comfortable and pleasant than going through the tunnel." Why the softness of "could be more pleasant than going through the tunnel"? This must be an error. Of course that going to and over the lid will be better than walking through a creepy 100+ foot tunnel. Also, it doesn't mention the experience of walking over the lid versus walking through a tunnel. Shouldn't this be a consideration of the visual impace? This is another eggregious anti-Option K statement that needs to be corrected to: The lid will significantly enhance the experience, yet it is presented here as either a neutral or negative.	Error or Incorrect; No support
I-311-250	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 79	231	Walter Oelwein	"access roads would be installed for vehicle access to the stormwater pump stations near the land bridge and this will give the south island a more developed quality." This is another example highlighing the negatives of the Option K Foster Island lid and a minimization of the negative impacts of a huge freeway going through the parkspace. How is it that something with minimally used access roads that covers up a massive freeway is "more developed" than a actual massive freeway with hundreds and thousands of speeding cars, trucks and busses?	Error or Incorrect; No support
	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 79	232	Walter Oelwein	"Intactness and unity when seen from the viewpoints near or on Foster Island could be diminished to low or moderate because the paved roads and land bridge structure are not consistent or harmonious with the island's existing undeveloped woodlands." Again, you call out this landbridge as being a negative to the island, when the other options have a (twice as large) large freeway zooming through it without any effort to be "harminious with undeveloped woodlands" This charcterization of the option is consistently incorrect and doesn't adequately express the effort to improve the situation on Foster Island. The other options make a bad situation worse on the island, yet this SDEIS does not articulate it.	Error or Incorrect; No support
I-311-251	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 80	233	Walter Oelwein	"The Foster Island trail may have to pass under SR 520 in a tunnel as it does today if the bridge height does not provide a minimum of 10 feet clearance for vehicles and pedestrians." There's a lot of discussion about the landbridge of Option K and it's impact, but no discussion of what it is like to have a freeway twice the width going through Foster Island. This section is incomplete and does not reflect the impact of Option A or L.	Omits or ignores important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

three options presented in the SDEIS (Options A, K, and L). The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Summary of Comments is available at: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/SDEIS.htm.

I-311-078

See the responses to comments I-311-001 regarding the extensive planning process for the project, and I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues. Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-079

See the responses to comments I-311-001 regarding the extensive planning process for the project, and I-311-002 regarding the development of the SDEIS options development continues.

I-311-080

See the responses to comments I-311-001 regarding the extensive planning process for the project, and I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues.

I-311-081

See the responses to comments I-311-001 regarding the extensive planning process for the project, and I-311-002 regarding the development of the SDEIS options.

I-311-252	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 83	234	Walter Oelwein	"Increases in the amount of ambient and direct light in the corridor may occur because of additional and/or brighter sources along the highway and access ramps." A special call-out for Option K's tunnel should be made here. As it is the only tunnel, it by definition, would reduce the ambient light compared to what adding four lanes on Opton A and L. Why is this not mentioned? In the following paragraph you talk about the differences between options, and this section needs to articulate this.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-253	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 83	235	Walter Oelwein	"he Option L bascule bridge over East Montlake Park would cast wide, dense shade in the park compared to the current dappled, softer shade from vegetation. Both Options A and L would increase shadowing over the Montlake Cut." This is correct, but I find it peculiar that you find many opportunities to talk about the "high retaining walls" and "deep canyons" of Option K (which I disagree with), yet you fail to mention that Option K specifically prevents this increased shading and ambient light. This indicates a bias against Option K.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-254	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 85	236	Walter Oelwein	"Avoidance and Mitigation" This section implies that these are the only good options -- avoidance and mitigation -- and reveals a core problem of the project. A third option is to identify designs that actually improve the area, that positively create a better environment (a positive approach) vs. avoidance and mitigation (a negative approach). You are preferring the "lipstick on a pig" model. Why wouldn't you first make an effort to design something great, and then tout its positive attributes? This is how most great architecture is done -- a design or architecture firm creates a design that meets the needs of all stakeholders. Where there are tradeoffs, explanations can be made. Through great design, you can make something better than its base components. The Seattle Library is an example of this. If it was a default building with mitigation, then you'd have something that no one cares about (or uses). Instead, it had the approach of being creative, exciting, exhuberent and built in exciting features that met the needs of all users, and inspired through a great look and design mere passers-by. It is on the list of great architectural achievements and is an example of how a great design can make anotherwise simple plot of land significant. You have this opporutnity here, you have taken the approach of "put a roadway down and mitigate". This makes the project, by definition, a failure from the start, and invites angry protests from most stakeholders. This section should provide a clear explaination for the design process chosen, or else it is incomplete. A SDEIS needs to articulate why this is the best possible design. Instead, it assumes a bad design and describes the way it apologizes for it.	Omits or ignores important info
I-311-255	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 85	237	Walter Oelwein	"Community input during the early stages of the I-5 to Medina project helped identify important visual quality and character features that were of concern." The reason the community had concerns was because you placed default roadway placement rather than proposed designs that would actually make the community happy. If you had said, "We have enlisted a top-design firm, and they have identified a way to remove this freeway from your views and elminiate noise altogether, while designing in increased throughput and mass-transit" -- how much "community input" would you need at that point other than -- "How soon can we get rid of this awful existing freeway that destroys the local area?" You could have done this if you proposed a tube or tunnel right from the start. You could have received the support of the local area, rather than resistance.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-082

See the responses to comments I-311-001 regarding the extensive planning process for the project, and I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues. WSDOT received a number of comments in support of and in opposition to all three options presented in the SDEIS (Options A, K, and L). The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Summary of Comments is available at: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/SDEIS.htm.

Chapter 2 of the Final EIS discusses the reasons that Option M, proposed during the legislative workgroup, was not considered a reasonable alternative. The primary reasons for its dismissal were environmental impact and cost. As stated in the findings of the legislative workgroup, “Because the Montlake Cut is an environmentally sensitive area, we believe the permitting of Option M’s wetlands impacts will be very risky and very costly to mitigate and we believe there would be a high likelihood of a much longer delay (12 to 24 months) in order to negotiate the permitting issue with the US Army Corps of Engineers.” Additionally, the Cost Review Panel was concerned that given the range of probable costs for Option M, it was unlikely to fit within the legislatively established budget for the project.

I-311-083

See the response to Comment I-311-082 regarding why Option M was not recommended by the legislative workgroup and the response to comment C-311-001 regarding Option K and the identification of the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-084

Please see the response to comment I-311-082 regarding Option M. Option M was not found to be a reasonable alternative. Therefore, it was

I-311-256	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 85	238	Walter Oelwein	"Mitigation options focused on the addition of landscaped lids to reconnect neighborhoods and augment open space; the use of sensitively designed achitectural elements and details, e.g., sound walls, ATM signage, and maintenance facilities to be integrated with, complement, or otherwise enhance existing and/or new features; the application of "green over gray"1 wherever possible in the corridor; a sustainable, functional, and aesthetic landscape design; and the increased spacing between bridge columns to open up views under bridge structures." Very little discussoin of the "green over gray" prinicples are found outside of this, in the visual quality section. Why not? The is the first I've seen of it this late in the report. I would have expected to see many instances where "green over gray" implmenations would have a positive impact on the project. This indicates that such principles have not been infused sufficiently in the project so-called "designs."	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-257	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 85	239	Walter Oelwein	"The design of sound walls must be carefully considered, given that they tend to create a confined, or hard-edged, visual character or reduce visual quality for motorists by cutting off views of visual resources. In addition, for viewers to the roadway these sound walls potentially block views and create an unpleasant concrete barrier." I believe that this is an incomplete discussion. The local residents agree that sound walls are very ugly, and have consistently been researching ways to slim down the profile of the bridge. The best ideas include using quiter pavement. However, WashDOT has consistently shown resistence to using technology it is unfamiliar with, so instead prefers to proposed ugly, unsatisfactory solutions that don't work. WashDOT had the opportunity to propose a tube/tunnel in the corridor that would, in effect avoid all of these issues, yet did not explore this opportunity. There is also no mention of what the best practices around the globe are for minimizing the impact of an urban freeway, just a repeatition of the impact of noise walls and some ongoing denegration of quieter pavement. A project of this scare requires greater thinking than this.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-258	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 85	240	Walter Oelwein	"the use of sensitively designed architectural elements and details" It has been admitted in multiple locations that such architectural elements have yet to have been designed. Therefore, this SDEIS is incomplete, since this is cited as something that has an impact on the visual quality of the project. This is one reason WashDOT has struggled to get this project going -- there really are no ideas for making this an improvement rather than a worsening of an already bad thing (a massive freeway going through a valuable natural and built environment).	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-259	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 85	241	Walter Oelwein	"The design of sound walls must be carefully considered, given that they tend to create a confined, or hard-edged, visual character or reduce visual quality for motorists by cutting off views of visual resources" Again, it is difficult for someone to make an assessment on the visual quality of sound walls without some actual designs of soundwalls, and how they would look with this bridge. The SDEIS is incomplete without some actual proposed designs (a problem throughout this document).	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

not analyzed in the NEPA EIS documents for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project. See also Chapter 2 of the Final EIS.

I-311-085

Please see the response to comment I-311-007 and I-311-035 regarding compatibility with potential future light rail and high capacity transit on SR 520. Section 2.4 in the Final EIS explains why initial implementation of light rail transit on SR 520 is not planned. The SR 520, I-5 to Medina project will provide new infrastructure that will bus rapid transit to operate in the corridor in the near-term, and high capacity transit in dedicated lanes to be added in the long-term.

I-311-086

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document, and the Introduction to the Executive Summary is purposefully brief. Information regarding the effect of project operation on neighborhoods can be found in Chapter 5 of the SDEIS. This information has been updated for the Preferred Alternative in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS.

I-311-087

Overall travel demand is expected to increase for SR 520 with or without the project. Although tolling with any of the 6-lane alternatives may reduce demand in 2030 compared to the No Build Alternative, tolling would not be expected to result in a decrease in demand compared to existing conditions. Tolling could reduce demand compared to the No Build Alternative. Demand for transit is expected to increase with all of the 6-lane alternatives.

I-311-088

The referenced statement refers to traffic volumes, not to traffic operations. Where operational improvements are planned or are

I-311-260	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 85	242	Walter Oelwein	"However, with a sensitive design that considers color palette, texture, top-of-wall treatment, and landscape, sound walls may in some cases serve as additional visual mitigation." This SDEIS can't just claim that sound walls could be "additional visual mitigation" without showing what some examples of "good" sound walls are. Sound walls are usualy applied in land-based freeway corridors, not "basin" like the Portage Bay area. Are there examples of these successfully being applied in a similar context? The fact that this is such a slight discussion point makes this document incomplete.	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-261	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 86	243	Walter Oelwein	"including the process for selection and location of any art in cooperation with municipal and county jurisdictions and art organizations." Perhaps the actual structure could be made artistically -- so that it, to is public art, rather than putting public art on an admittedly ugly structure?	Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-262	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 86	244	Walter Oelwein	"Construct sound walls that will visually screen the roadway from sensitive viewers, particularly in residential areas. The walls could be designed to ensure a unified visual appearance as viewed from within the roadway corridor." This seems a bit optimistic, since I'm not familiar with applications of sound walls on bridges, so it needs to be supported with examples where this has successfully been done in similar contexts for this statement to be valid. Otherwise, it is simply carting a tired, ineffective idea that hides other options (such as a submerged road -- very common in other cities).	No support, Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-263	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 87	245	Walter Oelwein	"Establish guidelines to ensure the design of structures are aesthetically compatible with the surrounding land and waterscapes in scale and architectural style, and unified in appearance." Shouldn't this have been done from the start? By admitting that these guidelines have not been set indicates that this project is doing things in the wrong order. You can't have a discipline report on Visual Quality if you are discussing the possible need to establish guidelines to ensure the design of structures that are aesthetically compatible with the surrounding land and waterscapes. An in this section you need to provide examples where this has successfully been done in the globe. Instead, all I have seen in this report and elsewhere, is default roadway placement that in no way is aesthetically compatible with the surrounding land and waterscapes. The SDEIS needs to have some actual designs in place in order to comment on them. And it needs to consider designs that actually restore the land and waterscapes.	No support, Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

proposed as part of the project, or where sufficient capacity exists to handle increased volumes, increased volumes do not necessarily degrade operations. The transportation analysis was conducted using accepted methodology. It identified future traffic volumes and resulting operations with each alternative and design option, based on the design and operational capacity of the specific option. Pollution is addressed in the air quality analysis, not in the transportation analysis. However, the air quality analysis used the results of the transportation analysis as inputs.

Section 5.1 of the SDEIS discussed traffic volumes and operations on local streets in the Montlake area for each of the alternatives, and the Transportation Discipline Report provided more detailed information. As stated on page 5-14 of the SDEIS, “Because Option A would remove the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps, traffic volumes would decrease through the Arboretum and increase at the Montlake Boulevard interchange compared to the No Build Alternative. Option A adds capacity across the Montlake Cut with the new bascule bridge, and on the SR 520 eastbound on-ramp with the addition of a second general-purpose lane. As a result, local and SR 520 vehicles and buses would benefit over the No Build Alternative by reduced congestion and delay on both directions of Montlake Boulevard between East Roanoke Street and NE Pacific Street.

Also see the responses to comments I-311-015 regarding the predicted level of service at area intersections under the SDEIS design options. Local traffic operations along Montlake Boulevard NE and NE Pacific Street would improve with Option A compared to the No Build Alternative.

The new bascule bridge that is part of the Preferred Alternative and Option A would create lane continuity between the Montlake Cut and the SR 520 Montlake interchange, which would improve traffic operations in

I-311-264	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Section 88	246	Walter Oelwein	"Foster Island would require extensive restoration for Option K, including shoreline and buffer restoration and roadside planting. This site is protected under Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. As such, development of revegetation plans would require coordination with City of Seattle (Seattle Parks and Recreation Department), University of Washington, Department of Natural Resources, and the National Park Service." Again, you call out Option K as the only problematic option for Foster Island, when Options A and L do nothing to improve upon the fact that a massive freeway is going through this natural environment, and the doubling in size makes Foster Island significantly worse rather than better. Every time you mention the work needed to make Option K work, you need to cite how Options A and L make a significantly worse mark on the island.	Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-265	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	247	Walter Oelwein	Portage Bay row Ignores that Option A and L have a second Montlake Bascule Bridge, which would severely alter the existing views. It also doesn't consider the intactness of watching two bridges go up at different times, and what it would look like to have double the lanes of traffic across the cut. This is a major omission and needs to be reassessed for this SDEIS to be valid. For "Unity and Intactness", the impact should be switched to low once you consider this.	Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-266	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	248	Walter Oelwein	The Portage Bay row makes incoherent comment on the fact that Option K is the slimmest profile. It says that the Option K section is narrower by "xx" feet. Given that this was discussed in mitigation, and is very important to the residents, it should have an impact on this visual assessment.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-267	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	249	Walter Oelwein	In the Montlake row, "elevated SPUI visible; lowered intersection at SE campus enhances circulation;" there is commentary on the "enhanced circulation. So this implies that circulation has an impact on visual quality. Well, there is no discussion on the impact of 8 lanes of cars waiting for the two Montake Bascule bridges going up and down several times a day, and the impact this stalled, congested traffic would have. Why? This seems to be a serious omission. Currently, visual quality of a traffic jam on both sides of the cut is severely diminished every time the bridge goes up. It wouldn't be so bad if it was just the local cars (like is found on the University Bridge), but with the Montlake freeway exchange, it makes for an instant traffic jam. Only Option K removes this visual clutter, and it needs to be cited in this analysis.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-268	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	250	Walter Oelwein	"OPTION A low to moderate: removal of unused ramps; augmented onramps reduce NOAA campus; landscaped stormwater pond at MOHAI" The unity of Montlake is going to be severely affected by a second Montlake bridge. It will look odd. This needs to be cited here.	Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-269	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	251	Walter Oelwein	"OPTION K low: addition of venting towers, stormwater pump station in East Montlake Park; depressed SPUI not in balance with parks, shoreline" I would think that this analysis shold show "high", since the freeway traffic being diverted into a tunnel, not waiting for an opened draw bridge, the pedestrian connection of buses to Sound Transit, and the opportunity to landscape the surrounding area would provide a significant improvements to the current low unity. This is poor analysis and doesn't demonstrate the benefits of Option K.	Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-270	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	252	Walter Oelwein	"OPTION A high: if second bascule bridge design complements existing historic bridge" This is a bad analysis. I would put it as low. A second bridge across the Montlake cut would be totally out of scale. It adds four lanes, will have two bridges going up and down, and basically is an ongoing homage to more car traffic. This does not make a quality visual experience, and needs to be changed to "low." Shame on you for trying to pass off a second Montlake bridge as "complementary" rather than "tacked on."	Error

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

the Montlake area compared to the No Build Alternative. Most notably, overall delay related to bridge openings would decrease for all vehicles because the additional capacity would help clear congestion more quickly. Additionally, the two parallel bridges would open simultaneously for boats to pass underneath. While traffic volumes in the SR 520/Montlake interchange area would be about the same as with the No Build Alternative, operations in this area would improve with the Preferred Alternative. Please see Chapters 6 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for more information regarding operational effects of the Preferred Alternative, including local traffic volumes and intersection operations in the Montlake interchange area.

I-311-089

See the response to Comment I-311-089 regarding the transportation analysis.

I-311-090

The Transit row does not say “transit is improved” as characterized by the comment. Rather, it notes that transit speed and reliability would be improved compared to No Build. Although there may be changes in transit routes, bus stop locations and route access, and rider connections, the speed and reliability of transit operations would be improved. This improvement is documented in the Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS) on pages 2-14 through 2-16 and updated for the Preferred Alternative in Section 5.1 of the Final EIS and Chapter 8 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

The project has indeed planned for replacement of the some of the functions of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station, and for connection to the light rail station at Husky Stadium. See the responses to comments I-311-006 regarding the removal of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station

I-311-271	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	253	Walter Oelwein	"OPTION L moderate to high: if second bascule bridge design complements existing historic bridge and doesn't block east view" Similarly to Option A, the second draw bridge will be an ongoing homage to traffic and will emphasize this as what is important to the local area. Rather than what the natural beauty is. Option L needs to be moved to Low, just as Option A does.	Error
I-311-272	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	254	Walter Oelwein	"OPTION A high: wider spacing of columns could open water level views; design of bridge could enhance vividness" This needs to be moved to Low. The addition of noise walls is called into question throughout the document, and thus needs to be cited as an issue on vividness. Also, this admits that there is no actual design being proposed, other than default roadway placement, so it is speculative that the vividness of the views could be "enhanced." This statement simply is speculative and not correct.	Error
I-311-273	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	255	Walter Oelwein	"OPTION K high: same as Option A" This simply cannot be true. Option K has the best chance to be listed as "high" because of its slimmer profile and its efforts to avoid using noise walls (different from the other options). Options A and L need to be lowered to "Low".	Error
I-311-274	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	256	Walter Oelwein	"OPTION A moderate to high: depending on bridge design and landscape under bridge west of Boyer, intactness could increase" This fails to note that the bridge is twice as wide as before, and higher and with noise walls. This better be one excellent bridge design, and given that this SDEIS had the opportunity to present one, but didn't, and is still using terms like "depending on the bridge design", indicates that this analysis is a priori incorrect and speculative. Then to claim that intactness is high is an overly optimistic claim, given the general sentiment that a large freeway going through this natural and built environment is a blight on the general area.	Error; Not supported
I-311-275	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	257	Walter Oelwein	"OPTION A high: depending on bridge design; column spacing could increase views through bridge" This is in the Unity Colum. You cannot possibly say that having a bridge twice as wide and higher has "high" unity. It will break up the views more than current, and the fact that you are still citing "depending on the bridge design" indicates that you have no idea. This SDEIS is incomplete.	Error; Not supported
I-311-276	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	258	Walter Oelwein	Error: In Portage Bay unit, Unity, it shows Option A as having Moderate Unity, and Option K as having High Unity. Yet it says that Option K is the "same" as Option A. However, Option A has a flyover HOV ramp, so it can't be the same.	Error

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

and how some of its functions would be replaced, and I-311-066 regarding the station and the Montlake Multimodal Center.

I-311-091

The information is presented in the same format for all of the SDEIS options. Additionally, detailed analysis of the property acquisitions with each option are discussed in the Land Use, Economics, and Relocations Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS).The Preferred Alternative is similar to Option A, however does not require the acquisition of the Montlake 76 Station nor the removal of any of the NOAA buildings. Updated information can be found in Section 5.2 of the Final EIS and the Land Use, Economics, and Relocations Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

I-311-092

See the response to I-311-090. The information presented here is accurate and compares the options using accepted quantitative measures that are consistent with FHWA and WSDOT policy, and a standardized format to allow for straightforward comparison.

I-311-093

Direct property tax effects are the result of conversion of property to right-of-way, and therefore can be validly analyzed. Research indicates that the effects of a transportation project on property values cannot be calculated with certainty. Property values fluctuate constantly based on a variety of factors, including the general condition of the economy at the national, state, and local level. Proximity to a newly constructed roadway is another factor that may have an effect on the value of the property, but it is not possible to quantify this effect with any certainty. Some properties could be negatively affected by a new roadway, while others could benefit from reduced congestion. Further, once completed, the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project will improve mobility, access, neighborhood

I-311-277	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	259	Walter Oelwein	Here is the quantification of the anti-Option K bias found in this document: If you give 1 point for "Low", 2 points for "Medium" and 3 points for "High" in each landscape unit (Roanoke Park, Montake, Portage Bay, and West Approach) for vividness, intactness and unity, you get 28 points for the existing structure, 29.5 points for option A, and 27.5 points each for options K and L. So under this analsyis, only option A is net improvement over the existing structure and options K and L are a net loss. So you're telling me the following: Only option A improves on the existing conditions (with no mitigation over Foster Island, a second Montlake bridge, no designs for either the second Montlake Bridge or Portage Bay span, no changes to the interchanges in Montlake, and freeway that is twice as large). While Option K, with a submerged roadway, lids, a narrower bridge profile, lowered SPUI, mitigation over Foster Island, a way not to have ugly noise walls on the Portage Bay span, and keeping the Montake cut views intact, is a net loss in visual quality. This is not credible. First, all three options, with this investment, should have significant improvements in visual quality in at least some areas. Second, Option K is overwhelmingly supported by the local residents, precisely because it makes an effort to improve the visual quality of the existing structure, and is significant positive improvement over WashDOT's proposed Option A. Yet WashDOT says Option K is worse than their Option A design (contradicting the sentiments of the residents) and in fact makes things worse. This lacks credibility.	Error; Not supported
I-311-278	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	260	Walter Oelwein	In doing my own assessment on the options, I get a much different score. I put Existing as 16 poitns. Option A as 15.5 points. Option K as 23 points, and Option L as 16.5 points. Compared with your assessment this is -12.5 for Existing, -15.5 for Option A, -4.5 for Option K, and -11 for Option L. You may disagree with my assessment, but my assessment is fairly representational of a local resident's sentiment toward the existing structure and what benefits the different options are. This is why local residents like Option K -- it is clearly the best choice, and this is the numeric justification for it using your system of evaluation. The fact that the SDEIS does not reflect this sentiment demonstrates the degree of disagreement that is had between the residents and WashDOT.	Error; Not supported
I-311-279	Visual Quality Vol. 1	Exhibit 1-1 (Section 97)	261	Walter Oelwein	Many of my comments discuss the missed opportunity of the Tube/Tunnel option, and the fact that it was dismissed so early reflects poor design processes. In my assessment, a tube-tunnel option would have scored a perfect score 36 (compared to the existing bridge's score of 16 and Option A's 16.5), since it would remove a large freeway in Portage Bay, use Option K interchanges underground and underwater, and would eliminate a big freeway going through the Arboretum and Foster Island.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-280	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 9	262	Walter Oelwein	This is the first mention of a design competition and it is in an attachment. Why hasn't it happened yet? Wouldn't we have come up with some awesome interchange and tunnel ideas? Would this have not made the SDEIS process simpler? Is this actually going to happen, or is it going to be default roadway placement and pressures to speed through this process will skip the design competition. What if someone designs something that submerges the freeway to elminate the visual blight? Would that have the chance to win?	No support.
I-311-281	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 9	263	Walter Oelwein	Why is the desgin competition mentioned only with Option A? This seems to indicate in advance, that only Option A merits a design competition. In other sections, it says for Option A -"bridge design to be determined", yet Options K and L have a determined bridge design. This is inconsistent and not supported anywhere in the text.	Error; Not supported

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

connectivity, air quality, noise conditions, and water quality in the project area. Therefore, it would be speculative to draw conclusions about changes in property value. The NEPA process avoids such speculation. For more detail on project economic effects under each option, see the Land Use, Economics, and Relocations Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). Updated information can be found in Section 5.2 of the Final EIS and the Land Use, Economics, and Relocations Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

I-311-094

See the response to I-311-093 regarding economic effects and long-term improvements that would result from the project. The project would improve mobility, thereby contributing to the regional economy. Analysis of social effects is included in the Social Elements Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS) and updated information for the Preferred Alternative can be found in Section 5.3 of the Final EIS and the Social Elements Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

I-311-095

Please see the response to comment I-311-007 and I-311-035 regarding compatibility with potential future light rail and high capacity transit on SR 520. Also see the updated analysis of environmental justice effects in Section 5.3 of the Final EIS and the Environmental Justice Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

I-311-096

See the response to I-311-093 regarding economic effects. The effect of the project on property values cannot be calculated with certainty.

See the response to Comment I-311-023 regarding Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966. Please note that the definition of Section 4(f) protected properties does not cover all

I-311-282	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 13	264	Walter Oelwein	Needless to say, these optoins are very ugly. They really do have a negative impact on the landscape. Why is this acceptible? Please include a view of no freeway.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-283	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 19	265	Walter Oelwein	(Exhibit 2.8) This visualization deemphasizes the impact of having eight lanes devoted to managing traffic on surface streets on Montake and the freeway exchange. Isn't this why people don't like Option A? It appears that you are hiding something.	No support; Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-284	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Sectin 22	266	Walter Oelwein	(Exhibit 2.10) You speak disparagingly about the retaining walls for the Option K tunnel, yet they are not visible here. This is where you said it would have the most iimpact. Instead, the largest feature is the pleasing SoundTransit station. Also, Option A doesn't have the Sound Transit Tunnel.	No support; Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-285	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 23	267	Walter Oelwein	(Exhibit 2.11) You say that the Option K and L lids have a poor effect on visual quality, yet these exhibit show no discernable difference. The analysis you provide discusses the terrible retaining walls and "walled canyons", but these depictions show no differenct.	No support; Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-286	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 31	268	Walter Oelwein	(Exhibit 2.14) The image of Option A seems to deemphasize that there are somehow 8 lanes of traffic crossing Montlake here. I don't think that the reflects accurately what it will be like, especially in comparison to the other images for K and L that emphasize traffic. Don't try to pass off that there is no traffic for Option A.	No support; Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-287	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 33	269	Walter Oelwein	(Exhibit 2.15) This viewpoint selection shows some significant bias. When on Foster Island, there is a massive freeway that is disruptive an ugly. However, in this viewpoint, you express that there is no such freeway, until Option K comes along. This is unacceptable bias against K. Why don't you show the creepy tunnels you'd have to walk through to get to this point in existing, A, and L?	No support; Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-288	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 44	270	Walter Oelwein	(Exhibit 2.22) This is a terrible view. Option A is clearly a bad choice -- it adds so much visual blight, yet this is not described in the exectutive summary or discussed much in the SDEIS, and the analysis seems to think that this is OK, while saying many disparaging remarks about the tunnel's "high walls". Look at this Option A bridge, and it is totally out of scale and balance for the area. Not to mention the additional traffic that it encourages across this choke point. Also, it should show what it looks like up. As that has a significant visual impact. The Option K rendering keeps the visual intact AND lets cars get on the freeway without having to wait for boaters (thus less congestion). This benefit is not reflected in the analysis. The Option L view is also problematic, since the second bridge, especially up, would be curious looking and out of scale. People would say, "Why the second bridge? That looks odd?"	Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-289	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Section 46	271	Walter Oelwein	Again, the second Montlake bridge looks odd, out of balance and out of scale, yet it doesn't come out in the analysis	Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-290	Visual Quality Vol. 2	Overall	272	Walter Oelwein	The lack of views from Portage Bay at Shelby Street misses a significant vista, and should be rendered.	Omits or ignores significant info.

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

properties that may be perceived as parks, such as plantings in rights-of-way or informal open spaces not designated for park purposes. In addition, a history of informal recreational use does not necessarily qualify a property for protection under Section 4(f), particularly if the property was acquired and designated for transportation use.

As required under Section 4(f), WSDOT evaluated whether there were feasible and prudent alternatives that would avoid the use of Section 4(f) properties. This evaluation was done both for the corridor as a whole and on a resource-by-resource basis, and was described on pages 121-133 of the Draft Section 4(f)/Section 6(f) Evaluation in Attachment 6 to the SDEIS. The analysis concluded that there were no feasible and prudent alternatives that avoid the use of Section 4(f) resources. The Preferred Alternative has been designed to result in 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. See the responses to comments I-311-001 and I-311-007 regarding reasonable alternatives. Acquisition of parkland is discussed in Section 5.4 of the SDEIS and updated in Section 5.4 of the Final EIS. Additionally, more detailed information about effects and methodology is included in the Recreation Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report. Section 4(f) does not require such an analysis either.

I-311-097

With Option A and the Preferred Alternative, the East Roanoke/10th Avenue East/Delmar Drive East intersection would be realigned. The turning radius would be increased so that movement along East Roanoke Street/10th Avenue East movement would become the through

I-311-291	Visual quality	Section 24	273	Walter Oelwein	"To address the potential for phased project implementation, the SDEIS evaluates the Phased Implementation scenario separately as a subset of the "full build" analysis. The evaluation focuses on how the effects of phased implementation would differ from those of full build and on how constructing the project in phases might have different effects from constructing it all at one time. Impact calculations for the physical effects of phased implementation (for example, acres of wetlands and parks affected) are presented alongside those for full build where applicable." I have not found any discussion of visual impact were it not to be a "full build." This means that there is no option other than doing a full build. Otherwise, this document does not take into account phased impmenetation, and therefore such an implementation that is not complete would not have been evaluatied for environmental impact.	Omits or ignores significant info.
I-311-292	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Exhibit 1-4 (section 24)	274	Walter Oelwein	The images are inconsistent than what is found in the Visual Quality discipline report. Option A shows no second bascule bridge. This is a serious omission that makes this report incomplete and faulty. It would lead one to believe that only option A has no impact to the local area, when this is clearly not true.	Omits or ignores significant info. Error.
I-311-293	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Exhibit 1-3 (section 22)	275	Walter Oelwein	This image shows 6 lanes plus 10 ft. shoulders. Yet WashDOT has submitted RFPs asking for 6 lanes, 2 light rail lanes, and 10 ft shoulders, making this image incorrect. How can one assess the impact with inconsistent default roadway placements? This larger profile being discussed in the bidding process needs to be included in the SDEIS for it to be a valid SDEIS. All instances where exhibit 1-3 appears to be incorrect.	Omits or ignores significant info. Error.
I-311-294	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Exhibit 1-3 (section 22)	276	Walter Oelwein	Why is 10 ft shoulders so important? Couldn't they be 6 feet or less, and still essentially serve the purpose of the breakdown lane? This is not discussed anywhere in the document for why the breakdown lane has to be as large as a regular lane.	Omits or ignores significant info. Options not considered
I-311-295	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 17	277	Walter Oelwein	One of the questions not asked is, "What is the minimum footprint that the transportation system can have and still meet the needs? What are the best designs for achieving throughput? The questions posed all assume that default roadway placement equals tranportation. Not true. Good, creative design (such as placing roads underground or underwater) can have a positive impact on transportation; Also, how does the tranportation system improve the area, rather than diminish it? Roads are an integral part of the environment, but the transportation questions posed do not even mention that the tranportation system has to integrate with the environment and is suitable for the enviornment. This is an important consideration.	Omits or ignores significant info. Options not considered
I-311-296	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 20	278	Walter Oelwein	"evaluate a new set of community-based designs for the Montlake area in Seattle." This is an important statement. This means that the community has had to take the burden of creating designs that meet the transportation and environmental needs. Why didn't WashDOT create designs that did this? This means that WashDOT did not do due dilligence, and the term "design" cannot be used. It is a project that was conducted without the community in mind. WashDOT would be better served by taking community input, and creating designs that work for all aspects of the project. Instead, WashDOT did default larger roadway placement, and waited for the community to object to eggregious aspects of it, and make modifications. WashDOT should enlist a proper design firm who can make the case of the best design given the various desgin needs and constraints of the project.	Error.

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

movement, rather than East Roanoke Street/Delmar Drive, as it is today. The lid would incorporate additional pedestrian connections between 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive, redevelopment of the path from Bagley Viewpoint to Boyer Way, redevelopment of the Bagley Viewpoint Park, and vista points to overlook Lake Union, Portage Bay, and the panoramas east- and westward. This information is included in the Description of Alternative Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). Recommendations for improvements to this area are also included in the ESSB 6392: Design Refinements and Transit Connections Workgroup Recommendations Report (Attachment 16 to the Final EIS).

I-311-098

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project under NEPA, and I-311-001 for additional information on the range of alternatives. Section 4(f) alternatives can only be feasible and prudent if they are considered reasonable under NEPA.

I-311-099

Please see the response to comment I-311-012 regarding effects on Foster Island.

I-311-100

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document and is purposefully brief. Construction effects on recreation areas are discussed in Section 6.4 of the SDEIS and updated information can be found in Section 6.4 of the Final EIS. Temporary occupation means that the area would be unavailable for public use during certain periods of construction, but would be returned to public use once construction is complete.

I-311-297	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 21	279	Walter Oelwein	"For the transportation analysis included in this report, it was assumed that traffic in the No Build Alternative would not be tolled." This is a faulty assumption. What would be the impact of tolling the 4-lane current structure? This seems to be an important data point, because elsewhere in the SDEIS you mention how traffic volumes will increase. But will they really increase with tolling? With tolling, could a 4 lane (with small shoulders) bridge actually be able to meet demand? This is an important question, because if you can manage traffic volume via tolling, then additional lanes is not important, and other, less expensive ways of completing the project could be considered, such as retrofitting the existing bridge. In order for this SDEIS to be complete, you need to remove this assumption and discuss how well you could manage increasing traffic demand via tolling.	Omits or ignores significant info. Options not considered
I-311-298	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 21	280	Walter Oelwein	"The 6-Lane Alternative would complete the regional HOV connection (3+ HOV occupancy) across SR 520 and implement tolling." Again, this seems to mix data points, and makes the environmental/transportation impact more confusing. You need to have the baseline of current state and the demanding, then the current 4 lanes plus tolling (with HOV's being toll-free), and finally, tolling plus HOV. It seems like a glaring omission not to consider the intermediary step of the impact on tolling without having to re-build the entire bridge, because this makes for a low-cost solution compared to the alternatives. Why was this not examined? What happens when political pressure changes this to a 2+ lane?	Omits or ignores significant info. Options not considered
I-311-299	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 21	281	Walter Oelwein	Why only 3+ carpools? Other carpool lanes in the state are 2 people, and there will be a political push to make 2 people vehicles qualify for HOV, especially with tolling. This seems to be a big assumption, and the reasons for only considering 3+ carpools is not provided in this document.	Omits or ignores significant info. Options not considered
I-311-300	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 22	282	Walter Oelwein	"The proposed width of the roadway would be approximately 18 feet narrower than the one described in the Draft EIS, reflecting public comment from local communities and the City ofSeattle." In order for this SDEIS to hold and to make this project legal, this statement has to hold. Please indicate why WashDOT has put out bid requests describing a larger profile, undermining the project, and probably causing delays.	Omits or ignores significant info. Options not considered
I-311-301	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 22	283	Walter Oelwein	"The project would include landscaped lids across SR 520 at I-5, 10th Avenue East, and Delmar Drive East, and in the Montlake area" In order for this SDEIS to be correct, these lids have to be built. Since there is no discussion of the environmental impact of not building these lids, it is a requirement that these bids be built, or else the project violates the law.	Reminder to keep promises.
I-311-302	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 24	284	Walter Oelwein	Imagery shows Option A as not having a second bascule bridge and new freeway interchange. This gives the impression that Option A is not a big change, when it is a dramatic change.	Error
I-311-303	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 25	285	Walter Oelwein	"Citizen recommendations made during the mediation process redefined this option to include quieter pavement for noise abatement instead of sound walls included in the 2006 Draft EIS." Why didn't WashDOT offer this itself? Why isn't WashDOT actively suggesting better mitigations, and waiting for citizens to conduct better freeway designs? This statement indicates that WashDOT has not sufficiently researched options for this project, and needs to do so in order for the project to meet the design needs.	Omits important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

With the Preferred Alternative, portions of Montlake Playfield and the Bill Dawson Trail would be temporarily occupied during construction. The Preferred Alternative would also require a portion of Montlake Playfield to be permanently converted to right-of-way. The Bill Dawson Trail would be reconstructed and relocated once construction is complete. Interlaken Park would not experience any temporary construction easements or permanent acquisition with the Preferred Alternative. Permanent effects on parkland with the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Section 5.4 of the Final EIS.

I-311-101

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document and is purposefully brief.

Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act prohibits the conversion of property acquired or developed with these grants to a non-recreational purpose without the approval of the Department of Interior's National Park Service (NPS). Section 6(f) directs the NPS to assure that replacement lands of equal value, location and usefulness are provided as conditions to approval of land conversions. Therefore, where a Section 6(f) land conversion is proposed for a highway project, replacement land will be necessary, and the NPS's position on the land transfer must be documented.

Effects on Section 6(f) properties and replacement sites are discussed in the Draft Section 4(f)/6(f) Evaluation (Attachment 6 to the SDEIS) and updated information is included in the Environmental Evaluation of Section 6(f) Replacement Sites in Chapter 10 of the Final EIS. Regarding analysis of alternatives related to their effects on parkland, see the responses to comments I-311-023 and I-311-096. That sort of analysis occurs under Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966. WSDOT has conducted the necessary and

I-311-304	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 25	286	Walter Oelwein	"However, because quieter pavement has not been demonstrated to meet all FHWA and WSDOT avoidance and minimization requirements in tests performed in Washington State, it cannot be considered as noise mitigation under WSDOT and FHWA criteria. As a result, sound walls could be included in Option K. The decision to build sound walls depends on neighborhood interest, the findings of the Noise Discipline Report (WSDOT 2009b), and WSDOT's reasonability and feasibility determinations." This statement is confusing and error-prone. First, does quieter pavement meet some criteria for improving the noise situation? It is presented as all or nothing, when clearly quieter pavement, as the name implies, does something to reduce noise. Second, why is this being considered only for Option K, and not the other options? Citizen input has been focused on option K because it is the only viable option, and citizens have been focused on creating the best design. Options A and L could benefit from quieter pavement, but because there is citizen opposition to these options, WashDOT will not consider quieter pavement? This does not make sense. The SDEIS needs to consider the impact of quieter pavement for all options. It also needs to make explicit that there is citizen opposition to Options A and L, and this is why quieter pavement is not discussed for these options -- citizens will be against these options with or without quieter pavement. This needs to be surfaced for this statement to make sense. Finally, what other options does WashDOT have other than noise walls? Is that it? This seems to be a very limited set of options for such a large project. How about a lower speed limit? That would reduce noise.	Omits important info
I-311-305	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 26	287	Walter Oelwein	"Noise mitigation identified for this option would include sound walls as defined in the Draft EIS." Why not add quieter pavement too? What's the issue of making it even better?	Omits important info
I-311-306	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 31	288	Walter Oelwein	"Exhibit 1-8 shows the vulnerable portions of the project that would be prioritized, as well as the portions that would be constructed later." The term prioritization implies that parts of this project could be dropped off. So the priority 3 parts -- such as the new lids and intersections, could conceivably be not completed. However, if you do this, this changes the environmental impact, making the document invalid, and if you don't complete all parts of the project, then the project is illegal, since it didn't take into account the environmental impact if priorty 2 and 3 options are not complete. So priority is the incorrect word. You can just say "Phase 1, Phase 2, based on safety concerns", but you can't say prioirty, because that implies that it does not need to be compelted as much, but in order for the SDEIS to be legal, it does.	Error. Omits important info
I-311-307	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 31	289	Walter Oelwein	"the regional bicycle/pedestrian path, but lids would be deferred until a subsequent phase" This makes it appear that building the lids is optional, but you are not considering the environmental impact of not constructing the lids. So this needs to be re-written not to imply that the lids are optional. How about, "The lids will be an integral part to complete this project, and if they are not, then this document is invalid and WashDOT has not completed the necessary regulatory steps to proceed on this project."	Error. Omits important info
I-311-308	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 31	290	Walter Oelwein	"WSDOT would develop and implement all mitigation needed to satisfy regulatory requirements." This is written to imply that mitigation is different from lids. It needs to be more explicit, such as "WSDOT will develop and implement the project as described in this document" so that alternative mitigation that is not discussed in the SDEIS is implemented without study or public comment.	Error. Omits important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

appropriate planning to comply with Section 4(f), including a Section 4(f) alternatives analysis.

I-311-102

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document is purposefully brief. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues. Visual quality effects are discussed in Section 5.5 of the SDEIS and the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). Updated information is in Section 5.5 of the Final EIS and in the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

I-311-103

Option K would change visual quality for the University of Washington, the Arboretum, and in the Montlake residential area due to the tunnel entrances, retaining walls, lids, and required ventilation towers and stormwater pump stations. Visual quality effects are discussed in Section 5.5 of the SDEIS and the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). Updated information is in Section 5.5 of the Final EIS and in the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS). If Option K were identified as the Preferred Alternative in the future, WSDOT would provide additional information as part of final design and permitting and ensure that negative effects associated with these options are mitigated to the extent practicable.

I-311-104

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document and is purposefully brief. Further, NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of

I-311-309	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section3 1	291	Walter Oelwein	"The evaluation focuses on how the effects of phased implementation would differ from those of full build and on how constructing the project in phases might have different effects from constructing it all at one time. Impact calculations for the physical effects of phased implementation (for example, acres of wetlands and parks affected) are presented alongside those for full build where applicable." This is the only reference to the "full build" in the Transporation Discipline report, which means to say that this SDEIS only considers full build, and not partial build scenarios. This means that WashDOT is obliged to build all aspects, including lids, or else it is a project that has not cleared regulatory standards.	Error. Omits important info
I-311-310	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 31	292	Walter Oelwein	"What are the key findings for freeway traffic?" This section describes the experience for freeway traffic, but not mass transit options. It is incomplete, because it does not describe the general experience for busses (which need to deal with the same traffic) and it does not mention that there is no mass transit option that is not affected by traffic (trains). Similarly, the bicycle and pedestrian situation is not mentioned. This is an incomplete assessment of the current state. It needs to describe the general mass transit experience if this wants to be the "transportation" discipline report. Transportation isn't just cars, but the way it is written, it implies that it is. This makes the SDEIS incomplete and incorrect, as in the introduction all kinds of transportation is discussed at the beginning chapter about the need for a transportation discipline report, but not when it comes to the actual content.	Error. Omits important info
I-311-311	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 34	293	Walter Oelwein	"With this growth, traffic volumes and congestion will be affected as described below:" Again, this assumes only traffic. What are the mass transit needs (i.e., people without cars? How many more busses? How many trains? This omission makes the findings imply that the only solution is increased roadway. This is an omission that needs to be corrected for this SDEIS to be correct.	Error. Omits important info
I-311-312	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 34	294	Walter Oelwein	"Daily traffic demand across Lake Washington would increase by 17 percent on SR 520," This doesn't seem like a whole lot. The increase in the number of lanes is 33%. It also seems as though quality mass transit could easily absorb that 17 percent, and tolling would discourage 17% driving. So the project does not seem to justify adding more lanes under this assumption.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-313	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 34	295	Walter Oelwein	"On SR 520, morning peak period demand would increase 10 percent and afternoon peak period demand would increase 16 percent compared to today. Peak period congestion would be worse than today." Again, this statement really doesn't seem much worse than today, not justifying a 33% increase in car lanes and the wide shoulders. It appears that some tolling that would reduce demand, increased busses, or a light rail line could easily handle this growth, especially with the sound transit line coming through the corridor. Because tolling on the "no build" alternative is assumed out, this design option is omitted, when it could significantly reduce costs and impact of the project.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report. Analyses presented in the SDEIS used accepted methodology based on WSDOT and FHWA guidance, as well as other guidance where applicable. Please see the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report for an explanation about how visual quality is analyzed. See Section 5.5 of the Final EIS and the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for a description of the effects of the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-105

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document, is purposefully brief, and does not describe all project components. A discussion of the visual quality effects of the new bascule bridge is included in Section 5.5 of the SDEIS the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS).

I-311-106

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document is purposefully brief. A discussion of the visual quality effects with Option K is included in Section 5.5 of the SDEIS the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). The effect is not “massive” as characterized by the comment, but it would affect cultural resources. See the response to comment I-311-016 regarding the effect of the new bascule bridge on visual quality and cultural resources, and how the cultural resources effect would be mitigated.

I-311-107

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document is purposefully brief. Please see the responses to comments I-

I-311-314	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 34	296	Walter Oelwein	"Westbound general-purpose travel times will increase approximately 20 to 30 minutes compared to today. Eastbound general-purpose travel times will increase up to 1 hour." What would happen if there was a toll (and $5 toll at that)? Wouldn't this reduce demand significantly, encourage HOV and bus travel? This is not considered, when it should be, because it is something that the legislature has actually signed into law -- early tolling. The estimates for the "no build" option are fiction, because we know that there will be tolling prior to building a new bridge, yet the impact of this on the "no build" option isn't considered. This is a strange omission and implies that WashDOT is not interested in identifying the best option for moving people and preserving the environment, but is interested in increasing the roadway footprint.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-315	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 34	297	Walter Oelwein	"With the 6-Lane Alternative, the SR 520 corridor would be tolled, which would cause some drivers to change their travel mode (bus or carpool), time of day for travel, or their route." The abrupt introduction of tollling with 6 lanes (but not considering it with 4 lanes -- even though this will happen because of state law) doesn't make sense. The SDEIS has to consider the impact of tolling on the "no build" alternative for this to be a valid SDEIS. It cannot state how congesting things will be without discussing the impact on tolls.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-316	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 34	298	Walter Oelwein	"The 6-Lane Alternative options would not generate more regional traffic, but would change traffic circulation patterns to and from SR 520." This statement is difficult to understand. How does a roadway "generate" traffic. Earlier it says that regional growth and employment generates traffic. Here it says that the roadway generates traffic. This is a contradiction. This statement is written to imply that the 6 lane alternative will not be responsible in more traffic, just the shifting around in traffic. This implies that the additional lanes are actually not necessary (since there isn't "more" traffic), and that an improvement in the interchanges are all that are needed.	Error or incomplete info.
I-311-317	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 35	299	Walter Oelwein	"The 6-Lane Alternative HOV system and design improvements would substantially reduce congestion at two of the most congested locations on SR 520 compared to the No Build Alternative: ll Approaching the SR 520 bridge in Medina (westbound), ll Approaching the SR 520 bridge in Seattle (eastbound)" Again, as this is the summary, there is no mention of the impact on mass transit options, it is purely a car-centric statement. The SDEIS needs to describe the impact on Mass Transit as welll.	Error or incomplete info.
I-311-318	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 35	300	Walter Oelwein	"Tolling and the completion of the HOV lane with the 6-Lane Alternative would reduce daily vehicle volumes across SR 520 by up to 4,700 vehicles (or 3 percent) compared to the No Build Alternative. Some people would choose to take other modes of travel (such as transit, carpools, vanpools, and bike), change time of travel, or select a different route." What about with the 4 lane alternative and increased busses?	Error or incomplete info.
I-311-319	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 35	301	Walter Oelwein	This section describes only the amount of car traffic, and vehicle traffic time. What is the mass transit traffic time change? What is the amount of mass transit trips that the bridge can handle? This report is focused only on vehicular transportation, and paints no picture of the mass transit situation and improvement oppportunities. This makes the SDEIS incomplete.	Error or incomplete info.
I-311-320	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 35	302	Walter Oelwein	It is not mentioned that the "Montlake Flyer" bus stop is being removed, so this would change non-car travel times in some way. This is not mentioned, even though this is a major source of traffic across the bridge, and I'm very interested in knowing what the change would be.	Error or incomplete info.
I-311-321	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 35	303	Walter Oelwein	"HOV vehicles approximately 40 minutes." Are you including busses in the mix of HOV vehicles? If so, it needs to be more explicit. At the same time, the busses will not be stopping at Montlake, so that has an impact on travel time. It is not mentioned here, making this document incomplete.	Error or incomplete info.

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

311-104 regarding the characterization of visual quality effects, and I-311-012 regarding effects of the SDEIS design options on Foster Island.

I-311-108

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document is purposefully brief. The effects shown in the table were similar across all options. For detailed comparisons of cultural resources effects, see Section 5.6 of the SDEIS and the Cultural Resources Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). See the Final EIS for updated effects with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-109

Please see the response to comment I-311-012 regarding effects on Foster Island. WSDOT determined that Option A would have fewer negative effects on Foster Island than Option K.

I-311-110

As discussed in Section 5.7 of the SDEIS, the 6-Lane Alternative would have a lower number of residences where noise levels exceed the Noise abatement Criteria (NAC) than the No Build Alternative. Please see the response to comment I-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-111

The noise analysis used accepted methodology based on WSDOT and FHWA guidance. A description of the methodology and more detail on the results can be found in the Noise Discipline Report (Attachment 7 o the SDEIS). Table 5.7-1 in the SDEIS provides the number of residences that would approach or exceed FHWA's noise abatement criteria without mitigation. Options A and K are very similar in their potential noise effects. For example, in 7 of the 9 neighborhoods, Options A and K would have nearly the same noise effect. Option A would cause more

I-311-322	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 35	304	Walter Oelwein	"General-purpose vehicle trips would decrease by up to 10,000 vehicles per day and general-purpose person trips would decrease by up to 13,500 persons per day." Then why make the freeway bigger? This implies that the traffic demand is managable, and tolling and mass transit could manage traffic through 2030 without increasing the bridge profile.	Error or incomplete info. Options not considered.
I-311-323	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 35	305	Walter Oelwein	"The 6-Lane Alternative would allow SR 520 to serve more traffic than the No Build Alternative during the peak period: up to approximately 700 more vph and 2,100 more people per hour." This "key finding" is written as though it is a good thing (more vehicular traffic is better). But let's consider this a bad thing: It implies that we are encouraging more general purpose traffic when we are in an era when we are trying to reduce vehicular trips. This implies that this is the main goal of the project, rather than finding the best transportation corridor that reflects our values. This statement is embelmatic of how WashDOT is not considering the interests and values, and is considering only increased throughput.	Error or incomplete info. Options not considered.
I-311-324	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 36	306	Walter Oelwein	"This diversion would increase traffic in the Harvard/Roanoke neighborhood and increase traffic along the NE 45th Street corridor. The diversion would also decrease traffic volumes north of the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection compared to the No Build Alternative." What is the impact on Delmar Dr. E? This needs to be mentioned for the SDEIS to be complete.	Error or incomplete info.
I-311-325	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 36	307	Walter Oelwein	"With Suboption A (with Lake Washington Boulevard ramps), access to SR 520 (and therefore traffic volumes) would be similar to the No Build Alternative." This cannot possibly be true, since above it is stated that all 6 lane alternatives would handle more cars and people than no-build, but none of these cars are going thorugh Lake Washington Blvd? This is impossible. The analysis is incorrect.	Error or incomplete info.
I-311-326	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 36	308	Walter Oelwein	"With Options K and L, traffic volumes at the SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke and I-5/NE 45th Street interchanges would be similar to the No Build Alternative." Again, this seems impossible. Throughout the introduction, you mention the explosive increased growth of population, employment, and vehicular traffic. Then you mention the increased throughput that the 6-lane alternatives would bring, but when it comes to the impact at interchanges, you say, "No different than no-build." It must be that more cars will get on and off at these interchanges, because there will be more cars, as stated earlier.	Error or incomplete info
I-311-327	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 37	309	Walter Oelwein	"In the Montlake area:" There is no mention of the impact of the bascule bridges on traffic. These bridges go up frequently during the day, and create lots of congestion. With Options A and L, you are creating more capacity, and at the same time stalling traffic the same amount of time, creating more congestion. This needs to be analyzed and mentioned in the SDIES for it to be complete.	Error or incomplete info
I-311-328	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 37	310	Walter Oelwein	"Option K or L would decrease traffic volumes on SR 520 between Montlake and I-5 compared to the No Build Alternative because drivers would shift their travel routes to the new interchange and its associated increase in capacity in the Montlake area." This key finding needs to be stated in the "Montlake" section. I could not identify a key finding that Option K and L would increase capacity in the Montlake area. This needs to be addressed in the Montlake section, because it seems like a pretty important differentiation between Options K and L.	Omission

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

noise effects in the Montlake South of SR 520 neighborhood, while Option K results in greater noise effects near the Arboretum. Thus, there is only a slight advantage in Option A over Option K when evaluating noise effects without mitigation.

The Noise Discipline Report discusses in detail each option, the results of the noise analysis, and the recommended mitigation. The noise analysis has been updated for the Preferred Alternative. See Section 5.7 of the Final EIS and the Noise Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

See the response to comment I-311-067 regarding the number of lanes in the SDEIS options.

I-311-112

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-113

Exhibits 15 and 16 on page 31 of the Air Quality Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS) show the effects at this intersection under Options A, K, and L. The suboption to Option A would result in a slight increase in CO concentration compared to Option A at this intersection, but the concentration would still be lower than with Options K or L, and lower than existing conditions, although it would be slightly higher than under the No Build alternative in 2030.

I-311-114

The air quality analysis used accepted methodology based on WSDOT and FHWA guidance. A description of the methodology and more detail

I-311-329	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 37	311	Walter Oelwein	"Even though SR 520 traffic volumes would decrease between Montlake and I-5, some westbound congestion would remain because neither Option K nor L includes the westbound auxiliary lane." This needs to be quantified for it to be valid. "Some congestion would remain" is vague and unsupported, but designed to make Option A look good and Options K and L look bad. It also implies that with Option A, "some congestion would *not* remain", that is, Option A relieves all congestion. This cannot be true, and needs to be stricken from the SDEIS for the document to be valid.	Not supported, Error
I-311-330	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 37	312	Walter Oelwein	"With Option K or L, congestion on SR 520 would also affect ramp traffic at the new interchange, spilling back onto the local system." OK, this is clearly an anti-L and -K statement. How can it be that Option K/L "spills back" and Option A doesn't? First, "Spills back" is a value-laden term that implies that Option K is the worst design, when in fact it does the most to channel traffic quickly to and from the freeway with no "spilling back." Second as Options A and L have bascule bridges that shut down traffic several times a day, this would surely "spill back" traffic into the local system. However, the fact that the draw bridges would stop traffic for extended periods is ignored in the SDEIS.	Error, not supported, omission
	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 38	313	Walter Oelwein	"The NE 45th Street/7th Avenue NE intersection would worsen from LOS D with the No Build Alternative to LOS E during the afternoon peak hour with Option A." This statement again shows Anti-K bias. It says that Option A is worse, but it does not say that Option K makes things better (since cars can more easily get north of the cut). Why not call out K when it is the best option?	Omission
I-311-331	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 38	314	Walter Oelwein	"Roanoke Street Interchange Area" This section describes only worsening of the intersections. However, what is WashDOT doing to make it so that these cars can be transitioned to mass-transit? By definition, these are people in close-in neighborhoods, so an improved mass-transit arrangement would make it possible to actually reduce trafic. But this report only discusses cars, so we don't know what the impact of improved mass transit will be. This is where the one-dimentional analysis of cars and growth = more cars is faulty. With more growth you can get more mass transit -- which means fewer cars but more people trips. This SDEIS doesn't seem to take into account the opportunities for improved people transportation, and only quantifies cars. This calls into question the basic concept of the project, where moving people in dense corridors is the top priority (not necessarily cars).	Omission; other options not considered
I-311-332	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 38	315	Walter Oelwein	"Montlake Interchange Area" This section needs to be more clearly written for it to make sense. This is where the greatest differential between Options A, L and K are, and the differences are difficult to follow. Secondly, there is no mention on the impact that the additional bascule bridges (options A, L) have vs. no additional bascule bridges for Option K. This is a huge difference, because traffic to and from the freeway will not be subject to boat traffic, as is common today. the fact that it is not mentioned makes this analysis glaringly incomplete, and leads one to believe that there is anti-Option K bias.	Omission; other options not considered
I-311-333	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 38	316	Walter Oelwein	"The Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection would improve from LOS F with the No Build Alternative to LOS E during the afternoon peak hour with Option A and its suboption." What would be the difference with Option L and K? This is an important difference between the two options, and it would seem that Option K would be much better, since traffic does not have to go across the Montlake bridges and can more directly access the freeway.	Omission; other options not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

on the results can be found in the Air Quality Discipline Report (Attachment 7 of the SDEIS). Exhibits 15 and 16 on page 31 of the Air Quality Discipline Report showed modeled CO concentrations at intersections in the Montlake area under Options A, K, and L. Emissions at these intersections with Options K and L would be generally the same or somewhat higher than with Option A in 2030.

I-311-115

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document is purposefully brief.

Options A, K, and L were generally similar in their permanent effects on greenhouse gas emissions, when compared to the No Build Alternative. For this reason, the Executive Summary did not show their relative ranking. However, exhibits 23 and 24 in the Energy Discipline Report show that Option A would have lower greenhouse gas emissions than Options K and L in the project area. See the response to comment I-311-088 regarding the transportation effects of the new bascule bridge.

I-311-116

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project. Please see Section 5.9 of the Final EIS for a discussion of how the project relates to regional goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Please see the response to comments I-311-007 and I-311-037 regarding how the project can accommodate bus rapid transit in the near time and potential future light rail.

I-311-117

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document is purposefully brief. Please see the response to comment I-

I-311-334	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 38	317	Walter Oelwein	"The Montlake Boulevard NE/East Shelby Street intersection would improve from LOS F with the No Build Alternative to LOS A during the afternoon peak hour with all of the 6-Lane Alternative options". This seems implausible, since two of the three alternatives have a bascule bridge, so there will be a difference non-peak at least. Second, with the additional lanes, this is going to be a much bigger intersection with Option A, so it is hard to imagine that it will be so much better with A, and especially in comparison to K. This is anti-K bias.	Omission; other options not considered
I-311-335	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 38	318	Walter Oelwein	Not once does it mention "off-peak" traffic. Normally, I could see this not being a big deal, but with the Montlake Cut, and the boating right of way, this is a major omission in the findings. During peak hours, the bridges don't go up, but at other times, the boating right of way causes the bridge (and potentially bridges) go up a lot. During the summer, A LOT. This makes non-peak traffic come to a halt for extended periods of time as boats go through. It is a common experience to be sitting in a stand-still in Montlake at any time of day, making non-peak traffic as much an issue as peak traffic. With Option A and L having bascule bridges, it stands to reason that this would extend and exacerbate the problem. And Option K would alleviate the problem, since SR520 traffic would not be subject to the whims of the boating right-of-way, and the back-ups waiting for the bridges would be limited to the cars who don't want to get on the freeway. That's a huge difference, and the fact that this is not discussed or considered in the discipline report is a major omission, and something that the public needs to be aware of. It also reflects Anti-K bias, since the design for Option K was to stop the madness of the Montlake bridge being a gateway for freeway (and transit) on-off traffic. This is a major benefit of the design, and needs to be analyzed and discussed.	Omission; other options not considered; Error
I-311-336	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 38	319	Walter Oelwein	I provided this feedback in the Draft EIS, but it does not seem to be addressed in the SDES: The main corridors of Furman/Boyer and Delmar Drive are not addressed in this section analysis. Given that these are two major arterials that are directly related to cars making short-cuts on-and-off the freeway, there is a great amount of interest in these streets, and how a new freeway would impact traffic on them. The intersection where they meet (Boyer and E. Lynn) gets heavy traffic in the morning and evening, and much of it is "cut-through" traffic -- people avoiding the freeway to get on to the bridge closer to the bridge deck. How would the new freeway road placements improve this kind of "negative impact" traffic to the neighborhood?	Omission;
I-311-337	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 39	320	Walter Oelwein	"Existing Conditions": This section has an incomplete discussion on the existing conditions of mass transit, it just says that it is commonly used for transit. What is it like to walk down to the freeway station and wait on the side of a freeway for a bus stuck in traffic? How do people get to the Montlake area via bus to get on 520? This is not discussed. It focuses only on the driver experience. How people experience this roadway via mass transit needs to be discussed, or else this SDEIS is woefully incomplete; in it's current state, it reflects the "only cars are important" concept commonly found in this SDEIS, and paints an incomplete picture of how the new freeway options are going to help transportation (cars and other modes) in the 21st century. This can explain why the Options presented so casually eliminate the "Montlake Flyer" freeway station, but do not recommend an option for how to replace the traffic there. C'mon WashDOT, get into the 21st century!	Omission

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

311-007 and I-311-035 regarding compatibility with potential future light rail and high capacity transit on SR 520.

I-311-118

Increases in pollutant generating impervious surface (PGIS) typically are viewed in a negative manner due to the increase in the quantity of runoff and the increase in the amount of associated pollutants. However, all PGIS that is part of the project would be served by water quality treatment that is also part of the project. The existing structure has no water quality treatment. Thus, the net result of the project would be an overall reduction in pollutant loads.

Although Option K adds parkland to a portion of Foster Island, the effects to wetlands and habitat are still high. The added parkland to the Foster Island area would be primarily for recreational use and would not be restoring the wetlands that previously occupied this space. Although visually this may be more appealing to people using the park, it would still be a negative effect on fish and wildlife.

I-311-119

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document is purposefully brief. Specific differences in the effects of the SDEIS design options are included in the summary for wetlands, fish resources, and wildlife habitat, and show that Option K has the greatest wetland fill effects of the three options. See the response to I-311-119 regarding the effects of Option K on ecosystems.

I-311-120

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document is purposefully brief. For detailed information regarding the loss of habitat with the design options, see the Ecosystems Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS).

I-311-338	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 39	321	Walter Oelwein	"Existing Conditions": This section omits discussion on the existing conditions of pedestiran and bicycle traffic. Why? Are these not valid transportation options that the new freeways are supposed to have an impact on? Yet in the Environmental Impact Statement, there is no discussion of the current state of pedestrian traffic (very common in the area) and bicycle traffic (just as common), and how they link to Mass Transit and Cars. Isn't there an "existing condition"? My assessment of the existing condition is that the current bridge setup completely ignored these modes of transportation, and pedestrians/bicyclists have to engage in large intersections that are dangerous and unaccomodating to pedestrians. The community sponsored designs make an effort to improve upon this signifciantly, so the fact that this is omitted shows a pro Option A bias, and undermines the positive impact that other Options provide. This needs to be in the executive summary or "key findings" for the SDEIS to be valid.	Omission; other options not considered; Error
I-311-339	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 39	322	Walter Oelwein	"are frequently congested during the morning and afternoon peak hours." Again, while peak hours are pretty bad on Montlake and Lake Washtington Boulevard, non-peak hours are just as bad because of the draw bridge grinding traffic to a halt, and creating backups. Why does this SDEIS only look at "top throughput" and not on how the new options make the overall conditions better? This shows a bias toward commuters, not residents, and toward Option A, not community suggested options.	Omission; other options not considered; Error
I-311-340	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 39	323	Walter Oelwein	"Traffic congestion can extend across the Montlake Bridge to the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection and as far back as 25th Avenue NE near University Village (approximately 1 mile)." The "as far as" comment is inaccurate. It backs up further than that. And it isn't only during "peak hour" congestion, as so frequently mentioned in this SDEIS. It is during the non-peak times, such as Saturday and Sunday, when many boats are out and about, causing the bridge to go up. The fact that it is not clear what is backing up the traffic shows an incomplete picture of what is going on in the local area, and is reflected in the poor design of Option A, that tries to solve the problem by just making a bigger roadway (that halts traffic)	Omission; other options not considered; Error
I-311-341	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 39	324	Walter Oelwein	"Montlake Boulevard NE is also an important transit corridor, serving both local and regional buses between the SR 520 interchange and the University District." This is written to imply that busses exist only on Montlake Boulevard. Not true. So many busses go through the "Montlake Flyer" freeway station, with a high volume of tranist riders who get on and off there. This is where the vast majority of the "regional" transit goes. This needs to be included in the discussion for the SDEIS to be complete.	Omission; other options not considered; Error
I-311-342	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 39	325	Walter Oelwein	"Montlake Bridge openings can have long-lasting effects on traffic flow in this area. The bridge does not open during the morning and afternoon peak periods; however, the last opening at 3:30 p.m. can affect traffic operations throughout the afternoon commute." This still has a strange emphasis on the "peak times." The emphasis on the 3:30 bridge opening's impact has the effect of minimizing the other opening times, which have a huge impact on the transportation corridor and especially to the local residents. This SDEIS needs to better understand that the traffic isn't there ONLY during peak times, but all of the time, and the Options presented need to be designed to stop this poor design.	Omission; other options not considered; Error

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

Options A and L have the roadway elevated through the Washington Park Arboretum, where the piers occupy both the water column and substrate area. Option K includes a portion of the roadway occupying the water column and the substrate. Table 5-11.4 on page 5-134 of the SDEIS shows the estimated number of concrete columns and the area of substrate occupied for each of the options, with Option K occupying the largest amount of aquatic substrate area.

Also, Option K has the lowest elevation structure over the aquatic habitat, compared to the other action alternatives, and in a number of places lower than the existing structures (see Table 5.11-3 in the SDEIS). The height of the structures over the water affects the entire aquatic food chain, from primary production (algae) to fish. The potential for fewer effects from higher elevation structures is based on the observed reaction of fish tending to hesitate passing through the edge of sharp shadow lines on the water, and the effects of shade on the growth of upland and aquatic vegetation. Higher structures produce less distinct shadow lines and result in lighter overall conditions under the structure, thereby reducing the potential for effects on aquatic resources.

I-311-121

Please see the response to comment I-311-012 regarding effects on Foster Island and the response to comment I-311-120 regarding fish habitat. See Table 5.11-5 on page 5-141 of the SDEIS which shows the amount of vegetation removed with each of the options by habitat type, with Option K resulting in the greatest loss of habitat. Also see the response to comment I-311-118 regarding replacing wetlands with parkland at Foster Island.

I-311-122

The table is broken down by option when the effects differ. Please see the response to comment I-311-012 regarding effects on Foster Island

I-311-343	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 39	326	Walter Oelwein	"Bridge openings compound whatever congestion is present on the local street network and can cause traffic on the SR 520 westbound and eastbound off-ramps to back up onto the SR 520 mainline. Congestion on the eastbound off-ramp can affect traffic on I-5." This statement doesn't seem very accurate to me. They do "compound" the network, but they also "create" congestion were there to be no bridge opening. This needs to be changed to reflect the bascule bridge actually creates as well as compounds congestion.	Error
I-311-344	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 39	327	Walter Oelwein	"Montlake Bridge opening delays affect travel times and reliability for all travelers. This makes it difficult for bus drivers to keep to their schedules, affects bus travel time reliability, increases transit service costs, and can make transit a less attractive option to driving alone." This is a good, strong statement on the current state of transit in the area. Yet it is still incomplete in that it doesn't mention the Montlake Flyer freeway station and the experience in getting to and from it, and how the current design make transfers difficult because pedestrians generally have to navigate car-centric intersections and freeway on-ramps to take transit. In addition, bicyclists have to carry their bicycles up and down staircases. There needs to be more discussion on the bicycle and pedestrian situation, since this is a common mode of transportation, and this is the transportation Discipline Report.	Omission; other options not considered; Error
I-311-345	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 39	328	Walter Oelwein	"Existing Conditions" This section seems to focus only on the Montlake exchange area. There is no discussion of the Roanoke area, 45th street area, Lake Washington Boulevard area (and especially for pedestrians in the Arboretum), and as noted elsewhere, discussions of Fuhrman/Boyer and Delmar/Lynn are omitted altogether, despite being pass-through traffic areas. It appears that this section simply was not completed. What are the existing conditions in these other important intersection areas?	Omission; other options not considered; Error
I-311-346	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 39	329	Walter Oelwein	"Existing Conditions" This section could benefit from a description of the current traffic demand that is going through the local area, and what percentage of it is going on and off the freeway. This is an important distinction, because treating it all the same would argue for one design (such as Option A), and treating it as different would argue for a different design (Option K) -- Option K takes the high volume of traffic aimed at getting on and off the freeway with as little delay as possible. Option A is designed at getting people across a drawbridge, and then maybe they'll get on or off the freeway. It's a very incomplete picture of the current situation and creates the image that Option A is a good design, when it is repeating and exacerbating the bad design from the past (having a drawbridge be the gatekeeper to getting on and off the freeway for a huge swath of Seattle).	Omission; other options not considered; Error
I-311-347	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 39	330	Walter Oelwein	"Existing Conditions" This section doesn't really capture the fact that the Arboretum, with it's emphasis on ramps, becomes a de-facto highway, when it was designed as a one-lane road through a natural park. The discussion needs to be included to help reviewers understand why people do not think freeway ramps in the Arboretum is a good idea. As it is currently written, the Arboretum is considered a minor issue, when in fact it is a park that has been innundated with freeway and traffic. Otherwise, the comment in Section 41 doesn't seem to have any context: "Less traffic in the Arboretum compared to the No Build Alternative (up to 900 vph)" This is a pretty big deal, and would make the no arboretum ramp option seem more viable when you better understand the "current state" and why people would want to remove these on ramps. The logic in the discussion is missing, and makes the SDEIS incomplete.	Omission; other options not considered; Error

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

and the response to comment I-311-120 regarding fish habitat. The design options fill requirements are discussed in Section 5.11 of the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-118 regarding replacing wetlands with parkland at Foster Island.

I-311-123

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document is purposefully brief. A more detailed explanation of the effects of shading and filling of habitat is included in Section 5.11 of the SDEIS and the Ecosystems Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). Generally, shading and filling of habitat is considered negative effects on fish and wildlife.

Regarding visual quality, he WSDOT Evaluation Matrix was used for the quantitative visual quality assessment, the results of which were summarized in text form in Exhibit 1-1 of the SDEIS Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report. The ratings analyze vividness, intactness, and unity, and assign values of low, medium, or high. Each rating represents the integration of visual quality assessment information gathered from site visits, viewpoint evaluations, and study visualizations. These composite ratings reflect a viewer's likely experience in that the ratings consider the entire scene, viewer speed of movement, seasonal variation, and multiple viewpoints. Please see the response to comment I-311-104 regarding the characterization of visual quality effects.

I-311-124

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document is purposefully brief. Through the analyses conducted for the SDEIS, WSDOT determined that Options K and L would result in higher impacts to natural resources than Option A. See the responses to comments I-311-120 through I-311-123 regarding Option K's effects. Also see the response to comment I-311-118 regarding replacing wetlands with parkland at Foster Island.

I-311-348	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 39	331	Walter Oelwein	"Existing Conditions". This section ignores the fact that the existing conditions do not have tolls on the freeway. This will have a huge impact on the number trips that people will want to take, and should be accounted for in the discussion. Otherwise, it paints the picture that there is NO WAY to regulate the number of cars getting on and off the freeway, when the tolls is a very precise way to regulate the amount of traffic demand (increase/decrease tolls accordingly). This makes this section incomplete.	Omission; Options not considers
I-311-349	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 41	332	Walter Oelwein	"Increased traffic and congestion at the Harvard/Roanoke intersection and I-5/East Roanoke Street and I-5/NE 45th Street interchange areas" This area was not discussed in the "existing conditions" area (Section 39). So when you say "increased traffic in Roanoke", it doesn't really have any context, and makes this statement seem more benign, when it isn't. A discussion in the existing conditions section would note that Roanoke/Harvard is a very difficult intersection for all modes of transportation (and the bias against pedestrians is particularly striking, as it doesn't come up at all).	Omission; other options not considered; Error
I-311-350	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 41	333	Walter Oelwein	"Suboption A would retain but reconfigure the SR 520 westbound off-ramp and eastbound on-ramp with Lake Washington Boulevard. This would result in traffic volumes and intersection operations in the overall SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange area being similar to the No Build Alternative." This omits discussion about what impact it has on traffic in the arboretum itself (Lake Washington Blvd). It stands to reason that with the the increased throughput of the bridge, and with the increase in population, this already clogged thoroughfare that was not designed for increasing cars (and shouldn't be), is a glaring omission and needs to be added for this SDEIS to be complete. The environmental impact of this section is very important!	Omission; other options not considered; Error
I-311-351	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 41	334	Walter Oelwein	"6-Lane Alternative" Overall, this section is confused and spotty. It is hard to follow and understand what parts of transportation, which areas, and which options it is discussing. It sometimes talks about the impact for different options, but not very systemically. It is hard to follow and does not really reveal the environmental impact.	Omission; other options not considered; Error
I-311-352	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 41	335	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would provide a new SR 520 interchange east of Montlake" These key findings are not found in the executive summary or the summary at the beginning of this document. However, they demonstrate significant improvements that Option K provides. Why the omission? This is very important and shows Anti-Option K bias.	Omission
I-311-353	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 42	336	Walter Oelwein	"Increase congestion at the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection due to increases in traffic volumes to and from the north" This does not seem to be supported. Why wouldn't this be specifically called out for Option A? And wouldn't the boat traffic resolution get cars through the area better, with the increased traffic (which isn't a result of the option, but the increased population, etc.)	No support
I-311-354	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 41	337	Walter Oelwein	"Provide a new crossing of the Montlake Cut that would not be affected by boat traffic (i.e., subject to bridge openings)" This needs to be quantified like the other sections are. This implies that this impact has not been studied, so a qualitative measure is substituted for it, when it could have been quantified. WashDOT needs to improve the quality of this research, because this is the main area of debate between the different options, and to gloss over the impact with vague and minizing statemetns "would not be affected" without even trying to quantify it makes it difficult for decision-makers to make a good choice.	Omission, error
I-311-355	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 43	338	Walter Oelwein	"What are the key findings for nonmotorized travel?" I'm glad to see this discussed, but it gets less discussion than the car-related discussion, as there is no "existing conditions" section. This needs to be added for the SDEIS to be complete.	Omission, error

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-125

As discussed in Section 5.12 of the SDEIS and the Geology and Soils Discipline Report, the structures required for Option K would be different from those of Option A or L, and would be more susceptible to damage. Please see the response to comment I-311-029 regarding the seismic standards for the original bridge. Although the current structure is at risk of being damaged in a major earthquake, the new bridges would be designed to meet current seismic design standards. Also see the response to Comment I-311-038.

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-126

As previously mentioned, the table is intended to call out differences between the three options presented in the SDEIS. The safety risk to ecosystems for spills in the West Approach area would be low with all options through the use of best management practices, such as spill containment lagoons. Therefore, the main difference between the options, regarding spills, is the risk of hazardous material being released in a confined space. The risk of fire and/or explosion with an accidental release of hazardous material during transport would be greater under with a tunnel compared with non-tunnel options. See the Hazardous Materials Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS) for more information on the risks associated with the different options.

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-356	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 43	339	Walter Oelwein	"Bicyclists and pedestrians would continue to reach the SR 520 corridor in Seattle via a combination of trails and on-street bicycle lanes." Again, there are relatively few bicycle-friendly sections in the current Montlake area, even the Bill Dawson trail is narrow and is dominated by a freeway overpass. Intersections are completely car-oriented, and do not have design that encourages bicycle or pedestrian travel. This discussion is not made in here, so it is incomplete and needs to be better understood so that the correct option can be chosen.	Omission, error
I-311-357	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 43	340	Walter Oelwein	"The number of buses with available bike racks would be reduced because transfers to buses on Seattle routes would not be possible when the Montlake Freeway Transit Station is removed." This discussion is so incomplete it is hard to know where to start. First of all -- what are the regional transit buses to do to pick up and drop off the Montlake/UW traffic. Is bus 545 no longer going to be able to serve this area? Are there MORE busses planned to make up for this? Why is this a good decision to remove a major transfer point when there is an employment hub (UW) a Sound Transit station, a major park, and walkable neighborhoods in the area where transit and regional connections make sense. The fact that this is glossed over makes this SDEIS very incomplete, and it needs to better articulate the plans for increasing regional bus service, rather than just drop it.	Omission, error, no support
I-311-358	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 43	341	Walter Oelwein	"What are the key findings for nonmotorized travel?" This section is entirely substandard compared to the motorized travel discussion. In the motorized travel discussion you have gread detail about the increase and decrease of traffic in certain options and sub-options. Nothing for non-motorized travel, just general statements regarding connecting neighborhoods and bike paths. Also, there is no estimate about the amount of bus-takers, transfers, sound transit riders, etc. Also, do the depressed intersections of options K and L encourage more bike-riding vs. Optoin A? We don't know because it is not discussed in this SDEIS. So it is just a slight section overall, and makes this document incomplete. Given that increasing non-motorized travel would be a highly desirable result of the investment of the project, this needs to be quantified better so that we understand the environmental impact.	Omission, error, no support
I-311-359	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 43	342	Walter Oelwein	"Bicyclists who wish to cross Lake Washington by bus, during inclement weather or at night for example, would be able to board on NE Pacific Street near Montlake Boulevard." This is the only statement of the impact on non-vehicle transporation, and demostrates just how non-quantifiable it is. Why would you spend a sentence about bicyclists in inclement weather and at night when there is no mention on how pedestrians get across the intersections or could catch a bus to the eastside?	Omissin, Error, No support

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-127

With a second bascule bridge, as under Options A and L, bridge height would be similar to the existing Montlake bridge, and operational effects on navigation would be minimal due to the similarity of design parameters and ability to synchronize openings of the existing and proposed bridges. The Preferred Alternative includes a second bascule bridge parallel to the existing Montlake bridge, similar to SDEIS Option A. See Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for a description of the Preferred Alternative, and page 46 of the Navigable Waterways Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS), as well as the Navigable Waterways Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for a discussion of operational effects.

I-311-128

The table represents the amount of permanent parkland acquisition (in acres) required for each option. See the response to Comment I-311-041 regarding why proposed lids are not considered park land.

I-311-129

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project. Please see the response to comment I-311-010 and I-311-123 regarding the Visual Quality assessment included in the SDEIS, and I-311-016 regarding the effect of the new bascule bridge on visual quality and cultural resources, and how the cultural resources effect would be mitigated.

I-311-130

See the response to Comment I-311-111 regarding the noise analysis and noise effects. The noise analysis used accepted methodology based on WSDOT and FHWA guidance.

I-311-360	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 44	343	Walter Oelwein	"The options would affect the non-motorized environment in the Arboretum by either decreasing or increasing vehicle volumes. Compared to the No Build Alternative, Option A would reduce vehicle traffic in the Arboretum by up to 900 vph, improving the walking, bicycling, and recreation environment. Suboption A traffic volumes would be similar to the No Build Alternative. Options K and L and their suboptions would increase traffic by up to 300 vph through the Arboretum." This statement does not provide an explanation for why Option A can have the option of no Arboretum ramps, but Options L and K can't. I've read quite a bit of this SDEIS, and it is unclear how WashDOT can not add or subtract Arboretum ramps for every option; thus discussion about the impact of arboretum ramps should be extended to be allowed for all options. I suspect that the proposers of Option K didn't know that it was an option to remove the Arboretum ramps, and WashDOT allowed this option only for Option A, to make Option A look better. WashDOT needs to articulate why this benefit couldn't be found with Options L and K.	Omission, Error, No support
I-311-361	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 44	344	Walter Oelwein	"Recent travel time data reviewed by King County Metro indicated that actual bus travel times between NE 51st Street in Redmond and the Montlake Freeway Transit Station (approximately 10 miles) during the morning commute can range from 10 to 30 minutes for both westbound and eastbound trips, with most trips (more than 90 percent) taking an average of 16 minutes" Hey-- you're removing the Montlake Freeway stations, so it is invalid to make arguments about how the project can improve travel times to the Montlake freeway station, as you are doing here. You instead have to articluate how someone is going to get on in Redmond and zoom through the Montlake area, get off Downtown, and transfer back to the Montlake area. What is the travel time then?	No support, Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-362	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 44	345	Walter Oelwein	"Options K and L and their suboptions would increase traffic by up to 300 vph through the Arboretum." It's not clear why these options require the Arboretum ramps, while Option A doesn't. This indicates that options were not considered.	No support, Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-363	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 44	346	Walter Oelwein	"With the gaps in the existing HOV lane system, transit cannot reliably bypass this congestion." Here you also fail to mention that there is no light rail option, and this wasn't mentioned in the "Existing Conditions" section. Focusing on Bus trasport shows a limited vision for what this document could provide: What would be the environmental impact of a light rail train?	Omits important info
I-311-364	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 45	347	Walter Oelwein	"The primary changes in the transit infrastructure for the 6-Lane Alternative are completion of the HOV lanes across the SR 520 floating bridge to the I-5/SR 520 interchange (where direct access would be provided to the I-5 express lanes) and removal of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station." This would be a good section to describe why it was absolutely necessary to remove the Montlake Freeway Transit Station. Otherwise, it argues that this is for the benefit of cars only	Omits important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-131

See the response to Comment I-311-115. Exhibits 23 and 24 in the Energy Discipline Report show that Option A would have lower greenhouse gas emissions than Options K and L in the project area. The greenhouse gases emissions analysis used accepted methodology based on WSDOT and FHWA guidance. Also see the response to comment I-311-088 regarding the transportation effects of the new bascule bridge. While, consistent with applicable policies and standards, an intersection-level study of greenhouse gas emissions was not conducted, the local air quality analysis shows that CO emissions at intersections near the Montlake Bridge would not be expected to be higher under Option A than under Option K. See the response to Comment I-311-114 regarding CO emissions at intersections near the Montlake Bridge.

I-311-132

The effects on water resources are different from the effects on park land. The information provided here simply lists the amount of impervious surface added with each option. An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document is purposefully brief. Section 5.10 of the SDEIS and the Water Resources Discipline Report provided a more detailed explanation of the effects of adding impervious surface with all options.

As shown in the Executive Summary, Option A would result in the least acquisition of park land compared to Options K and L. Option A does not do the “least to mitigate” as characterized by the comment. Mitigation for park effects would occur under all options.

I-311-133

Analyses presented in the SDEIS used accepted methodology based on WSDOT and FHWA guidance, as well as other guidance where applicable. Please see Chapters 5 and 6 of the SDEIS and the discipline

I-311-365				The "Did you know" section ("This addition to the transit connections in the Montlake area will make the Montlake Triangle a more robust multi-modal center. Travelers will be able to access light rail in addition to local and SR 520 bus service. Pedestrian and bicycle traffic to and from the transit services will increase activity in the area.") doesn't seem to be supported in the main body of the text. SR520 bus service is not explained at all, and this is the only mention of the Montlake Light Rail system. Also, the pedestrian commentary doesn't really mention this. This "did you know" section cannot replace an actual environmental impact statement.	Omits important info; info not supported
Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 45	348	Walter Oelwein		
I-311-366				"between transit services and other travel modes would also improve." This implies that there are transit services to transfer to, but I have yet to see an explanation for how you are going to replace the high volume of travelers who catch the 545, and other Downtown to Eastside routes. And with Sound Transit, it is important to estimate how many more people are going to want to use Montlake to Eastside/Montlake to Downtown transit services. This section has no metrics and is very incomplete, especially in comparison to the SOV traffic volume analysis, which indicates that this is a statement only on SOV impact, and not on Pedestrian, Transit and Bicycle impact, all of which everyone agrees needs to have a significant role in the 21st century transporation infrastructure.	Omits important info
Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 45	349	Walter Oelwein		
I-311-367				"HOV travel times between I-5 and SR 202 would improve by up to 5 minutes for westbound HOV traffic in both morning and afternoon peak periods." This is unsupported, because there is no statement articulating how the carpool lane between Medina and 405 will be managed. Currently it is a very narrow carpool lane that must weave between traffic, so even with the benefit of HOV, it is a crowded, difficult stretch of road. As a result, this statement appears to be incorrect or unsupported	Omits important info, error, no support
Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 45	350	Walter Oelwein		
I-311-368				"The 6-Lane Alternative would result in approximately a 14 percent increase in daily transit person trip demand compared to the No Build Alternative. Peak period transit person trip demand would increase similarly (11 percent during the morning commute and 14 percent during the afternoon commute). These increases are due to the HOV lane completion and a toll on general purpose traffic." Here you say that tolling will have an impact on general purpose traffic, yet you do not mention the impact of tolling in the summary of impacts on traffic "(What are the key findings for Street Traffic, Section 38). This inconsistency needs to be reconciled for this SDEIS to be correct and allow someone to understand the impact of the changes being proposed. I find that the discussion of impact on traffic ignores the impact of tolling's ability to manage demand.	Omits important info, error, no support
Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 45	351	Walter Oelwein		
I-311-369				"With Option K, SR 520 buses would no longer be directly delayed by Montlake bridge openings during off-peak hours." You have the opportunity to quantify this here, but as per typical in this SDEIS, you gloss over the positive impacts of Option K, and systemically quantify the impacts of Option A when you can make Option A better (i.e., The arboretum ramps reduce traffic by 900 vph, while Options L and K increase it!). So while I agree with the statement that Option K helps SR520 buses, it reflects sloppy analysis and unsupported information.	Omits info, no support
Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 45	352	Walter Oelwein		
I-311-370				""With Option K, SR 520 buses would no longer be directly delayed by Montlake bridge openings during off-peak hours." A second issue with this statement is that it implies that there are SR520 buses, while there is no evidence to support that Sound Transit and Metro will change their bus routes accordingly. The removal of the freeway station has a significant impact on access to transit, so it needs to be better articulated how transit will adjust to the various options.	Omits info, no support
Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 45	353	Walter Oelwein		

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

reports in Attachment 7 to the SDEIS for information on how the effects analyses were conducted, and their findings.

The section referenced in the comment discusses the potential effects of the options on natural resources, and is not intended to evaluate potential effects on the human environment. For further information on natural resources effects, please see the responses to comments I-311-012 regarding effects on Foster Island and I-311-120 regarding fish habitat.

I-311-134

Since Options K and L require the construction of a new intersection at NE Pacific Street and Montlake Boulevard NE, they would require the temporary closure of Pacific Street. Option A would construct a new bascule bridge parallel to the existing bridge and connect it with the existing NE Pacific Street and Montlake Boulevard NE intersection and would therefore not require this closure. The Preferred Alternative, like Option A, would not require the temporary closure of NE Pacific Street.

I-311-135

East Shelby Street and East Hamlin Street were identified as potential haul routes for Options K and L primarily for the construction of the single-point urban interchange (SPUI). Since Option A would have a Montlake interchange at its existing location, it would not require the use of these streets to create a new interchange. Further, local jurisdictions can limit the use of nonarterial streets for truck traffic; therefore, efforts were made to identify designated arterial streets for potential use as haul routes. The potential haul routes for the Preferred Alternative and do not include East Shelby Street and East Hamlin Street. 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.

I-311-371	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 46	354	Walter Oelwein	"The Montlake Freeway Transit Station is being removed to address the community goal of narrowing the project footprint through the Montlake neighborhood." This is a statement that is so objectionable that it is hard for this local citizen to believe that our government officials are even beginning to listen to the community. The statement implies that the bus transit stop in Montake is the thing that is widening the road. No, it's the shoulders and the extra lanes that do, and this is what the community objects to. The community wants BETTER access to transit, and for WashDOT to intimate that there is no way to design a freeway bus stop is unconcionable. How about a bus tunnel that cuts underground a bit? How about using that shoulder space for that small section? If you were actually interested in meeting the community goal of narrowing the footprint, you would propose a tube/tunnel, rather than reject it; you would propose a new freeway station where buses get off in option K, go to right next to Sound Transit, and get back on. C'mon WashDOT! Stop giving these false choices by punishing the community with poorer transit options, but a bigger road. This shows terrible design thinking, and reflects why the community is so frustrated with the options WashDOT proposes. Another issue is that if you were really interested in narrowing the footprint in the Montlake area, you would not propose and advocate for a SECOND bascule bridge that widens Montlake even further -- what you are trying to pass off is a widened 520 AND a widened Montlake Blvd, that does NOT meet the community goal of narrowing the project footprint.	No support, Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-372	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 46	355	Walter Oelwein	"The Sound Transit Link rail project would provide service between the University area, downtown Seattle, and Sea-Tac by year 2016." I know that you cover it later, but in this summary you need to discuss how eastbound commuters are affected. I'm on page 46 and I'm still not clear on what the plan is to make transit better, rather than worse, otherwise it appears that you are trying to make the impact appear better than the current plans allow.	No support, Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but
I-311-373	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 47	356	Walter Oelwein	"With Option A, a transit stop would be located at the termination of the westbound transit-only direct access ramp at the Montlake overpass, allowing people to make connections in the Montlake area. With Options K and L, the first Seattle transit stop for SR 520 University District routes would be at the Montlake Triangle." This section diminishes the differences between Option A and Options L and K. In Option L and K, a transfer would be much quicker to Sound Transit, since the bus would stop so much closer to Sound Transit. You need to articulate the pedestrian travel time from the Option A Montlake Stop to the Sound Transit stop. This is another example where you do not quantify the differences between Option A and Option K, when you can, and it appears that you are not doing so because it would make Option A look worse. This shows anti-Optoin K bias.	Omits important info, error, no support

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-136

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document is purposefully brief. For more information regarding construction activities and construction-related effects, please see Chapters 3 and 6 of the SDEIS.

The commenter's opinion that Option K "is designed to best improve the experience in the local area" seems to relate to the operational effects of the project rather than construction effects. As shown in Tables 6.16-1 and 6.16-2 in the SDEIS regarding construction effects, compared to Option A, Option K would result in more parking spaces lost, more street closures, larger onsite construction energy consumption, greater effects on wetlands and parkland, a longer construction duration, and more intense construction activities due to the construction of the tunnel and the SPUI. If Options K or L were identified as the Preferred Alternative in the future, WSDOT would provide additional information as part of final design and permitting and ensure that negative effects associated with these options are mitigated to the extent practicable.

I-311-137

As previously mentioned, the table is intended to call out differences between the three options presented in the SDEIS. This statement does not indicate that Option A has no social effects, but that other effects are generally similar across all options. The Social Elements Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS) discusses these effects in greater detail.

Since Options K and L require the construction of a new intersection at NE Pacific Street and Montlake Boulevard NE, they would have a greater effect on the University District. Because of the intensity of construction to build a new SPUI in the Montlake neighborhood, Options K and L would also have a greater effect during construction. The excavation required for the SPUI and the construction of a tunnel, would

I-311-374	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 47	357	Walter Oelwein	"This could mean some out-of-direction travel for people destined for areas south of the Montlake Cut." The fact that you highlight this for Option K, but don't mention the extra travel time for someone transfering from a Bus in Option A to Sound Transit demonstrates that you are not disclosing the environmental impact so that a decision maker could understand the difference and benefits of the options. This fits with a theme that the differences between the Options are not articulated when it makes Option K better, but they are when Option A looks better.	No support, Omits or ignores important info; Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-375	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 47	358	Walter Oelwein	"With Options K and L, riders transferring between local and SR 520 buses could continue north for a half mile on Montlake Boulevard to the Montlake Triangle to board an eastbound SR 520 bus." You highlight the half-mile distance here, when the person is riding the bus, so it wouldn't make a difference, yet two bullet points above ("board an eastbound bus at the traffic island located at the entrance to the eastbound SR 520 on-ramp") without mentioning that the Sound Transit riders would have to WALK that same half-mile to the bus. This again shows pro-Option A bias and anti-Option K bias.	Omits or ignores important info.
I-311-376	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 47	359	Walter Oelwein	"This could add approximately 1 to 3 minutes of travel time for riders originating from areas south of the Montlake Cut by car or bus, or approximately 7 to 10 minutes for those who walk." You then proceed to quantify the 1-3 minute travel time, but don't quantify the walk time for someone leaving the Sound Transit station and going to the Option A on ramp station. What is the pedestrian travel time and how come it isn't disclosed here? This is another example of Anti-Option K bias, and pro Option A bias, and reveals why the Legislative Workgroup would be inclined to think that Option A is the best option, when it is presented in the best possible light, and Option K is presented in the worst possible light. It is reasonable to assume that estimates of the budget, a major consideration, had similar machinations, where Option A is estimated more rosily, and Option K is estimated in a more dire fashion. On the Legislative Workgroup website, it even declares that Option A " has the least environmental impact". This is true only by systemically showing anti Option K bias and ignoring the issues raised by the community about why Option A is undesirable.	Omits or ignores important info.
I-311-377	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 47	360	Walter Oelwein	I find the section describing transit alternatives to be wholly unsatisfying. It describes new transit options that don't appear to make things better, but makes things neutral or worse. This indicates poor freeway design that biases cars over mass transit. It appears that you put down the roadway and then tried to figure out where the busses would go, rather than figure out where mass transit would optimally be placed, and then had the cars work around it. That would have been design that would reflect good urban planning and 21st century design.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-378	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 47	361	Walter Oelwein	Similarly, imagine a tube/tunnel option that actually submerges the freeway across portage bay. You could have a low profile train and bike/pedestrian path be the elevated part, with convenient stops in Montlake, and the messy car exchanges underground. People who wanted the views could ride mass transit, and SOVs can be relegated to the underground. Because WashDOT was not willing to invest in good design, we missed these opportunities.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

have a greater effect and longer construction duration than Option A. See the Construction Techniques and Activities Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS) for more details on the construction methods for Option K.

I-311-138

As previously mentioned, the table is intended to call out the major differences between the three options evaluated in the SDEIS. This statement does not indicate that Option A has no effects on emergency vehicles or response times, but that other effects are generally similar across all options. The Social Elements Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS) discusses these effects in greater detail.

Please see the response to comment I-311-134 regarding the closure of Pacific Street during construction. Because of the required temporary closure of NE Pacific Street under Options K and L, detours routes would be required and could cause delays in response times to access the UW Medical Center.

I-311-139

Please see the response to comment I-311-012 regarding effects on Foster Island and the response to comment I-311-120 regarding fish habitat. The potential for fewer effects from higher elevation structures is based on the observed reaction of fish tending to hesitate passing through the edge of sharp shadow lines on the water, and the effects of shade on the growth of upland and aquatic vegetation. Higher structures produce less distinct shadow lines and result in lighter overall conditions under the structure, thereby reducing the potential for effects on aquatic resources.

I-311-140

The analysis of construction effects is accurate and the effects to parks

I-311-379	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 50	362	Walter Oelwein	"Construction Truck Volumes" You mention that construction trucks will be on the freeway, but will they be on the local streets?	Omits important info
I-311-380	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Secton 50	363	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would have a greater effect on SR 520 traffic operations compared to Option A, Suboption A, or Option L." I'm not sure I can buy-in to this assessment. Option K creates a separate path to the bridge, so it would affect the existing path the least. Option A, in contrast, expands on the existing set-up, so it would be most close to the current traffic.	Error
I-311-381	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 50	364	Walter Oelwein	"Detour routes would be provided during construction of the Delmar lid, and the project would minimize the duration of these detours." These need to be articulated in the summary, because it is hard to imagine what the detours are, or at least provide a reference where this is found later in the document	Omits important info
I-311-382	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 53	365	Walter Oelwein	"The cumulative effects scenario is expected to result in fewer person and vehicle trips across Lake Washington on SR 520 compared to the No Build and 6-Lane Alternatives because of improved traffic conditions on other routes in the region." This statement is hard to understand. Doesn't the cumulative effects scenario include either No-Build or 6-lane alternatives? What is cumulative effects scenario without SR520 no build and 6-lane alternatives? I'm reading this section and it is hard to understand.	Error
I-311-383	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Overall	366	Walter Oelwein	There are very few side-by-side comparisons between the different options in this discipline report. The only one that does appear is a comparison of parking affects, which naturally shows Option A as the least affecting. Other comparison charts are not found. Why? My suspicion is that it is anti-Option K bias, and charts would show the better travel times with Option K, but since this doesn't fit WashDOT's agenda, it is buried in the prose.	Omits important info
I-311-384	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 61	367	Walter Oelwein	"The SR 520 project travel demand model for the SDEIS No Build and 6-Lane Alternatives did not include Eastlink light-rail across Lake Washington on I-90 because the ST2 proposal was not approved and programmed when the analysis was performed." I also expect a statement about whether the Sound Transit Montlake station is taken into account here. It often figures in the discussion points throughout the document, but if the models didn't include it, this needs to be stated outright.	Omits important info
I-311-385	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 62	368	Walter Oelwein	This section on travel modeling could be cleaner so that it could be understood. In it it appears that it did not include transit across I-90, and the impact of tolls is murkily described. A chart saying which models were used, when and what their assumptions were would help here. Otherwise, it is a meaningless section at worst and hard to follow at best.	Omits important info
I-311-386	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Overall	369	Walter Oelwein	There is little or no discussion on the traffic impact on Delmar Dr/E. Lynn St., and Fuhrman/Boyer. Also, Roanoake/Harvard is not mentioned much, and with little analysis. For this SDEIS to be complete, you need to include analysis on the environmental impact of the local area. You mention "9 of 39 intersections" but there is no visualization of this.	Omits important info
I-311-387	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 69	370	Walter Oelwein	"Traffic volumes were forecasted for three time periods: daily, morning, and afternoon." This might reveal why the analysis regarding the Montlake Bridge impact is incomplete. Morning and Afternoon, boat traffic does not affect the drawbridge, and daily seems to be a summary of the entire day, and not reflect the sudden changes in traffic flow ability that a draw bridge can have.	Omits important info, error, no support

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

were minimized wherever possible for all options. Please see the Recreation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS) for detailed information regarding project construction effects on parks. As discussed on page 56 of that report, the Arboretum would be the primary parkland affected by construction of Option K, due to the construction of the land bridge at Foster Island. The report also notes that "the 5.3 acres of construction easements for work bridges, trail construction, and fill on Foster and Marsh islands would be returned to park use once construction is completed."

I-311-141

The comment refers to the summary of construction effects of Options A, K, and L on energy and greenhouse gas emissions. See the response to comment I-311-131 regarding operation effects on greenhouse gas emissions, and regarding analysis and findings for pollutant emissions in the Montlake area.

I-311-142

It is unclear from the comment whether the comment is referring to a specific construction effect. The table on this page begins on page 39, and is a summary of construction effects of Options A, K, and L. For "long-term" effects, see the table beginning on page 29 of the SDEIS Executive Summary for effects from project operation under Options A, K, and L. However, greater construction effects do not necessarily correlate to greater long-term benefits. Chapters 5 and 6 of the SDEIS describe the project's operation and construction effects for each element of the environment.

I-311-143

See the responses to comments I-311-001 regarding the planning process for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project, and I-311-002 regarding design considerations in development of the alternatives and options.

I-311-388	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 69	371	Walter Oelwein	"Traffic forecasts and operational analysis results are reported here for the peak 3 hours (6:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 to 6:00 p.m.)." This statement again reflects the lack of analysis that a second bascule bridge has on traffic, when this is one of the main points of creating Option K -- not to repeat the mistake of putting a draw bridge in between freeway traffic.	Omits important info, error
I-311-389	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 69	372	Walter Oelwein	""the purpose of the project is to improve mobility for people and goods across Lake Washington." This is an incomplete statement and needs to include: "in a manner that is safe, reliable, and cost-effective, while avoiding, minimizing, and/or mitigating impacts on affected neighborhoods and the environment." The fact that you focus only on the movement piece and not the impact to neighborhoods piece indicates an unbalanced focus.	Omits important info, error
I-311-390	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 69	373	Walter Oelwein	"The best way to measure the improvement of mobility is two-fold. First, assess the person demand associated with any specific action on the corridor; and second, measure how many of those people are actually served during a specified time period." But if you have only these criteria, and not the impact on the community and environment, then this is a meaningless assessment. Why not measure it with 30 lanes? You need to have the full balance in these statements.	Omits important info, error
I-311-391	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 69	374	Walter Oelwein	"Demand refers to the number of vehicles or people that want to use the freeway during a given time period." I'm trying to assess in this SDEIS whether demand and mode choice was calculated, and then the transportation needs were determined, or whether it was first determined that it is a 6 lane freeway, and then determined what the transportation throughput could be. It looks through this discussion like the analysis was created to fit the design, rather than the design created to fit analysis. It should be that the demand models should be created, and the identify the correct mix of transit, HOV, cars, tolls, pedestrian, bicycles, etc, and then design the transportation corridor. We might have very different results, rather than a push for 6 lanes.	Omits important info, error, specific design choices not considered
I-311-392	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 70	375	Walter Oelwein	"Vehicle- and person-trip forecasts for buses were based on the travel demand model forecasts." I'm concerned that the forecasts were based on a freeway that allows actual stops in transporation hubs, rather than a 'design' that cuts off and transportation hubs. In this case, your design (Option A, specifically), actually makes transportatoin	Error
I-311-393	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 73	376	Walter Oelwein	"What are the measures of effectiveness for the freeway operational analysis?" This SDEIS has many explanations of the flow of traffic and demand for cars, and to a certain degree transit, but I haven't seen anything about pedestrians and bicyclists. Did similar simulations get performed? Or is this not considered at all? This needs to be stated outright.	Omits important info
I-311-394	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 73	377	Walter Oelwein	"What are the measures of effectiveness for the freeway operational analysis?" Similarly, the visual impact section didn't have as sophisticated a model for impact of different options. For example, if you had a simulation the different designs and what a pedestrian would experience from a visual/noise, as you're doing here with throughput, then maybe the designs would be different. I feel that this report has high sophistication for identifying how to get cars through, but low sophistication on how to maximize the design quality so it has a positive impact on the local community.	Error
I-311-395	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 73	378	Walter Oelwein	"Congestion and backups occur at locations where traffic demand exceeds the capacity of the roadway, limiting how many vehicles and people can be served." When the Montlake Bridge goes up, the capacity is zero. It is no longer a street and becomes a boat right of way. This model does not seem to indicate that there are times with Current Option, Option A and Option L are actually capacity zero. This needs to be done for this environmental analysis to be complete.	Error, omits or ignores significant info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

WSDOT received a number of comments in support of and in opposition to all three options presented in the SDEIS (Options A, K, and L). The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Summary of Comments is available at: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/SDEIS.htm. Also, see the response to comment I-311-005 regarding design refinements that are part of the Preferred Alternative, based largely on community feedback.

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." FHWA and WSDOT have identified the Preferred Alternative and evaluated it in the Final EIS.

I-311-144

See the response to Comment I-311-143. WSDOT has involved communities throughout the process of identifying alternatives and mitigation measures. A detailed overview of the public involvement process is located in the Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). Also, see the response to comment I-311-005 regarding design refinements that are included with the Preferred Alternative, based largely on community feedback.

I-311-145

See the response to Comment I-311-002 regarding design considerations in development of the alternatives and options.

The organization and presentation of the analyses meet NEPA requirements. Analyses presented in the SDEIS used accepted methodology based on WSDOT and FHWA guidance, as well as other

I-311-396	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 74	379	Walter Oelwein	The "Did you know" section is correct partially. In the Montlake area, it is not like a funnel at all during peak times. It is like a stopper. Where it doesn't matter how many lanes you have, it goes for x number of lanes to 0 number of lanes for extended periods of time. With two bridges, this is likely to be even worse. You need to include a "did you know" that explains that Montlake is not like most on-ramps and off-ramps with funnels, but with a random stopper. Hence, Option K was developed to not have that be an issue for the high volume freeway traffic.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-397	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 76	380	Walter Oelwein	"Distribute freeway ramp traffic. Future freeway volumes were distributed through the local roadway system during the morning and afternoon peak hours using existing intersection turning movement ratios." I feel like you missed an opportunity here. The local neighbors are not concerned about freeway onramps as much as they are concerned with "cut through" traffic. For example, people get off at Boylston, drive down Delmar Drive, and get on at Montlake. Similarly, people don't get on at 45th, and go through Fuhrman/Boyer and get on at Montlake. There does not appear to be any analysis on how much of this kind of traffic there exists, and if the new freeway will alleviate this. It may, but we don't know. The environmental impact statement is incomplete.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-398	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 76	381	Walter Oelwein	"peak hour". Peak hour is a big issue with this Discipline Report. In the Montlake area, the bascule bridge makes things worse during Non-Peak hours, but this does not seem to have been analyzed.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-399	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 76	382	Walter Oelwein	"Traffic on local streets is comprised of two types: 1) traffic using local streets to primarily access the freeway, and 2) traffic using local streets to access other local locations." There is a third type of traffic, and I'm surprised you didn't include it, because it is a big issue with residents: People who use local streets in lieu of the freeway, also known as cut-through traffic. This is very common and needs to be included in your models.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-400	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Overall	383	Walter Oelwein	You mention in section 76 that there is traffic that goes to the freeway as a major traffic source. There is no mention on how the design will make sure traffic will actually go to the closest on-ramp. For example, someone on Broadway and Aloha -- which is the best onramp for 520 eastbound? Is it going down 10th to Roanoke to Delmar to Lynn to Montlake? (As is common), or is it going to Pine street and jumping on the freeway there? The impact difference to the local community would be huge if there is a way of encouraging people to get on the freeway early, rather than late. This does not seem to be addressed in the designs or mentioned at all in the discipline report, and makes this SDEIS incomplete as a result.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-401	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 77	384	Walter Oelwein	"Future pedestrian volumes were assumed to remain consistent with existing volumes" This indicates that there was little consideration to the pedestrian traffic experience, and indicates a bias toward maximizing cars, and ignoring pedestrians. This makes the SDEIS incomplete and needs to be improved.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-402	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 77	385	Walter Oelwein	"Forecasting Local Street Traffic" This section does not mention that there is an unusual draw-bridge configuration that makes the situation much different than normal "Local street traffic", because it is local street traffic and local boat traffic. This needs to be demonstrated that this is addressed -- especially in light of the key diffrences between Option A and K, and ignoring this makes Option A look better than it actually is.	Error, omits or ignores significant info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

guidance where applicable. The discipline reports describe the methodologies as well as policies and regulations applicable to the specific resource. Mitigation is identified where warranted for effects that cannot be avoided or minimized.

I-311-146

WSDOT agrees that the text referenced here is somewhat unclear. The text should read “With the build Alternatives, SR 520 would be considerably wider throughout the corridor. With Option A and K, the bridge would also be somewhat higher across the Washington Park Arboretum.” In other words, the exception regarding Option K in parentheses is referring to the height of the bridge, and not the width of the corridor. As shown in Table 2-3 in the SDEIS, all options would increase the width of the bridge. Option A would actually be the narrowest of the SDEIS design options in the area between Montlake and Foster Island and the area between Foster Island and the floating bridge. The overall width of the Preferred Alternative in this area would be wider than Option A, because a wider gap between the eastbound and westbound structures would enhance the future compatibility with light rail.

With regard to Option K’s height across Foster Island, the height of the structure does necessarily correlate with effects. Chapters 5 and 6 of the SDEIS describe the project’s operation and construction effects for each element of the environment. Also see the response to comment I-311-012 regarding effects on Foster Island.

I-311-147

The comment’s characterization of opinions about Options A and K is not accurate. WSDOT received a number of comments in support of and in opposition to all three options presented in the SDEIS (Options A, K, and L). The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Summary

I-311-403	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 78	386	Walter Oelwein	"Traffic conditions for street systems are typically measured for a single peak hour during the longer morning and afternoon weekday commuter peak periods." Again, this is an error, because the main difference between Option A and K is that the non-peak times will be much better with Option K, since the bridges will not be stopping traffic. The fact that this is not discussed is a glaring omission to the analysis.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-404	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Section 79	387	Walter Oelwein	I'm shocked to see that the following two intersections were not analyzed: Furhman and Eastlake, and Boyer and Lynn. Both of these intersections are at nextus points where local streets serve as a proxy for the freeway within the study area. Someone can choose to go down Boyer and get on the freeway at Montlake, rather than get on the freeway at 45th, which is VERY common. Similarly, someone can go down Delmar Drive instead of get on at Pike street, or a different person can get off at Boylston and cut through Delmar/Lynn and hit Boyer Ave. So the Boyer/Lynn Street intersection should get particular study. It does not appear that you study the volume of cut through traffic, and showing that you don't even include Boyer/Lynn as an intersection worth studying demonstrates that this is an incomplete SDEIS.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-405	Tranportation Discipline Report part 1	Overall	388	Walter Oelwein	I did not see any discussion on the number of traffic lights Option A has vs Option K. It would seem to be that Option A would continue to have the similar number of traffic lights as is inches through the Montlake neighborhood. While Option K has only the existing Pacific street intersection and then SPUID. I'm surprised that this is not mentioned. Also, there is no discussion on how this stretch of Montlake Blvd is essentially a residential neighborhood, and Option K would restore that character -- quite an opportunity indeed.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-406	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 1	389	Walter Oelwein	"What is traffic currently like on SR 520?" This section needs to also state that there is no option other than buses on SR520, and that railway is not an option. Omitting this makes the debate seem to be focused on more cars versus even more cars, instead of more cars vs. more transit options	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-407	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 1	390	Walter Oelwein	"The existing configuration of SR 520 does not meet current WSDOT design guidelines". There is also no mention that this is a freeway going through a residential area -- what are the guidelines for that? Similarly, why doesn't WSDOT have guidelines for freeway expansion to be transit first, and cars second? This seems to be missing a key message that new transportaion designs should start from. Finally, what right does WSDOT have to use the word "design?" The current freeways are ugly, don't integrate with the environment, crumble, etc. Who is the designer? It is not mentioned.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-408	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 3	391	Walter Oelwein	"This new interchange design would Exhibit 5-1. Distribution and Type of Eastbound and Westbound Crash Rates along SR 520 provide a much improved configuration to potentially reduce the level of crashes associated with the intersection." This acknowledgement of Option L and K having a better design from a safety perspective is not found in the summary of the Discipline report or in the Executive summary. This needs to be noted other than deep in the discipline report.	Error, omits or ignores significant info
I-311-409	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 14	392	Walter Oelwein	This graphic shows that Option K compares favorably to Option A in terms of actual vehicle trips and person type. Yet I have not seen this described in the executive summary or the key findings in this discipline report. Only statistics that are favorable to Option A apper in the executive summary, when this finding appears to be diminished. Why?	Error, omits or ignores significant info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

of Comments is available at: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/SDEIS.htm.

I-311-148

The Preferred Alternative has been designed to minimize SR 520's footprint across Foster Island to the maximum extent possible while accommodating potential future light rail through the corridor. The Preferred Alternative includes a narrow footprint across Foster Island, with reduced right-of-way acquisition in the Arboretum compared to the SDEIS options. In addition, a constant-slope profile improves the clearance of the crossing above the Arboretum Waterfront Trail from its existing 8 feet to between 14 and 20 feet. The higher clearance also improves conditions for wetland vegetation east and west of the island. These aquatic bed wetlands would experience a slightly greater overall area of shading than under Option A—as a result of the gap between northbound and southbound lanes to accommodate future light rail—but would benefit from greater light penetration beneath the higher structures. See the Ecosystems Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for further discussion of effects on wetlands.

WSDOT has worked with Sound Transit since 2003 to design for future rail compatibility in the corridor. The April 2010 Nelson/Nygaard report identified several changes to the SDEIS options that were believed to be necessary to "meet the mayor's goal of an SR 520 bridge that is readily convertible to rail." Although WSDOT believed that the design had already achieved this goal, it continued to work 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. As discussed in Final EIS Section 2.4, the Preferred Alternative is compatible with two future rail options:

- Option 1: Convert the HOV/transit lanes to light rail. This approach

I-311-410	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 15	393	Walter Oelwein	"With the new structure (tunnel or bridge) across the Montlake Cut, both options would increase roadway capacity in the Montlake area. Traffic patterns would shift in response to this new capacity, increasing traffic volumes on the on- and off-ramps at the new Montlake area interchange. Without the westbound auxiliary lane between the new interchange and I-5 and the increase in traffic volumes on the ramps, the westbound on-ramp merge would be over capacity and congestion would spill back onto the local system." I object to how this is presented and is consistent with the anti-K bias found in this report. By emphasizing "increasing traffic volumes" with Option K, it makes it seem like this is a bad thing, when this is what it is precisely hoped that it would do. Meanwhile, the follwing statement emphasizes Option K's shortcomings and brings up the value-laden term "spill back", the first time I've seen this mentioned in the report other than as a definition of the term. I would expect this to be revised to instead describe the Option K diverts freeway traffic away from a neighborhood corridor and better meets the objective of keeping the profile of the Portage Bay bridge slim, per project goals. The graphic in section 14 shows that Option K has more capacity than Option A. Why isn't this discussed in this section?	Omission, Error
I-311-411	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 17	394	Walter Oelwein	This graphic shows Option K as appearing to have the best impact on handling traffic demand. I don't see this mentioned as a favorable point in comparison to Option A in the executive summary or other summaries of the analysis, instead it leaves the impression that K increases congestion. (Same thing goes for graphic in Section 18 and 26 as well). This needs to be corrected.	Omits important info
I-311-412	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 26	395	Walter Oelwein	This is another example where the concept of "spill over" should apply to Option A and not K, as is stated in section 17. When the bridges go up, this will create the same spill-over. The graphics being provided in Section 17, 18 and 26 all make them look the same, but what about spill over traffic from backed up traffic waiting for the bridge to go up and down? There is no analysis on this, and I'm sure the heat maps would look different.	Omits important info
I-311-413	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 27	396	Walter Oelwein	It is not clear anywhere the impact on tolling and just the overall disencentive to cross the bridge at all given this traffic. If you look at the charts in section 27, it is clear that there is a greater disencentive to cross the bridge with the greater traffic. At a certain point, people will change their behaviors: Move closer to work, carpool more, shift their work schedule. Similarly, employment centers will not develop in the same way -- with this kind of traffic that even an expanded bridge can't handle, employers will encourage other means of getting places, such as telecommuting, private buses (already in place at Microsoft), or changing where the employment center is. In looking at these graphs, it is clear that the assumptions are absurd, and need to be revised for this SDEIS to be complete. No one would sign up for a commute where everyday traffic is backed up between 51st and 405 for the entire 3pm to 7pm period. Behaviors will change and adjust. This report does little to articulate what the future actually will look like.	Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered
I-311-414	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 27	397	Walter Oelwein	In a similar vein, it looks like the real choke point is not the bridge, but the area between Redmond and I-405. It is kind of a crazy chart-- is this because there is no tolling at that stretch of freeway? Do you think that you could add some?	Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

would accommodate light rail by converting the HOV lanes to exclusive rail use. Trains would use the direct-access ramps at Montlake Boulevard to exit, or they could use a 40-foot gap between the eastbound and westbound lanes of the west approach to make a more direct connection to the University Link station at Husky Stadium.

- Option 2: Add light-rail-only lanes. This approach could provide several connections—via a high bridge, a drawbridge, or a tunnel, as suggested in the Nelson/Nygaard report—to the University Link station.

The new bascule bridge would create lane continuity between the Montlake Cut and the SR 520 Montlake interchange, which would improve traffic operations in the Montlake area compared to the No Build Alternative. Most notably, overall delay related to bridge openings would decrease for all vehicles because the additional capacity would help clear congestion more quickly. Bridge height would be the same as the existing Montlake bridge, and operational effects on traffic would be minimized by the ability to synchronize bridge openings of the existing and proposed bridges. The Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 of the Final EIS) expands the discussion of the effects of the second Montlake Bridge on local traffic.

Please see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how urban design has been incorporated into the project.

The comment's characterization of opinions about Options A and M cannot be verified.

Please see the response to comment I-311-082 regarding Option M. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS discusses the reasons that Option M, proposed during the legislative workgroup, was not considered a reasonable alternative.

I-311-415	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 30	398	Walter Oelwein	In this section about the Portage Bay bridge, there is no mention of the impact of a second draw bridge creating "spill-over traffic."	Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered
I-311-416	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 30	399	Walter Oelwein	"Vehicles traveling from Montlake Boulevard via westbound SR 520 to I-5 would pay a toll." OK, so you're saying that there is less traffic going from Montlake to I-5 because there is a toll. Now, please explain where that traffic is going instead. It must be surface streets -- and which ones? This is not documented. It is assumed that cars will take surface streets instead, creating more traffic on the surface streets. For this SDEIS to be complete, this analysis needs to be explicit. I thought the goal of the project was to reduce the impact of "spill-over" traffic. This looks like really bad design.	Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered
I-311-417	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 30	400	Walter Oelwein	"This is because sections of SR 520 would be tolled, including the Portage Bay Bridge. Vehicles traveling from Montlake Boulevard via westbound SR 520 to I-5 would pay a toll." Additionally, throughout this document, it says that a toll will be imposed, but I have yet to see a discussion about how much the tolls would be, and to what degree tolling can impact traffic demand. It appears in most cases in the SDEIS that tolling is an either/or thing, rather than something that can increase or reduce demand. This SDEIS seems very incomplete, since this seems like a major tool for managing traffic, yet most of the discussion is about whether 6 lanes handles more traffic than the no-build option, and the slight differences between options A, L and K. This document needs to have a better discussion of how tolling can manage the traffic flow rather than simply increase lanes. Similarly, any numbers surrounding the "no-build" alternative appear to be incorrect, since I read earlier in the document that tolling is not assumed with No-build, when it is legislatively mandated that this be the case, so it is a false assumption that WashDOT needs to correct.	Error, Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered
I-311-418	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 31	401	Walter Oelwein	"Option A would remove the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps, providing less capacity to and from SR 520 at the SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange than the other options." I have yet to see an argument why Option A eliminates Lake Washington ramps, and why not Options K and L. This makes no sense. I can understand that in negotiations there were parties interested in mitigating the incredible damage that Option A does, but the same arguments for eliminating the Lake Washington ramps could be made for Optoins K and L. This SDEIS needs to make a plausible explanation for why this major difference between Options A and K.	Error, Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered
I-311-419	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 31	402	Walter Oelwein	"The higher volume results in more congestion spilling back from I-5 onto the Portage Bay Bridge and the local system." In this discussion of the down-side of Option A, I have not seen this mentioned in any of the general summaries. In the Executive Summary, there needs to be an explicit statement that says, "Option A creates more congestion spilling back to the local system." Shame on you for trying to hide this in page 31 of the second section of the SDEIS.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-420	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 31	403	Walter Oelwein	"Even with the auxiliary lane between the SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange and I-5, the merge point of Montlake Boulevard westbound on-ramp and the SR 520 mainline would be over capacity, adding to the congestion spilling back onto the local system." Again, you make no mention of this in the executive summar, when this is a pretty strongly worded statement that appears to me the situation worse rather than better, the exact opposite intention of the project. This needs to be explicit in the SDEIS Executive Summary.	Error, Omits important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-149

It is not clear what bidding documents are referred to as showing 6 lanes, 10 foot shoulders, and two more lanes for light rail. It is assumed the reference is to the pontoon bidding documents, which contains a drawing of a future design consideration, not part of the construction project. As noted in the response to comment I-311-148 and discussed in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS, there are two potential ways to accommodate future light rail on SR 520: in the HOV lane or in a new right-of-way separate from the HOV lanes. On the floating bridge, the second method (addition of a new rail right-of-way) would involve widening of the bridge, which would require additional supplemental stability pontoons to support the weight of light rail. The drawing depicting one potential future configuration of a 6-lane roadway with future HCT was included in the SR 520 Pontoon Construction Project Design-Build Request for Proposals. The drawing included the note "This configuration is assumed for design. Actual configuration unknown at this time." This depiction represents a possible future design consideration for bidders to consider, in an effort to keep future light rail options open. It does not represent the project that is proposed by WSDOT and evaluated in the EIS.

The SDEIS Options A, K, and L, as well as the Preferred Alternative are all 6-lane options and are correctly described in the EIS documents. The addition of light rail or additional lanes to support rail or another form of high capacity transit, such as bus rapid transit in additional, dedicated lanes would need to be planned and programmed by regional land use and transit agencies, funded by a public vote, and evaluated in its own environmental analysis.

I-311-150

Visual impacts associated with the second bascule bridge with Option A are discussed in the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS) on pages 2, 44, 64-67, and 79. Exhibit 2-22

I-311-421	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 31	404	Walter Oelwein	"Suboption A, which would include the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps in the new SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange design, would improve these conditions." This is a locially incorrect statement. OK, so the no-ramps creates spillover into the local system (prior paragraph), but the ramps make it better. But better for Lake Washington Blvd? Obviously not, it makes things worse for Lake Washington Blvd. So it isn't better, it's worse too. So basically this section is a large error-prone section: It is trying to state that the ramps are needed via ignoring the impact of the ramps on the local streets when they are there, but highlighting the ramps are there. This is a major error and invalidates this SDEIS.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-422	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 31	405	Walter Oelwein	"Although Option K or L would have less congestion spilling back from I-5 than Option A, without the westbound auxiliary lane between the new interchange and I-5, the westbound on-ramp merge from the new interchange would add to congestion spilling back onto the local system." Again, this is not mentioned in the Executive summary. This is a huge problem with this document. Issues that make this project seem good are highlighted in the executive summary, but issues that make the project seem bad are hidded in the discipline report. This statement makes it clear that there is not enough done with the design to make any of the alternatives viable. Or that there is no consideration on how you will prevent spillover traffic into the local streets and neighborhoods nearby.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-423	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 32	406	Walter Oelwein	"The difference in travel times is due to the westbound congestion approaching the bridge in Medina, which HOVs can bypass." This is extensive discussion about an auxilliary lane between I-5 and 520, but not much discussion about which direction it would serve -- the "traditional" or "reverse" commute. According to this statement and others in the document, the reverse commute is just as bad, which makes having a single 'auxilliary' lane not make sense. Why serve one direction and not the other? This indicates some incorrect design considerations and needs to be stated in the executive summary: "We have installed in Option A an auxillary lane that favors residents on the eastside and sacrifices the west side residents and commuters."	Error, Omits important info
I-311-424	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 32	407	Walter Oelwein	In Exhibit 5-20, it is clear that Option K is the best option from a travel time perspective. This is not stated in the Executive summary. This needs to be articulated in the executive summary for this document to be accurate. Why bury the good aspects of Option K in the discipline report?	Error, Omits important info
I-311-425	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 32	408	Walter Oelwein	"When congestion is at its peak, the 6-Lane Alternative would provide an even greater travel time savings for HOV travel compared to general-purpose travel (from a 40-minute savings with the No Build Alternative to a 50-minute saving with the 6-Lane Alternative)." This statement is false if tolls are not considered in the no-build alternative, and the price of tolls are not discussed, as is the case in this document. In the no-build alternative, there will be tolls, so there is a way to manage this demand. More demand? More tolls. People will carpool even if there is no HOV lane, just to pay the toll. The fact that this is not explored make this document incorrect.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-426	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 33	409	Walter Oelwein	"SR 520 congestion could extend as far back as I-5 with the No Build Alternative." This cannot possibly be true, and or is a terrible piece of analysis. First, if 520 is rarely backed up eastbound TO 405 today. As a frequent commuter, I cannot recall a time when it actually was backed up even to the collector lane to 405. Second, if it is indeed backed up all the way to 405, wouldn't you pay the toll to wait like that? That doesn't make any sense, the toll would discourage such a high volume. Third, people would take alternate routes, such as I-90 or north or south on I-5 or 522. This analysis seems to imply that this is the only way to get across. I'm actually appalled that this passes for analysis in this document.	Error, Omits important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

in that report show the existing view from the Montlake Bridge compared to the view with each option. Exhibit 2-23 shows the view looking west from northeast corner of East Montlake Park toward Montlake Bridge. The visual quality effects of the new bascule bridge with the Preferred Alternative would be similar to those of Option A, and updated information and visualizations can be found in the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS). For example, a new viewpoint was added to the addendum (see Exhibit 2-24), which compares the existing view looking north along Montlake Boulevard toward the Montlake Bridge with the Preferred Alternative view. Please see the response to comment I-311-016 regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge.

I-311-151

See the responses to comments I-311-031 and I-311-066 regarding the coordination between WSDOT, FHWA, and Sound Transit and connections to the Montlake Multimodal Center which is adjacent to the University of Washington light rail station, and I-311-148 regarding options for connecting potential future light rail to the light rail station at Husky Stadium.

The visual quality analysis includes pedestrians as well as motorists, as mentioned throughout the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report. Discussion of the Montlake Area with Option A is included on pages 64-65 of that report.

I-311-152

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-427	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 33	410	Walter Oelwein	"The 6-Lane Alternative would substantially reduce this congestion because HOVs would be able to reliably bypass general purpose congestion after completion of the eastbound HOV lane between I-5 and Medina." Given the unsubstantiated piece of rhetoric that immediately precedes this sentence, this makes this statement completely incorrect. The only backups on 520 eastbound in Seattle are related to the capacity to merge, and less on the overall capacity of the freeway. After the chokepoints, traffic generally flows. It is more likely that these HOV lanes on the bridge proper are unnecessary, since all traffic will be flowing no problem once people are on the bridge, as is currently the case. This statement needs to be stricken from the document for the document to be correct.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-428	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 33	411	Walter Oelwein	Exhibit 5-21 shows that Option K has the ability to handle the most vehicle person trips -- by a large numbrer over option A. This needs to be explicity stated in the executive summary for this to be an accurate document. Another example of the Anti-Option K bias.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-429	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 34	412	Walter Oelwein	"By the year 2030, congestion on SR 520 approaching the SR 520/I-405 interchange would be worse due to I-405 traffic backing up onto the SR 520 ramps. This congestion would limit the amount of traffic that can exit from SR 520 to I-405. Congestion on the SR 520 off-ramp to northbound I-405 would spill back onto the SR 520 mainline and cause congestion extending back to I-5." This statement needs to be stricken from the document for the document to have legitimacy. Currently there is no backup TO 405 from 520 Westbound. Never, ever. Compare this to the daily backups in Montlake and Westbound 520, where there is an actual problem. To state that traffic would back up all the way to I-5 is an eggregious exaggeration or a lie or a completely faulty piece of analysis that calls into question the entire SDEIS.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-430	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 35	413	Walter Oelwein	This chart is completely absurd. There is no explanation why backups would start occuring where there are currently no backups to I-405. Additionally, it is not clear why Option A is allowed to have a sub-option with no on-ramps at Lake Washington Blvd, and not the other Options. This makes Option A look better than the others in this chart, creating the false impression that it is specific to Option A's design, an not that similar sup-options were not considered.	Error, Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-153

The comment's characterizations that WSDOT "did not enlist aesthetic assistance," "there is no aesthetic expertise involved in creating the designs," that "'due weight' has not been made in decision-making," and that "Option A…is easily the poorest in aesthetic quality" are inaccurate. First, in keeping with FHWA and WSDOT methodology for visual quality assessments, the alternatives and design options in a NEPA visual quality and aesthetics analysis are not rated according to aesthetic quality. Second, visual quality assessments are conducted by landscape architecture professionals who are trained in using the industry-accepted FHWA and WSDOT assessment methodology. Third, the analysis does not assign a single, overall number to the alternative or option as a whole because visual effects are local and result from individual effects, even though one could use the evaluation matrix to calculate such a number. Further, according to the evaluation matrix for the SDEIS, Options K and L had the greatest local negative effects on visual quality. This was due to the substantial and negative effects at MOHAI (tunnel for K and bridge for L) and the demolition of north Foster Island for the land bridge. Option A had its own effects at Montlake but they were small relative to the MOHAI effects of K and L. So overall, Options K and L had much greater effects on visual quality than Option A.

The purpose of the visual quality assessment is to disclose how the existing visual quality conditions would change due to the location, size, and character of the new facility. Disclosing effects allows stakeholders and decision-makers to identify how effects can be minimized or reduced through the design process, or mitigated as warranted. The aesthetics of a finished design will be an important part of the design development process that follows the NEPA Record of Decision. If Options K or L were identified as the Preferred Alternative in the future, WSDOT would provide additional information as part of final design and permitting and ensure that negative effects associated with these options are mitigated to the extent practicable.

I-311-431	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 37	414	Walter Oelwein	"General-purpose travel times would range between 22 minutes (average) to up to 1 hour and 25 minutes during the peak hour of travel. With the 6-Lane Alternative, HOV travel would be 6 to 31 minutes faster than general-purpose travel because an eastbound HOV lane would be added between Medina and the SR 520/I-405 interchange." Again, this has no basis in reality. Why is it that traffic backing up onto 405 is going to be so bad, when it doesn't occur at all currently. And if it were to start to be this bad, would people even take I-405, or 520 for that matter? couldn't they avoid 520 altogether, given the 1.5 hour commute nightmare ahead of them, even if they aren't getting on 405? Finally, this is perhaps the most dire commute time projection seen thus far in the SDEIS -- backups on Eastbound 520 approaching 405 with commute times up to 1 hour 25 minutes, and 1 hour with the 6 lane alternatives. This didn't make it into the executive summary, and should. There has been a lot of talk about with the expanded 520, cars would not have anywher to go to get on I-5, but this analysis says things are much worse going eastbound approaching 405. If anything, this makes the argument that 520 should be restricted even further (4 lanes? 2 lanes) -- that adding capacity would create greater traffic snarls. Best to keep them off the road entirely -- This is a piece of bizarro analysis and needs to be seriously revised -- either with a better highlighting of this dire backup to 405 in the executive summary, or a revision of this SDEIS that doesn't place traffic jams where there are no traffic jams.	Error, Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered
I-311-432	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 37	415	Walter Oelwein	Exhibit 5-24 does not explain why Option A has such significantly better general purpose wait times, compared to Option K and L. The differences between Options A and K and L are on the west side of the lake, and even then, so how would the eastbound travel times be so different (30 mins. vs 55 mins.)? The auxilliarly HOV lane can't possible make this much of a difference (nor is it credited for it), so what is the difference? No on-ramps at Lake Washington Blvd? That can't be, since the back-up is at 405, according to your analysis. What is the difference? I suspect that this is making an argument of Option A that is not justified at all. First, you trump up the backup to 405 (which doesn't exist), and then you say that option A has a 25 minute improvement than Options K/L. Suddenly, Option A looks better. However, there is no basis in reality here.	Error, Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered
I-311-433	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 37	416	Walter Oelwein	Exhibit 5-24 does not offer any anticipation of spillover traffic into Medina, when this is obviously going to happen if there are 30-48 minute wait times trying to get on 405. This has to happen, yet the SDEIS does not mention it at all. There needs to be a clear articulation that there will be, according to this rather dire scenario, thousands of cars cutting through Medina, Clyde Hill and Bellevue. I suspect that you are either trumping up this 405 backup to make Option A look better (and without justification), or you are hiding from the Medina, Clyde Hill and Bellevue residents the impact of the expanded 520 bridge: Expanded cut-through traffic in their neighborhoods. Spill over is discussed repeatedly in the west side, but not on the Eastside? This makes the document strikingly incomplete. I suspect that if you mentioned that there will be massive spill-over traffic into Medina (trying to avoid that back-up onto 405), the Eastside residents might not be so excited about this freeway expansion. This omission is scandalous.	Error, Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

Please see the responses to comments I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues and I-311-010 regarding the methodology of the visual quality assessment.

I-311-154

The statement if from the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report, and it does not pertain to the Montlake or west approach areas. Please see the responses to comments I-311-137 regarding construction of Option K, and I-311-074 regarding potential phasing. See Chapter 3 of the Final EIS for a discussion of construction sequencing with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-155

The discussion refers to construction effects. As cited in the comment, the construction of Option K would include barges, boring equipment, hauling of excavation materials, and removal of vegetation near the shoreline. Along with the longer construction period, the effects of these construction activities would be more intense than Option A. While the construction of the second bascule bridge could temporarily affect the view of the historic bridge, the effects would be shorter and less intense. Please see the response to comment I-311-136 for more information on the construction effects with Option K.

I-311-156

The Option K design was developed through the westside mediation process based on a number of considerations; more information is provided in the Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Discipline Report. The cultural resources and visual quality analyses in the SDEIS noted and compared the potential effects of Options A, K, and L. Additionally, NEPA requires the EIS documents to disclose effects, but

I-311-434	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 39	417	Walter Oelwein	"This comparison allowed us to determine what local street and intersection traffic operations would be like without the project. The 6-Lane (Build) Alternative was then compared to the No Build Alternative to determine effects on traffic conditions with the project." This methodology is error-prone. Here's why: The no-build alternative does not assume tolling, even though this is legislatively mandated and will occur soon, so the No-Build scenario does not exist. You need to at least have a "no build with tolling" as a baseline. Second, you need to have a "bridge collapse" scenario. You have mentioned several times in the document that the bridge could very likely have a catostrophic failure. What would be the impact on local roads then? Third, since you do not study -- ever -- the impact of the second draw bridge, any discussion on "local streets" must be incomplete, since this is an ongoing character of the local area, and defines the traffic. Finally, you mention in the prior section that back-ups to I-5 of cars waiting to get onto 405 are inevitable. This means that there will be even more spillover traffic in the West-side neighborhoods, trying to avoid freeway backups. If this is not considered in the analysis, then this entire section needs to be called into question, and considered error- and omission-prone.	Error, Omits important info; specific alternatives not considered
I-311-435	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 39	418	Walter Oelwein	"Traffic operations at five study area interchanges are discussed in this section. These five interchange areas include SR 520/Montlake Boulevard, SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke Street, I-5/NE 45th Street, I-5/Mercer Street, and I-5/Stewart Street." It is odd that you would not include in this list the interchanges at Roosevelt/Eastlake/Fuhrman and Boyer/Lynn, as these are proxys for the I-5 interchange to 520 on the surface street, and local residents can assure you that there is massive spillover traffic in this area, making analysis necessary. It is a general fear by residents near these streets that increased freeway traffice and throughput means increased local street traffic. The fact that these roads/intersections are not analyzed shows both disrespect to this concern (we should know what to expect with this increase in capacity-- perhaps it could even be better? We don't know) and a lack of understanding of the local traffic conitions.	
I-311-436	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 39	419	Walter Oelwein	"The SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange area, which provides access to and from SR 520, is congested during the morning and afternoon peak hours." This is an incomplete statement that ignores a core experience with this intersection: It is ALSO congested in the middle of the day, due to the bridge going up regularly. The fact that this is not stated outright and in the introductory statement about the intersection is an eggregious omission and does not correctly reflect the current state of the intersection.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-437	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 40	420	Walter Oelwein	"Congestion in the Montlake area affects transit service efficiency and reliability, constraining transit service." This statement is incomplete, because the combination of local transit service trying to compete with freeway access traffic adds to the problem. Add in a draw-bridge, and you have extra-unreliable transit service. This is something that only Option K tries to solve. However, by missing this aspect of the current state, you are omitting important info that would help idnetify the best option. This is an example of Anti-Option K bias.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-438	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 41	421	Walter Oelwein	"Montlake Bridge openings can have long-lasting effects on traffic flow in this area. The bridge does not open during the morning and afternoon peak periods; however, the last opening at 3:30 p.m. can affect traffic operations throughout the afternoon commute." This statement again emphasizes only the peak period aspects of bridge openings. This is an incomplete assessment of the current conditions.	Error, Omits important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

do not require the documents to points out what areas are not affected by the various designs of the project.

I-311-157

The requested change was not made because the text is accurate. The text referenced in the comment is comparing the height of the bridges and therefore does not include Option K, since it does not include a bridge over Foster Island. Please also see the response to comment I-311-156 regarding why Option K was developed and the discussion of effects in the SDEIS.

I-311-158

The use of the term “effects” is typically used in EIS analyses; one purpose of the NEPA process is to provide neutral analyses to inform decision-makers. Please see the response to comment I-311-104 regarding the characterization of visual quality effects. Please see the response to comment I-311-005 regarding design enhancements included with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-159

The text immediately prior to the quoted text (see pages 2-3 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report) explains that Option K would include features that would affect the visual quality of the area. “The single-point urban interchange (SPUI) under the mainline and the tunnel entrance would replace the existing ramp weaves, tree buffers, and shoreline with terraces of very tall retaining walls, columns for the mainline, and more road surfaces at the shoreline in Montlake.” Because the SPUI for Option K would be below grade and below the ordinary high water mark of Union Bay, large retaining walls would be constructed around its perimeter, with heights ranging from 20 feet to more than 60 feet high. A conceptual illustration of these retaining walls is shown in Exhibit 9 of the Description of Alternatives Discipline Report (Attachment

I-311-439	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 41	422	Walter Oelwein	"Bridge openings compound whatever congestion is present on the local street network and can cause traffic on the SR 520 westbound and eastbound off-ramps to back up onto the SR 520 mainline. Congestion on the eastbound off-ramp can also affect traffic on I-5." This statement is buried as a sub-statement of the fourth bullet point describing the current conditions of the intersection. This de-emphasis shows an incomplete understanding of the impact of combining a draw bridge with a major freeway interchange.	Omits important info
I-311-440	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 41	423	Walter Oelwein	"Morning and afternoon peak-hour traffic volumes on streets within the SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange area are shown in Exhibits 6-1 and 6-2." Again, a chart about non-peak traffic needs to be added, due to the unique aspect of a draw bridge, and the impact of doubling this unique aspect with two of the three options.	Omits important info
I-311-441	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 41	424	Walter Oelwein	"Traffic volumes are shown for comparison between Options A, K, and L." This section requires comparing Option K to Option A and L during non-peak times, because there is a serious and tangible benefit of Option K here, and to understand the environmental impact of the different options, this needs to be articulated and made explicit, not ignored entirely.	Omits important info
I-311-442	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 42	425	Walter Oelwein	This image shows that Options K and L reduce traffic across the Montlake bridge significantly. However, this is not mentioned in the executive summary. This would be a huge step for creating a better neighborhood environment, where the neighborhood traffic is not co-mingled with the freeway traffic. This is de-emphasized in the SDEIS, and reflects an anti-Option K bias.	Omits important info
I-311-443	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 42	426	Walter Oelwein	Similarly, the image shows Option K having much more capacity than Option A in the future. This is not discussed in the Executive summary, and the lack of highlighting the traffic flow benefit of Option K reflects and anti-Option K bias.	Omits important info
I-311-444	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Secction 43	427	Walter Oelwein	This image shows that Options K and L reduce traffic across the Montlake bridge significantly. However, this is not mentioned in the executive summary. This would be a huge step for creating a better neighborhood environment, where the neighborhood traffic is not co-mingled with the freeway traffic. This is de-emphasized in the SDEIS, and reflects an anti-Option K bias.	Omits important info
I-311-445	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 43	428	Walter Oelwein	Similarly, the image shows Option K having much more capacity than Option A in the future. This is not discussed in the Executive summary, and the lack of highlighting the traffic flow benefit of Option K reflects and anti-Option K bias.	Omits important info
I-311-446	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 44	429	Walter Oelwein	This analysis does not appear to be correct. First, how is that Option K, which actually adds an outlet towards the freeway, is worse than Option A, which keeps the existing funnel in one direction. The same extends for the upstream intersections near U-Village. This analysis that Option K would have a worse impact -- when it does not get backed up behind two additional lights as it goes through the Montlake neighborhood doesn't make sense. This does not seem to be mentioned. Also, since the intersection at Montake and Pacific Street has equal impact in the AM, how is it that Option A is better than Option K in the AM in the intersections toward U Village? When it comes to the PM, how is it that Option A has only a "B" rating for the right hand turn onto Montalke from Westbound 520, when suddenly Option K has an "F" rating for essentially the same traffic -- (but not stuck behind two extra intersections in the Montlake neighborhood). The analysis seems to be incorrect or insufficient.	Error

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

7 to the SDEIS).

In some areas, as shown in Exhibit 2-15 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report, the Option K interchange is more visible than Option A. Both options include lids which aid in improving the visual quality of the project in the Montlake Area. As mentioned in the response to comment I-311-005 the Preferred Alternative has improved the Montlake lid to be a full lid that runs from the Montlake Interchange to the shoreline, thus increasing the visual quality more than either option.

The comment's characterization of opinions about Options A and K is not accurate. WSDOT received a number of comments in support of and in opposition to all three options presented in the SDEIS (Options A, K, and L). The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Summary of Comments is available at: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/SDEIS.htm.

I-311-160

"A complex, multi-layered visual field" is not necessarily a negative effect. As discussed on page 67 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report; "The lowered intersection and tunnel portal would be covered by a partial or full lid… This new configuration would create a complex, multi-layered channel that would block views to the University of Washington and Rainier Vista from the viewpoints of the motorist and transit rider. However, pedestrians, cyclists, and disembarking or departing bus and light rail commuters could have an improved experience due to being separated from vehicular traffic and having unobstructed views… In the southeast campus area of the university, intactness and unity could increase if the depressed intersection results in the removal of overhanging wires, lamps, and signage and creates better pedestrian and vehicle orientation and circulation." A visualization of the conceptual lid design in this area is included in Exhibit 10 of the Description of Alternatives Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the

I-311-447	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 44	430	Walter Oelwein	It should be noted again that there is no analysis of what the intersections look like during non-peak hours, when Option K would provide a tangible benefit and Option A and Lwould be a significant problem, making this SDEIS very incomplete.	Omits important info
I-311-448	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 44	431	Walter Oelwein	What is missing is the discussion about how Option K ultimately has more throughput than any of the other options. This is not highlighted, and reflects an anti-Option K bias.	Omits important info
I-311-449	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 46	432	Walter Oelwein	"Generally, the westbound SR 520 off-ramp queue does not extend onto the SR 520 mainline." The lack of precision of this statement reflects how incomplete it is. Of course the westbound SR 520 off-ramp que extends to the SR520 mainline. The right lane on 520 is frequently backed up as it waits for this to be cleared out. This statement needs to be more precise and revised for this SDEIS to be correct.	Error
I-311-450	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 47	433	Walter Oelwein	This graphic depicts that traffic volumes are actually going to get worse on the local streets (10th and Roanoke, for example). This means that an objective for this project is not being met. It would be hoped that an expansion of the freeway would remove some congestion on the local intersections, especially as there is less cut-through traffic trying to skip ahead to Montlake via Delmar Drive. However, this graphic demonstrates that the expanded freeway makes things worse for the local residents, compared to the No Build option. So therefore the freeway design is a failure. This needs to be articulated in the Executive summary: "After analysis, despite expanding the freeway and trying to find ways to alleviete traffic on local streets, the new freeway design makes it worse for the local residents than the no build option, making our freeway design poor." This would be an accurate reflection of the impact of your freeway design, and should not be glossed over or hidden in the discipline report.	Error, Omits important info, options not considered
I-311-451	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 48	434	Walter Oelwein	Interestingly, Option A is the only option that is worse than the other options, yet this is not mentioned in the summary statement. Why is Option A generating 100 more care in the peak hour at Roanoke and 10th? This needs to be explained for the SDEIS to be complete. As a resident nearby, I want to know why Option A dumps more traffic on my street. I need to know the environmental impact.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-452	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 49	435	Walter Oelwein	In this graphic, it shows the intersection at Harvard/Roanoke and Roanoke/Boylson as F. What have you done to make this a better design? Was there even a designer involved to alleviate this clearly terrible set of intersections? Why is this acceptible that after this massive project, you just keep the worst elements of the existing state? This should be a signal to go back to the drawing board and create an intersection design (or tube/tunnels) that do not overstress a portion of the neighborhood. The expanded freeway does nothing good here, and needs to be articulated in the executive summary. An accurate statement would be: "We have decided that we can do nothing about the poor conditions at Harvard/Roanoke, so we are just putting in more freeway capacity and letting that intersection be terrible for the next 30 years. This is our idea of freeway design and mitigation for the local area. Environmental Impact: Really Bad." This way the reviewers can better understand what we're getting with this default roadway placement.	Omits important info
I-311-453	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 50	436	Walter Oelwein	The fact that this graphic shows no real impact means that you need to be studying some other, closer in intersections, specifically Boyer/Lynn and Roosevelt/Fuhrman. The fact that you have no analysis, data or commentary on this section makes this SDEIS incompelte.	Omits important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

SDEIS). See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues.

I-311-161

In keeping with FHWA and WSDOT methodology for visual quality assessments, the alternatives and design options in a NEPA visual quality and aesthetics analysis are not rated according to aesthetic quality. The quoted text simply states that Option K removes the most natural woodlands on Foster Island. Although some of this is replaced with parkland, the visual effects would still be dramatic due to the removal of trees, wetlands, habitat, etc. Please see the response to comment I-311-012 and comment I-311-118 regarding effects on Foster Island.

I-311-162

Please see the responses to comments I-311-156 regarding NEPA requirements and I-311-158 regarding the use of the word “effect.” Please see the response to comment I-311-104 regarding the characterization of visual quality effects. Also see the response to comment I-311-160 regarding visual effects in the University of Washington area.

I-311-163

Option K, with a tunnel under the Montlake cut, is analyzed in the SDEIS, including in the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report. Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-454	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 52	437	Walter Oelwein	There is no discussion as to why Option K outperforms Option A here. However, there is much discussion elsewhere in how Option A outperforms Option K. This demonstrates anti-Option K bias.	Omits important info
I-311-455	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 52	438	Walter Oelwein	In this graphic, it shows the intersection at Mercer and Fairview as F and Fairview and Valley as D. What have you done to make this a better design? Was there even a designer involved to alleviate this clearly terrible set of intersections? Why is this acceptible that after this massive project, you just keep the worst elements of the existing state? This should be a signal to go back to the drawing board and create an intersection design that do not overstress a portion of the neighborhood. The expanded freeway does nothing good here, and needs to be articulated in the executive summary. An accurate statement would be: "We have decided that we can do nothing about the poor conditions at Harvard/Roanoke, so we are just putting in more freeway capacity and letting that intersection be terrible for the next 30 years. This is our idea of freeway design and mitigation for the local area. Environmental Impact: Really Bad." This way the reviewers can better understand what we're getting with this default roadway placement.	Other options not explored
I-311-456	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 59	439	Walter Oelwein	In this graphic, it shows the intersection at Stewart and Denny as F. What have you done to make this a better design? Was there even a designer involved to alleviate this clearly terrible set of intersections? Why is this acceptible that after this massive project, you just keep the worst elements of the existing state? This should be a signal to go back to the drawing board and create an intersection design (or a tube/tunnel) that do not overstress a portion of the neighborhood. The expanded freeway does nothing good here, and needs to be articulated in the executive summary. An accurate statement would be: "We have decided that we can do nothing about the poor conditions at Harvard/Roanoke, so we are just putting in more freeway capacity and letting that intersection be terrible for the next 30 years. This is our idea of freeway design and mitigation for the local area. Environmental Impact: Really Bad." This way the reviewers can better understand what we're getting with this default roadway placement.	Other options not explored
I-311-457	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 62	440	Walter Oelwein	"With these increases, congestion is expected to worsen compared to today's conditions. Intersections in the SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange area where traffic operations would degrade to worse than LOS D under the No Build Alternative are described in detail below." Another area where the SDEIS is misleading, since there is no mention of the impact of tolling on traffic congestion, and the No Build option assumes no tolling, which is inconsistent with the reality.	Other options not explored
I-311-458	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 60	441	Walter Oelwein	"What would traffic be like at the study area interchanges in 2030 without the project?" This section ignores Roosevelt/Furhman and Lynn/Boyer. These are important intersections that are proxies for the freeway, and often serve as overflow. These need to be studied for this SDEIS to be an articulation of the environmental impact.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-459	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 66	442	Walter Oelwein	"With the 6-Lane Alternative, the SR 520 corridor would be tolled, which would cause some drivers to change their routes, modes of travel, or time of day traveled to avoid the toll." It is precisely because of this statement that it must be studied what the traffic flow will be to Delmar/Lynn and Fuhrman/Boyer, sections that could provide short-cuts to and from the freeway. These intersections are not even mentioned anywhere in the document.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-460	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 66	443	Walter Oelwein	"Some SR 520 traffic would shift to the SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke Street interchange area regardless of which build option is selected." . . .and down Delmar/Boyer	Error, Omits important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-164

This section of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report discusses effects that are common to all options. The height of the bridge would be different with each option and in each area. As discussed on page 77 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report, "with a sensitive design that considers color palette, texture, top-of-wall treatment, and landscape, sound walls may in some cases serve as additional visual mitigation." The exact location and design of noise walls would not be decided until a later stage of design, in coordination with affected communities. The SDEIS provided a comprehensive analysis of effects based on the project design and construction information available at that time.

Also note that noise reduction strategies included with 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, except potentially along I-5 in the North Capitol Hill area where the reasonableness and feasibility of a noise wall is still be evaluated (see Section 5.7 of the Final EIS). Please see the response to comment C-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative.

See the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-165

The analysis considers both viewers from and looking at the proposed project. A noticeably wider roadway is listed on page 61 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report as one of the primary effects on visual quality and character and is discussed throughout the section titled "How would operation of the project affect visual quality and

I-311-461	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 67	444	Walter Oelwein	"It would result in arterial traffic operations that are better than the No Build Alternative." This is a statement of value that is not supported in this document. Not studying the impact of a second draw bridge during non-peak hours is a big omission. It is easy to imagine that backing up the increased freeway volume on a second draw bridge would make things worse than the No-Build Alternative, since traffic will only tolerate a certain amount of backup and shift to other transportation corridors. This would be better stated as, "We have no idea if Option A would be better than the no build alternative, as it repeats the same design problems of the existing setup, and essentially doubles it with a second draw bridge. During peak times we expand the capacity and widen the road significantly through a neighborhood, but still, we don't know." This would be a more accurate statement.	Error
I-311-462	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 72	445	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would include a new lowered single-point urban interchange (SPUI) that combines the functions of the existing SR 520/Montlake Boulevard and SR /520 Lake Washington Boulevard interchanges to the east." There is no similar statement of value that you provide for Option A in Section 67. For this SDEIS statement to be correct, you need to state, as you do with Option A in Section 67, that "Option K would result in arterial traffic operations that are better than the No Build Alternative." This is a glaring example of anti-Option K bias in this document	Omits important info
I-311-463	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 69	446	Walter Oelwein	"No westbound left turn with Suboption A" And where will this traffic go instead? It is assumed it will go up Delmar Drive (and further clog Harvard Roanoke--our infamous F intersection which this design does nothing about). I do not see this mentioned anywhere in the SDEIS. It needs to be discussed for this to be complete.	Omits important info
I-311-464	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 69	447	Walter Oelwein	As a citizen, I have to say that this intersection looks like a total mess, and cannot be supported as a desirable transporation alternative. I know that this is the car section, but this graphic is the best view of what a nightmare it is for non-cars. The sheer square footage of concrete is terrible. It is a capitulation to cars who are dominating the landscape. This is not what a future transportation system should look like -- this seems like the the most eggregious intersections in Bellevue, only worse. This does not reflect the values and interests of the Seattle citizenry, and you should be ashamed for even thinking that this is somehow acceptable.	Really bad design. Really.
I-311-465	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 69	448	Walter Oelwein	"Additional GP lane No HOV lane with Suboption A" C'mon! An additional lane on this on-ramp? So now you have three lanes merging onto three lanes. This looks like again, terrible freeway design that will just create back-ups, and is a good example of how expanding the freeway doesn't solve traffic problems, it just makes them more absurd. Also, earlier in the document it is cited that the local residents wanted a narrower 520, so you remove the bus stop -- yet you simply take that exact same space and add an extra lane on the on ramp. This makes your design contractory to the stated goals of the project.	Error. Omits important info
I-311-466	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 69	449	Walter Oelwein	"Third southbound lane between Lake Washington Boulevard and E Louisa Street" This isn't discussed anywhere about the impact of having 3 lanes merge into 2 here. Why 3 lanes anyway? There is no discussion or rationale for this expansion of the street, other than to create more backups on surface streets.	Error. Omits important info

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

aesthetics?"

See the responses to comments I-311-005 and I-311-057 for a list of design enhancements and noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-166

The purpose of the visual quality assessment is to disclose how the existing visual quality conditions will change due to the location, size, and character of the new facility. Disclosing effects helps to identify what needs to or can be mitigated through the design process. The aesthetics of a finished design will be an important part of the design development process that follows the NEPA Record of Decision.

WSDOT considered a wide range of alternatives before narrowing them down to those evaluated in the Draft EIS. Please see the response to comment I-311-007 regarding the range of alternatives evaluated for the SR 520 project.

I-311-167

The Preferred Alternative has been designed to minimize SR 520's footprint as much as possible while allowing room for HOV lanes and the shoulders required to satisfy current safety standards regulated by FHWA and the Association of American State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). This included narrowing shoulders to 8 feet in some locations.

Highway lanes and shoulders are designed to standards that have been established to protect the safety of drivers. When circumstances warrant a change from these standards, WSDOT must request FHWA's approval of a "design deviation." WSDOT has already obtained approvals for

I-311-467	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 69	450	Walter Oelwein	In this visual depiction of the Montalke Interchange, it appears that there is a fairly wide median between the westbound and eastbound lanes. When the stated goal was to narrow the freeway in this area, why keep the super-wide median? Or if you are going to use this much right of way for the freeway, why not narrow the median and keep the Montlake Freeway station? It appears that there is plenty of room for this here. This decision is not discussed anywhere that I have found, and narrowing this median seems to solve a lot of bad decisions (keeps the freeway narrow, keeps the freeway station). Of course, with Option A, having the freeway station here is stupid, because the transit points are a 1/2 mile away near the stadium. This looks like some really bad design.	Error. Omits important info
I-311-468	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 69	451	Walter Oelwein	After looking at this depiction of Option A, you should characterize this interchange as a Lid, but a bridge over the freeway expansion. It is occupied exclusively by a high volume of cars, and would be a nightmare for pedestirans and bicyclists, further disconnecting the neighborhoods.	Error. Omits important info
I-311-469	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 69	452	Walter Oelwein	What is that strange orane structure over the Bill Dawson Trail? This needs to be explained. Are pedestrians being asked to walk through a tunnel? This needs to be mentioned. I didn't see anything on this part discussed on the pedestrian impacts.	Error. Omits important info
I-311-470	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 70	453	Walter Oelwein	"Option A would not degrade intersection operations during either peak hour compared to the No Build Alternative." I expect to see a similar evaluative statement for Option K, otherwise this is anti-Option K bias, but instead I see a statement that is less evaluative, and sounds like more of an implication of Option K: "With Option K, traffic volumes in the overall SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange area would increase by 23 percent compared to the No Build Alternative because of the new capacity associated with the new interchange and crossing of the Montlake Cut. By shifting SR 520 freeway traffic to the SPUI, drivers would choose to take advantage of the capacity made available on Montlake Boulevard." This sudden change of terms in comparison to Option A's valuative statement that says things are better. Instead, you say that Option K increases capacity, not "Makes things better for freeway commuters."	Error. Omits important info
I-311-471	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 71	454	Walter Oelwein	For Option A: "With these changes, traffic operations would improve at the following intersections (compared with No Build Alternative)" "Option A would not degrade intersection operations during either peak hour compared to the No Build Alternative." "This shift would decrease traffic volumes at intersections north of the SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange area, including Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street and NE Pacific Street/15th Avenue NE." "As with Option A, this suboption's design would improve intersection operations compared to the No Build Alternative." "With the improvements to the SR 520 mainline, the Lake Washington Boulevard eastbound on-ramp merges would improve, allowing the ramp meters to serve more traffic. This would substantially reduce congestion that spills back onto Lake Washington Boulevard compared to the No Build Alternative."	
I-311-472	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 71	455	Walter Oelwein	"NE Pacific Street/15th Avenue NE intersection operations would improve from LOS E under the No Build Alternative to LOS D with Option A. Removing the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps would result in less traffic traveling through this intersection and, thus, less delay for drivers." This appears to be an error. How does the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps have an impact on NE Pacific Stret/15th Ave NE section? These are very far away from one another and don't seem to be connected.	Error

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

design deviations for both lane and shoulder widths in response to community requests for a narrower roadway footprint. In the interest of safety, FHWA will not approve further narrowing of the corridor.

See Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for more information. The Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report Addendum analyzes the effects of the Preferred Alternative (see Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

I-311-168

In response to community feedback, the Preferred Alternative includes a number of noise reduction strategies that would reduce noise levels along the corridor. See the response to comment I-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative, and regarding quieter concrete pavement. Also see Section 5.11 of the Final EIS and the Noise Discipline Report Addendum for more details regarding the noise analysis and findings.

I-311-169

Please see the responses to comments I-311-001 and I-311-007 regarding the range of alternatives evaluated for the SR 520 project.

The text referred to in the comment is in a section discussing Option K only. That section pointed out that, during the mediation process, citizens recommended that Option K not include noise walls; however, WSDOT regulations require that noise walls be evaluated where they may be warranted, and recommended where they meet the feasibility and reasonableness criteria. As discussed in the Noise Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SEIS), noise walls were analyzed for all SDEIS options.

The Preferred Alternative includes a number of noise reduction strategies that would reduce noise levels such that noise walls would not be recommended in the Seattle portion of the project, except potentially

I-311-473	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 71	456	Walter Oelwein	"Drivers destined for areas south of SR 520 would need to use the Lake Washington Boulevard westbound off-ramp to travel southbound on Montlake Boulevard rather than using the U-turn movement as they do today." This appears to be an error. Drivers are not allowed to make a U-Turn off of Montlake today (unless they make an illegal move). To state that this is what drivers do today is misleading and incorrect.	Error
I-311-474	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 74	457	Walter Oelwein	In this image of Option K, why the big median between the main lines of 520? Elsewhere in the document you mention how you're trying to narrow the width of 520 in this area, per the request of the residents, but in this concept, there is a median that appears to be 2-3 lanes wide? Why not narrow the median and return access to the Montlake freeway station? Or put a replacement Montlake freeway station near the new intersection to the east, allowing people to make relatively easy transfers to Sound Transit or walks to the UW? There appears to be plenty of room, and a pedestrian that gets you to the new bike trail isn't out of the question.	Options not considered
I-311-475	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 74	458	Walter Oelwein	That Tear-drop turn-around is awesome! I like option K because it puts the freeway interchanges over the freeway, and keeps the residential streets and Montlake/24th a residential street. I expect this to be highlighted as a benefit in the SDEIS, but I don't see this really mentioned as a benefit of this design. Why?	Options not considered; Omits Important Info
I-311-476	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 73	459	Walter Oelwein	This image needs to show where people will be able to catch the bus to and from 520. It appears that this was not examined very closely with Option K, althrough there are many opportunities for creating integrated bus-stops. This visual depiction would help.	Omits important info
I-311-477	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 74	460	Walter Oelwein	This visual depiction hides one of the main benfits of Option K-- the lack of the second draw bridge and the widening of Montlake Blvd. In order for this document to be fair, it needs to better demonstrate this visually.	Omits important info
I-311-478	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 75	461	Walter Oelwein	"A grade-separated pedestrian crossing of the Montlake Boulevard/NE Pacific Street intersection." This is not visually depicted in Section 73, which makes the visual depiction of Option K worse than it actually is. For this SDEIS to be complete, you need to add this.	Omits important info, Error
I-311-479	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 73	462	Walter Oelwein	"No right turn pocket with Option K" This appears to be an error. The caption indicates a right turn pocket. It appears that this section on Option K was put together sloppily and not with due consideration.	Error

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

along I-5 in the North Capitol Hill area where the reasonableness and feasibility of a noise wall is still be evaluated (see Section 5.7 of the Final EIS). See the responses to comments I-311-005 and I-311-057 regarding design enhancements and noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-170

The summary included in the Introduction to the SDEIS Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report is intended to be a brief, and the requested information regarding the definitions of vividness, intactness, and unity are included in pages 19-20.

The WSDOT Evaluation Matrix was used to conduct the quantitative visual quality assessment, the results of which were summarized in text form in Exhibit 1-1 of the SDEIS Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report. The ratings analyze vividness, intactness, and unity and assign values of low, medium, or high. Exhibits 8 and 14 of that report define low, medium, and high. Each rating represents the integration of visual quality assessment information gathered from site visits, viewpoint evaluations, and study visualizations. These composite ratings reflect a viewer's likely experience in that the ratings consider the entire scene, viewer speed of movement, seasonal variation, and multiple viewpoints.

I-311-171

The information presented here is accurate and compares the options in a standard and measurable format. The visual quality analysis was conducted in accordance with FHWA's visual quality and aesthetics impacts assessment methodology and WSDOT's Environmental Procedures Manual, using the checklist provided in Exhibit 459-1 of the manual. The purpose of adhering to an approved and established methodology is to conduct an objective, unbiased evaluation. Please see

I-311-480	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 73	463	Walter Oelwein	Throughout the document, you discuss how the Option K version of the intersection at Pacific Street and Montlake Boulevard would be an LOS F, and that it has no hope for ever being better than this level. Given that you have two levels to work with here, I believe that you aren't considering other options that would drastically improve traffic flow in this area, and perhaps even preclude the need for a stoplight at all for those getting on the freeway (er, tollway). Here's what you do: The surface traffic (not getting on or off the freeway) stays at street level. The freeway traffic goes underground getting on the freeway. The people getting on the freeway going southbound would merge into the left lane, the people coming from Pacific street eastbound would merge into the center lane, and the people merging from northbound would merge into the right lane. Since they are going underground, there is no need for a stoplight for any of them. OK, for people getting off the bridge, here's the plan: They get to surface level coming off the freeway, since they are returning to surface streets. Those turning left should be relatively few, since many people would take the awesome offramp onto 24th Street. One lane for going straight onto Pacific street, and the two lanes to go north on Montlake Blvd. It would be a much slimmer intersection on the surface, with much less traffic, since the people getting on the freeway would be removed from the equasion. So before saying, "Oh, option K is too busy and makes things worse, you need to be more creative in your designs. You would still have a lid, but the traffic on it would be much more managable. The people getting on the freeway would have ony the SPUID interchange to deal with.	Specific design options not considered
I-311-481	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 74	464	Walter Oelwein	The Bill Dawson Trail is not indicated as a bike/pedestrian trail on this image. This is another error that indicates that Option K was not examined as thoroughly by the producers of this document.	Error
I-311-482	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 75	465	Walter Oelwein	"With Option K, traffic volumes in the overall SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange area would increase by 23 percent compared to the No Build Alternative because of the new capacity associated with the new interchange and crossing of the Montlake Cut." This is an entirely misleading statement. In the option A summary, you use the term "Improve" a lot, and here with Option K you state that it would "Increase". The implication is that "increase" sounds bad, while "improve" sounds good. In truth, Only option K can handle the increased traffic demand, while Option A replicates it and creates worse jams. This is not articulated fairly in this SDEIS, and makes Option A sound better than K, when it clearly is not.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-483	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 76	466	Walter Oelwein	"The pedestrian lid at the Montlake Boulevard/NE Pacific Street intersection would improve pedestrian travel (no signal delays) and traffic operations (more signal green time available)." This is the first time in the Option K discussion that the word "improve" is used, while in the parallel Option A discussion, it is used several times. For Option K, the only "improvement" cited by the SDEIS is pedestrians, when it is clear that there will be improvements for local traffic, and traffic getting on and off the freeway, but this is stated as "increases", which has a negative connotation compared to "improved." This discussion is filled with anti-Option K bias.	Error, Omits important info
I-311-484	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 76	467	Walter Oelwein	"As shown in Exhibits 6-1 and 6-2, some local streets would experience greater traffic increases than others, with the greatest increase on Montlake Boulevard north of NE Pacific Street." Here you highlight local streets having traffic increases, when this interchange is specifically designed to get the traffic off of the local streets, and onto an interchange away from the neighborhoods, unlike Option A. This statement is not supported and needs to be revised to better reflect the benefits of Option K.	Not supported, Error

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

the response to comment I-311-010 regarding the Visual Quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-172

The community input referred to on this page of the Visual Quality and Aesthetic Discipline Report is discussed in more detail on page 77 of that report. As stated on page 77, it included the Design Advisory Group, a standing committee of citizens. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues. That response also provides more information about the Design Advisory Group.

I-311-173

The visual quality analysis was conducted in accordance with FHWA's visual quality and aesthetics impacts assessment methodology and WSDOT's Environmental Procedures Manual, using the checklist provided in Exhibit 459-1 of the manual. The purpose of adhering to an approved and established methodology is to conduct an objective, unbiased evaluation. Please see the response to comment I-311-010 regarding the Visual Quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

Also see the responses to comments I-311-003 regarding the project's purpose and need, I-311-001 and I-311-007 regarding the range of alternatives considered for the project, and I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues.

I-311-485	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 76	468	Walter Oelwein	"However, because of roadway improvements associated with the project, Option K would not degrade operations at any intersections during the morning peak hour and one intersection (Montlake Boulevard/NE Pacific Street) during the afternoon peak hour (see Exhibits 6-3 and 6-4). Traffic operations for this intersection as well as other elements of this option are discussed below." Here, instead of saying "improve" as you repeatedly do in the option A discussion, you say, "would not degrade." This is clearly an effort to make Option K look less appealing compared to Option A.	Not supported, Error
I-311-486	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 76	469	Walter Oelwein	"The intersection of the SPUI ramps would operate acceptably at LOS B during both the morning and afternoon peak hours." This completely whitewashes the benefits of this exchange. In the Option A discussion, an "improvement" is cited compared to the "no build" to LOS E, but here, with much better LOS B at the corresponding exchange, it is merely "acceptable". This is actually a MAJOR improvement and should be cited as such, and the fact that this improvement is deminished, and uses the value negative term "acceptably" compared to the value-positive term "improved" indicates anti Option K bias.	Not supported, Error
I-311-487	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 76	470	Walter Oelwein	"At times, SR 520 freeway congestion on the Portage Bay Bridge would affect the westbound on-ramp, causing congestion to spill back into the street system surrounding the SR 520/SPUI. As discussed in Chapter 5, the freeway congestion is associated with Portage Bay Bridge traffic volumes and bridge design. Option K would not have an auxiliary lane on the Portage Bay Bridge, affecting the capacity of the merge point with the westbound on-ramp." This section is completely misleading and needs to be revised for this SDEIS to be correct. You are using terms like "spill back" with Option K, while this term is not used at all in the corresponding Option A discussion. Is there no Spill Back with Option A? Actually, Option a is pure spill back, because all of the back-ups are on the local surface streets, and not on the interchages. But this is not described as such. Option A is consistently compared to the "No Build" alternative, and Option K has discussion about "spill overs" and "traffic increases". This entire section is misleading about the benefits and effects of Option K, and needs to be revised to parallel the analysis provided for Option A.	Not supported, Error
I-311-488	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2		471	Walter Oelwein	"The eastbound off-ramp would also operate over capacity at times during the afternoon peak hour. Congestion would back up onto the SR 520 mainline, requiring exiting drivers to slow down before leaving the SR 520 mainline." This discussion is not provided for Option A. Are you saying that Option A does not have any back up on to the SR520 mainline? This is implausible, since a) you state that there will be backups to I-5 all the way from I-405. Second, there is a draw bridge that currently backsup up to the 520 mainline -- will this not happen with the two drawbridges?	Incorrect, error, omission
I-311-489	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 76	472	Walter Oelwein	"Because the SPUI is located farther away from the local street system, congestion associated with on-ramps would be relocated away from the Montlake neighborhood, improving access and mobility through this area, especially south of the Montlake Cut." Why is this the last statement associated with this Option, and not the first? You appear to be burying this feature and benefit from the reader. Additionally, this statement should be in the Executive Summary as it is an important distinction, and it is hidden from decision makers. Buried in the discipline report, and at the end of the section within the discipline report	Error, Incorrect info, Omission

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-174

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. A visualization from south of Portage Bay, looking northeast, is included in Exhibit 2-5 in the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report. Additionally, two new visualizations were created for Montlake Playfield and two for views from Boyer Avenue south of SR 520 for the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

I-311-175

Visualizations have been created for South Foster Island for the Final EIS visual quality analysis. See Exhibit 2-32 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report Addendum for a view looking northwest from south branch of Foster Island Trail toward SR 520 and 2-34 for a view looking northwest at south entrance of Foster Island pedestrian tunnel under SR 520.

I-311-176

Visualizations were not included for views from the south side of the Arboretum and Foster Island because most views of SR 520 are blocked or densely screened year-round by evergreen vegetation. Exhibit 2-21 in the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report illustrates a view from the wood pedestrian bridge between Marsh Island and the MOHAI parking lot.

In addition to the new viewpoints discussed in the response to comment I-311-175, two additional viewpoints were added from the Arboretum, south of SR 520. See Exhibits 2-37 and 2-38 in the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for these visualizations.

I-311-490	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 77	473	Walter Oelwein	"Drivers traveling through the traffic turnaround south of the SPUI would experience congested conditions during the afternoon peak hour because of high traffic volumes and lane changes approaching the turnaround (see Exhibit 6-21). The traffic turnaround roadway was designed for slow speeds (25 mph), which was an outcome of the mediation process. Given these conditions, both the southbound and northbound sections of the roadway would operate at low speeds with restricted maneuverability in the afternoon peak hour. Vehicles heading north through the traffic turnaround would see similar conditions in the morning peak hour." I find this analysis completely inadequate. First of all the traffic turnaround is not subjected to a stop light, like is found in Option A. Second, this is the first mention of the impact of lane changes. Lane changes at 25mph doesn't sound like such a difficult prospect, and will not likely cause additional backups. Third, what pertinence is the mediation process? Why cite this? Why not cite every other detail that is the result of the mediation process? By citing this, you make it sound like the mediation process has made this option worse, rather than better. This needs to be stricken for this SDEIS to be a fair assessment of environmental impact. Or, how about cite every element of Option A that the mediation process objected to? I could help you do that.	Error, Incorrect info, Omission
I-311-491	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 77	474	Walter Oelwein	"Under Option K, operations at this intersection would improve to LOS E from LOS F under the No Build Alternative. Traffic volumes would decrease as a result of the change in access to SR 520, which would shift traffic to the new tunnel." This appears to be faulty analysis. The improvement would seem to be significantly more than to LOS E, since you have an entirely new interchange to the east that is handling the freeway traffic, and that is at LOS B. So the local traffic gets the existing Montlake Interchange minus the Freeway traffic, which should be a much better improvement. For you to say otherwise needs to be justified or else it appears that you are trying to make Option K look worse than it actually is.	Incorrect, error, omission
I-311-492	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 77	475	Walter Oelwein	"By removing the connection to SR 520, northbound and southbound traffic operations would improve because the need to keep off-ramp traffic from backing onto the SR 520 mainline would no longer exist." This statement is buried in the analysis, and contracts the minor improvements (LOS F to E) that are stated just prior. This appears to be a major improvement, and needs to be cited as such, and in comparison to the "No Build" alternative, as you frequently do with Option A.	Incorrect, error, omission

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-177

Please see the responses to comments I-311-010, I-311-016, and I-311-150 regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge and views from East Shelby Street. Views from E Shelby Street in Roanoke were evaluated and it was determined that the second new bridge under Option A would not change the visual quality of the view.

Please see the responses to comments I-311-156 regarding NEPA requirements.

I-311-178

The purpose of the visual quality assessment is to disclose how the existing visual quality conditions would change due to the location, size, and character of the new facility. Disclosing effects allows stakeholders and decision-makers to identify how effects can be minimized or reduced through the design process, or mitigated as warranted. NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report. The “appropriateness” of the existing bridge and freeway is not part of the analysis. However, existing conditions are described in the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report.

Please see the response to comment I-311-010 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-179

Please see the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-493	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 78	476		"Under Option K, this intersection would operate acceptably at LOS D during the morning peak hour. During the afternoon peak hour, it would continue to operate at LOS F under Option K. With Option K, this intersection would serve as the primary access from the University District to SR 520, accommodating the majority of trips destined to SR 520. Traffic volumes would increase through this intersection, causing it to be 38 percent over capacity (compared to 26 percent over capacity with the No Build Alternative)." This is counterintuitive and needs to be justified. Here's why: With Option K, you are adding an extra spoke to a three-way intersection. The vast majority of the intersection is turning right off of 520 north to Montlake. It should be able to handle that traffic no problem. Second, there are two left-hand turn lanes onto 520 from Southbound 520, which would seem to handle lots of capacity, and there are two lanes straight from Eastbound Pacific, again more capacity that the intersection should be able to handle. The traffic trying to get on the freeway is separated from the traffic trying to stay local, and they each get their requisite number of lanes, compared to Option A which combines and funnels them across Montlake, through three more lights. Finally, with the additional SPUI interchange, this provides extra capacity. Why the Pacific Street/Montlake Blvd exchange is so bad isn't really explained in the SDEIS, and creates suspicion as to what the actual analysis says. In order for this SDEIS to be complete, it needs better study about the impact of the tunnel on the intersection.	Incorrect, error, omission
I-311-494	Tranportation Discipline Report part 2	Section 78	477	Walter Oelwein	"Congestion would increase under Option K compared to the No Build Alternative. The increased congestion would affect adjacent intersection operations to the north, south, and west." This is a value-laden statement that is not supported, especially compared to the repeated statements that Option A "improves conditions" while with Option K, "Congestion would increase." With the extra capacity, the specific intersection design, the avoidance of the draw bridge, the separation of freeway traffic from local traffic, this statement seems completely unjustified, and I haven't been able to find real analysis that supports it.	Not supported, Error
I-311-495	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section1	478	Walter Oelwein	"Public comments on the project have emphasized the benefits of these features to residents in the project vicinity." Why do you need public comments to make this point? Did you not know this already? Also, why don't you mention all of the other public comments that could help provide background. Perhaps in the next draft of the SDEIS, you can mention, "Public comments show that our analysis of Option A was entirely biased in its favor, and our analysis of Option K was completely biased against it."	Omission
I-311-496	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 5	479	Walter Oelwein	"All three options include a lid that would be constructed over SR 520 between 10th Avenue East and Delmar Drive East." By stating this, you mean to say that if these lids are not built, then the SDEIS is entirely incorrect, and the project did not go through the proper regulatory review. Right?	Omission

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-180

Please see the responses to comments I-311-016 and I-311-150 regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge.

I-311-181

NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report, and existing conditions are considered in all analyses.

I-311-182

Comment noted. The requested change was not made because it does not affect the analysis or findings of the EIS.

I-311-183

Please see the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-184

Comment noted. The requested change was not made because the original statement is accurate and altering the language would not affect the findings or analysis of the EIS.

I-311-185

See the response to comment I-311-174 regarding visual quality in the area south of Portage Bay.

I-311-497	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 5	480	Walter Oelwein	"Several design enhancements were added to Option A during the mediation process." I have a problem with this statement in that it implies that design enhancements were not provided prior to the mediation process. This indicates that WashDOT did not actually do designs, but simply put down greater-sized roads, and then did mediation/mitigation. This reveals a flaw in the the process, and calls into question the entire project. What should have happened was to identify the project needs (including enhancements to the local environment and neighborhoods), and come up with a great design using top talent. Then you wouldn't need mediation, because the designer actually meets the desgin needs. Instead, you used mediation as a proxy for design, and you come up with a three-headed mess with no consensus, forcing you to write a SDEIS covering three options. If you had applied design thinking from the start, used actual urban planning and proposed something that would appeal to the various stakeholders, you wouldn't be in this mess.	Omission
I-311-498	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 6	481	Walter Oelwein	"A new grade-separated pedestrian crossing over the lowered intersection would allow pedestrians to have free movement without traffic conflict." This is not mentioned in the Executive Summary, and would seem to be an important detail, especially in comparison to the monstrocity of intersections provided by Option A.	Omission
I-311-499	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 6	482	Walter Oelwein	"This design would allow movement between potentially expanded bus zones, the light rail station, and the University of Washington (UW) Medical Center without changing grades. The lid in this option would provide pedestrian connections over NE Pacific Street and Montlake Boulevard NE." This is not visually depicted in the exhibits found in part 2 of the SDEIS. This needs to be corrected in order for people to understand the environmental impact of the various Options.	Error, Omission
I-311-500	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 6	483	Walter Oelwein	"The lid design and layout would be confirmed through continued coordination with the University of Washington, the City of Seattle, and neighborhoods." This is a highly sketchy comment. You should have a proposed design on the table so we don't have to rely on the "trust us" component. This indicates to me that this SDEIS was released too early, and should only have been released after a proposed design has been developed. In addition -- why is it that the street intersections are all perfectly laid out in the SDEIS, but the pedestrian ones are still being worked out? This seems to be a bias in favor of the automobile aspect of this project, and not the pedestrian/bicycle aspect of the project.	Error, Omission
I-311-501	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 6	484	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would reduce a substantial amount of vehicle traffic south of the Montlake Cut from Montlake Boulevard. This traffic reduction would improve the experience of cyclists and pedestrians using that roadway to travel between areas south of SR 520." This comment is not made in chapter 6. All I read was that Option K would increase vehicle traffic, and intersections would be clogged. This calls into question all of the analysis provided in chapter 6, and needs to be revised to reflect this suddenly, in chapter 7, improved view of Option K	Error, Omission
I-311-502	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 6	485	Walter Oelwein	"This design feature would reduce the potential for pedestrian and bicycle conflicts with motorized vehicles." This is mentioned as a benefit for pedestrians and bicyclists, but not as a mention as a benefit for vehicles in chapter 6. This needs to be noted in chapter 6, that Option K reduces the chance of conflicts with vehicles, which in turn implies that it would help vehicular traffic. Instead, all we hear about in chapter 6 is that Option K is increased in congestion, but not here.	Error, Omission

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-186

This section of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report describes the current visual character of the study area. The comment's claim that the Portage Bay Bridge is not mentioned is inaccurate. The same page as the quoted text regarding the yacht club, page 33, contains the following statement: "The bridge dominates the views southward from the community areas and interrupts views northward from south Portage Bay." Noise is discussed in Section 5.7 of the SDEIS and the Noise Discipline Report.

Please see the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-187

The comment's characterization of Option K's visual effect is inaccurate. Please see the response to comment I-311-153 regarding the visual quality effects of Option K compared to Option A. Additionally, see the responses to comments I-311-016 and I-311-150 regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge.

I-311-188

Comment noted. The requested change was not made because it does not affect the findings or analysis of the EIS.

I-311-189

Please see the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-503	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 7	486	Walter Oelwein	"Options A, K, and L each has a land bridge suboption at Foster Island to increase/maintain connectivity of regional trails to the Washington Park Arboretum." This appears to be an error. Option A (and L I belive) are repeated stated elsewhere, such as the Executive Summary, as not having an optoinal land bridge over Foster Island. This is made clear repeatedly, but here suddently Option A has an optional land bridge. Not only that, the other sections repeatedly denegrate Option K for the costs, visual impact, stormwater impact, etc. of the Foster Island land bridge, while saying that Option A avoid these terrible enviornmental impacts. However,when you get to the part of the pedestrian benefits, where landbridges are suddently desirable, you now say that Option A could have this. This is a serious error, and appears to be intentional, as it makes Option A look better to readers interested in the positive pedestrian impacts of the project. Instead, you need to articulate here: Option A cuts through Foster Island and does not have a land bridge that will make the pedestrian experience better. In fact, Option A takes more land away from Foster Island, making the pedestrian experience worse.	Error, Omission
I-311-504	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 11	487	Walter Oelwein	I expected to see a discussion on pedestrians on Boyer Ave and Delmar/Lynn. These are common pedestrian and bicycle thoroughfares, and with a 520 bike path, would probably increase. There is no discussion about the quality of these bicycle paths, when there should, since it is part of the same immediate network	Error, Omission
I-311-505	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 14	488	Walter Oelwein	"Sidewalks are provided throughout the SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke Street interchange area. Boylston Avenue East, Harvard Avenue East, and East Roanoke Street have sidewalks on only one side of the street where they are adjacent to I-5, except in areas that provide access to bus stops. There are currently no marked pedestrian crossings on the north or west legs of the East Roanoke\Harvard Avenue East intersection, or the north or east legs of the Roanoke\Boylston Avenue East intersection." It should be noted that it is an extremely inhospitable experience for bicyclists and pedestrians, as this intersection is over-run with cars (as other analysese show), have narrow sidewalks, and massive freeway noise. Not a good pedestrian experience, and it really discourages walkers.	Error, Omission
I-311-506	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 17	489	Walter Oelwein	"Two of the primary considerations when designing a bicycle/pedestrian path are personal safety and comfort on the path." In this case, you need to include the path on Delmar Dr./E. Lynn St. This is a bicycle/pedestrian corridor that feeds the 520 project area, with terrible design that provides neither safety nor comfort. Cars frequently crash into the guardrail, and provide peril for bicyclists and pedestrians alike. The 520 project, if it is interested in "designing safety and comfort", should include this stretch of road, connected to lids, so that the design is good in the entire project area.	Error, Omission
I-311-507	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 17	490	Walter Oelwein	""the ability to walk and ride bicycles around the neighborhood to parks, community facilities, and commercial areas is important. Safety should be addressed and walkways and trails enhanced." Again, Delmar Dr./E. Lynn St. should be in the study area, because it is an important bicycle connection corridor that is not safe and probably does not comply to the standards articulated on this same page.	Error, Omission

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-190

The freeway and bridge structure in the West Approach is discussed in the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report in the paragraphs on pages 36 and 37; immediately following the text quoted in the comment.

I-311-191

The comment's characterization of the consistency of the visual quality analysis is inaccurate. As mentioned in the responses to comment I-311-186 and I-311-190, bridge and freeway elements are discussed throughout the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report.

I-311-192

The requested change was not made because it does not affect the findings or analysis of the EIS. Please see the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the Visual Quality assessment included in the SDEIS.

I-311-193

Comment noted. The requested change was not made because it does not affect the findings or analysis of the EIS.

I-311-194

Although not specifically from Shelby Street, views and vistas from the Roanoke area are noted in the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report on page 42, second paragraph.

Please see the response to comment I-311-010 regarding views from East Shelby Street. Views from East Shelby Street in Roanoke were evaluated and it was determined that the second bascule bridge under Option A would not change the visual quality of the view and that the Option L bascule bridge would change the view slightly. Also see the

I-311-508	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 17	491	Walter Oelwein	"After hearing public concerns about the existing nonmotorized network, the state has worked to proactively address concerns for newly constructed nonmotorized facilities and thereby achieve maximum benefit as part of a planned interconnected system." Again, why is it that only AFTER hearing public concerns do you take action? Wasn't this an obvious public concern to begin with? This statement implies that the design process was not intending to meet the needs of non-vehicular traffic, and only after the public vociferously requests this do you take action. This statement implies that WashDOT did not even consider bicycle and pedestrian impacts in this project, which calls into question the design methodology for all aspects of the project. WashDOT appears to have expanded the roadway, and then asked at public hearings that this is what they are going to do. This was not effective at garnering support, and has been an abject failure, causing lots of re-work with the mediation and multiple options. Incorporate some design thinking from the start, and you can get your project built faster.	Error, Omission
I-311-509	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 18	492	Walter Oelwein	"After the DEIS was published, Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 6099 was passed, directing the state to hire a mediator to facilitate an agreement among stakeholders on the bridge design." This shows the mistake behind the project. Why did you engage in mediation AFTER the DEIS? Why didn't you engage with the stakeholders PRIOR to the DEIS, hire a proper design firm, and come up with designs that actually meet the needs, values and ideals of the project stakeholders. Instead it's been a series of difficult, contentious negotiations, and even when you get designs that people like (like Option K), you still go against it, and push the original, non-mediated option. The project needs to start over with proper design thinking, and when this happens, you will be able to get it built.	Error, Omission
I-311-510	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 18	493	Walter Oelwein	"Other than the main bicycle/pedestrian path along the floating bridge itself, all proposed nonmotorized connections in the Draft EIS have been altered as a result of the mediation discussions." I find it interesting that in the SDEIS you are advertising the suggestions from stakeholders when it comes to bicycle/pedestrian facilities, but there is very limited commentary regarding the roads/intersections etc., where the mediation process also netted big changes. I believe that you want to de-emphasize that Option K is the preferred option by the stakeholders, and in areas of lesser controversy -- such as improved bike paths, you speak freely about the results of mitigation. I belive that your backwards thinking has hurt the project, and it is reflected throughout this SDEIS.	Error, Omission
I-311-511	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 20	494	Walter Oelwein	"All of the design options would meet the project goals of providing trransportation and livability benefits to the affected neighborhoods and to the region as a whole." This is an incorrect statement. Option A creates bigger sprawl, creates worse visual impact, doubles back-ups with two bascule bridges, and that interchange at Montlake/520 is a mess. This should be revised to say, "Only Option K has the support of the local residents as meeting the project goals. . ."	Error, Misleading
I-311-512	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 20	495	Walter Oelwein	"Options A, K, and L include an optional land bridge at Foster Island that provides additional connections from the SR 520 bridge to the existing Arboretum trails." Again, this is patently incorrect, as elsewhere in the document it is explicitly stated that only option K has a landbridge. And additionally, Option K is repeatedly made to sound worse because of claimed negative impacts of the bridge (which I object to). But when it is in the "improvements" section, suddenly Option A gets in on the action, and can claim to have this feature when it sound good for pedestrians, park users, and bicyclists.	Error, Misleading

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

responses to comments I-311-016 and I-311-150 for additional information regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge.

I-311-195

Transportation effects are not explicitly part of the visual quality analysis. Please see the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS.
The transportation effects of Options A, K, and L are included in the Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). Please see the response to comment I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A and the Preferred Alternative. Updated transportation information is included in the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

I-311-196

The Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report discussed the existing visual quality at Foster Island including the existing bridge and freeway elements. Please see the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS.

I-311-197

The requested change was not made because it would not change the analysis or findings. Please see the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS.

I-311-198

NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report and existing conditions are

I-311-513	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 20	496	Walter Oelwein	"While all of the design options meet the basic project goals, they contain slight differences in their effects on nonmotorized transportation." Again, only Option K has the support of the local residents, so it is impossible to claim that the goals are met with Options A and L. This should be stated, "Only option K meets the goals of the people most affected by the project."	Error, Misleading
I-311-514	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Overall	497	Walter Oelwein	I find it disturbing that there is no discussion of the to-from destinations of pedestrians. And what the pedestrian patterns there will be with the Sound Transit Sation. This seems glossed over.	Omission
I-311-515	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 21	498	Walter Oelwein	"As described below, the ease of nonmotorized travel from place to place will be most improved to the east and southwest through Option A." This statement is incorrect and unsubstantiated. Option A has the worst traffic interchanges for pedestrians and bicyclists.	Error, Unsupported
I-311-516	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 21	499	Walter Oelwein	"Option A offers the most direct access on paths from the SR 520 bridge to Lake Washington Boulevard, the Arboretum, and the Bill Dawson Trail." The "lid" over 520 at Montlake/24th cannot be characterized as such, because it is a monstrous intersction, and is extremely non-pedestrian and bicycle friendly. Option K significantly reduces the traffic at this intersection, keeps it at a reasonable size, and is thus more hospitible. I cannot abide by this assertion that Option A is "most direct." The exhibits provided don't make this clear how this could possibly be true. This section needs to be revised for it to be correct.	Error, Unsupported
I-311-517	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 23	500	Walter Oelwein	"In Seattle, an HOV lane is located along short sections of NE Pacific Street (eastbound only) and Montlake Boulevard (southbound only) leading to the Montlake Bridge." This appears to be an errror. There is no HOV lane on Montlake Boulevard, unless you count that merge lane just before the bridge? Or are you talking about the onramp to Eastbound 520? This section is incorrect, whatever it is trying to say.	Error
I-311-518	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 31	501	Walter Oelwein	"This high variability means that travelers needing to keep a regular schedule must plan for the worst conditions and expect a relatively long travel time." As is a common theme with this SDEIS, there is no or limited discussion impact on having draw bridge in the local area, and only discusses peak times, but not non-peak times, when the draw bridge opens. This should be a discussion point in any EIS, since it is a part of the environment. Major sections of this need to be rewritten for it to be correct.	Omission
I-311-519	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 35	502	Walter Oelwein	"The No Build Alternative was assumed to be untolled for all vehicles." Again, this is a faulty assumption that can wildly skew the impact analyses of the project. There will be tolling on the no-build option. This SDEIS needs to be re-written with this assumption, or else it is filled with errors wherever the no-build option, an comparisons to other options occurs.	Error
I-311-520	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 35	503	Walter Oelwein	"For the SDEIS transportation analysis, it was assumed that this general service structure would continue into the future, but with improved service frequencies and additional bus routes during peak and off-peak periods." It's not clear how you can make this assumption, since there is no freeway station, frequency of service for anyone boarding or alighting in the Montlake area is limited to U-District busses. This cuts down the number of accessible busses significantly.	Error or Incorrect
I-311-521	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 40	504	Walter Oelwein	"When the update to the transportation analysis for the SDEIS began in 2006, the ST2 Plan had not yet been approved by voters and was unfunded." Perhaps you should mention that the SR520 project is not fully funded either?	Error or Incorrect

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

considered in all analyses. The “appropriateness” of the existing bridge and freeway is not part of the analysis. Please see the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS.

I-311-199

NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report and existing conditions are considered in all analyses. The “appropriateness” of the existing bridge and freeway is not part of the analysis. Please see the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-200

The purpose of the visual quality assessment is to disclose how the existing visual quality conditions will change due to the location, size, and character of the new facility. See the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-201

Visual effects due to the presence of a new bascule bridge were determined to be minor from viewpoints in Portage Bay. Please see the responses to comments I-311-016 and I-311-150 regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge.

I-311-522	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 40	505	Walter Oelwein	"Inside HOV lanes (3+) in both directions across the SR 520 bridge to I-5" Why is it assumed that it is 3+ HOV? The only 3+ lanes are ones where it is litterally too narrow for 2+ level traffic (Westbound 520). Everywhere else it is 2+. I can't imagine that 3+ would be the default set-up. Your analyses need to include 2+, because this is a very likely scenario.	Error or Incorrect, specific options not examined
I-311-523	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 40	506	Walter Oelwein	"In addition to the HOV facilities listed above, Option A would include a westbound transit-only direct access off-ramp to northbound Montlake Boulevard." In looking at this, it seems to add to the width of 520 unnecessarily, and doesn't seem to serve much purpose. I haven't seen an analysis that states why Option A should have a special HOV off-ramp. Why couldn't busses take the non-HOV off-ramp? Also, where that bus-stop dump people off is into a very inhospitible location forcing the disembarkers to cross three lanes of off-ramp traffic. Yuck!	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-524	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 41	507	Walter Oelwein	""In addition to the HOV facilities listed above, Option A would include a westbound transit-only direct access off-ramp to northbound Montlake Boulevard." It is not stated whether busses would then get back on to 520 westbound, or just keep going north across the drawbridge, and into the U-District. If it is "get back on the freeway", then this is less desirable than the no-build option, since a) pedestrians have to cross three lanes of traffic to go northbound, and b) the bus then has to wait at the intersection to get back on the on-ramp. This is not discussed or described in the SDEIS, making it incomplete.	Incorrect or incomplete
I-311-525	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 43	508	Walter Oelwein	"Based on discussions with Montlake area residents and the 2008 mediation process, it was decided that the Montlake Freeway Transit Station would not be rebuilt so the footprint of SR 520 through the Montlake neighborhood could be narrowed." I find it interesting that you cite the narrowing of the bridge in this one instance, yet you do not mention all of the times when you ignored the imput of the local residents. For this document to be correct and consistent, you need to include all of the times you specifically ignored the local residents requests, and made the impact worse, of which there are plenty of examples. By repeatedly citing the one time you did narrow the footprint of the project in relation to local residents' requests, you create the impression that this is the only request of the local residents, and all of the objections to the project don't exist. Secondly, because you are taking away a popular and important transit stop by meeting this request, you effectively blame the local residents' request and make them the "bad guys" for the project, when it was your systemic lack of design thinking that caused the problem in the first place, forcing the residents to fight for slightly improved design, and then resulting in comprimised design that takes away the one thing that is working about the existing design. This is why there is opposition to this project -- you do not meet the local residents' requests, and when you do, you repeatedly blame them for the failures of the design. For this document to be correct, you need to do the reverse -- blame WashDOT for all of the failures of the design to improve the local area, to create more pollution, to improve visual impact, to reduce noise, and to make the intersections work better. Something like, "Because of WashDOT's failure to incorporate design thinking and priciples that meet the stakeholders, the Roanoke Park/Harvard intersection remains at LOS F." This would need to be repeated throughout the document. On this example, the same could be said, "WashDOT has no ideas for making this freeway station integrate with the other bus transit options, so we are blaming the local residents for the failure to continue to have a local freeway stop." Any aspect of inadequacy of the project needs attribution, and since WashDOT is the "project leader", then you need to make this explicit. Don't blame the local residents for faults with the project.	Misleading and incorrect.

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-202

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document and is purposefully brief. The same level of detail is not required to be repeated in multiple sections.

Since the SDEIS was published, Sound Transit has removed the specimen conifers located in the University of Washington Open Space (just south of Husky parking lot) for construction of the University Link light rail station. Effects to the University of Washington Open Space with the Preferred Alternative are discussed in Section 6.5 of the Final EIS and the Recreation Discipline Report Addendum.

I-311-203

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document and is purposefully brief. The summary discusses the overall effects of the options, while the cited text is discussing effects specific to the Montlake Bridge and NOAA. While Option K has less of an effect on these elements specifically, Option still would have substantial effects on other areas. Please see the response to comment I-311-153 regarding the visual quality analysis.

I-311-204

Comment noted. The requested change was not made because the referenced statement is accurate.

I-311-205

Please see the response to comment I-311-153 regarding the visual quality analysis. Excavation of the Montlake Cut is just one part of the construction of Option K. As the quoted text explains, freezing operation and mining machinery would be visible during construction. The construction of Option K would also include barges, boring equipment, hauling of excavation materials, and removal of vegetation near the

I-311-526	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 44	509	Walter Oelwein	"With Option A, a westbound transit stop would be located at the termination of the westbound transit-only direct access ramp on the Montlake overpass, allowing people to make connections in the Montlake area." I have not seen justificatin for why this direct access ramp is necessary. It appears to be something that WashDOT has thrown in to Option A to make it appear more "transit friendly", when it in essence dumps people off into a huge, unwieldy intersection. The extra expense and location of the ramp is not justified.	Not supported. Design options not considered
I-311-527	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 44	510	Walter Oelwein	"With Options K or L, the first Seattle transit stop for SR 520 bus service would be at the Montlake Triangle. This would mean some out-of-direction travel for people destined for areas south of the Montlake Cut." Why don't you also say, "But bus service that connects right to Sound Transit, without having to wait for bridge openings, and three stop lights as the bus sloggs through the Montlake neighborhood."? You consistently de-emphasize the positives about Option K and emphasize the positives about Option A (when they aren't even positives).	Misleading and incorrect. Omission.
I-311-528	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 45	511	Walter Oelwein	"This would add approximately 1 to 3 minutes1 of travel time for people originating from areas south of the Montlake Cut by bus, or approximately 10 to 15 minutes 2 for those who walk." Only when discussing Options K and L do you mention the additional walk time, but with Option A, you say nothing. It appears to be the same, since you would have to get to the Montlake Triangle for each of the Options. This is misleading and makes it look like Option A is the status quo and Options Ka and L are worse.	Misleading and incorrect. Omission.
I-311-529	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 45	512	Walter Oelwein	"Under all options, some passengers would transfer at the Evergreen Point Freeway Transit Station to reach their final destinations." This seems to be a massive design failure. You basically are saying that when people didn't have to transfer in the U-District, they now do have to transfer at Evergreen point. So you have just spent 4.5 Billion dollars on making public tranportation users add a transfer and wait more. Similar to the blame you place on "requests by the Montlake residents" to eliminate the freeway station, why don't you blame the failures on your part to identify how to keep similar transporation hubs? How about, "Due to our design failures, some passengers would transfer at Evergreen Point Freeway Transit Station."	Misleading and incorrect. Omission.
I-311-530	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 46	513	Walter Oelwein	"Eastbound transit riders in the Montlake and University District that want to cross the SR 520 bridge would have fewer routes to choose from with the removal of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station." This is an especially embarrassing statement for WashDOT, because with Sound Transit, you are precisely going to get more people expecting to transfer at Montlake to the eastside, more so than now. This is something that shows the shortcomings of your design, and needs to be fixed prior to attempting to construct the west side interchange.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-531	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 46	514	Walter Oelwein	"Once preferred design options are selected, more detailed transit planning and intersection design will be conducted in coordination with transit agencies to determine whether existing bus stops would need to be replaced, relocated, or removed." The fact that this is in the Option K and L analysis shows that less thought has gone into considering Option K and its impact. In order for this SDEIS to be complete, you need to say this about Option A as well, or better yet, you should actually solve these on paper before spending billions of dollars, and then try to solve the problem.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

shoreline. Along with the longer construction period, the visual quality effects of these construction activities would be more intense than Option A.

I-311-206

The purpose of the visual quality assessment is to disclose how the existing visual quality conditions will change due to the location, size, and character of the new facility. See the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-207

Comment noted. The requested change was not made because the statement is accurate and the change to the language would not affect the findings or analysis of the EIS.

I-311-208

Please see the response to comment I-311-010 regarding views from East Shelby Street. Views from East Shelby Street in Roanoke were evaluated and it was determined that the second bascule bridge under Option A would not change the visual quality of the view and that the Option L bascule bridge would change the view slightly. Also see the responses to comments I-311-016 and I-311-150 for additional information regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge.

I-311-209

This section of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report discusses construction effects. The width of the bridge with Option A in the West Approach is discussed on page 70 of the report, under the discussion of operational effects. Please see the response to comment I-311-012 for additional information regarding effects on Foster Island.

I-311-532	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 48	515	Walter Oelwein	"Expand the transit network to include the ultimate development of an SR 520 high capacity transit system, which may include exclusive, dedicated transit facilities in the corridor" This statement does not seem to make sense when reviewing the rest of the document. In the previous section, you claim that the freeway is too narrow to even have a freeway bus stop. Yet you now say that "high capacity transit" may be included in the coordidor? How are you going to pull this off? Where are you going to put it? A more accurate claim would be, "We have put no thought and have no ideas for how to add high transit capability in the cooridor." This would give a better understanding of the potential of this project, and where it stands.	Error, Misleading, Omission
I-311-533	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 50	516	Walter Oelwein	"Freeway Traffic – Afternoon Peak Period No Build Alternative" These sections are misleading, since there is not the assumption of tolling on the no-build alternative. This makes the entire project seem more necessary than it is. If you include tolling on the "no build", you could then manage traffic better and increase HOV traffic even without HOV lanes. Then you could concentrate on just fixing the structural problems, rather than try to expand the bridge.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered
I-311-534	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 52	517	Walter Oelwein	"However, when I-405 congestion is at its worst, westbound SR 520 general-purpose travel times would be the same as the No Build Alternative because the project is generally not adding general-purpose capacity." This appears to be an example of unsystemic thinking. If I-405 traffic gets worse, wouldn't tolling be instituted? Wouldn't transit be increased? Could it be that by 2030, Bellevue will have a "no car" policy like London? Just because they aren't adding general purpose lanes doesn't mean you can't get people there. I find your analyses of the 405 situation to be incredibly simplistic, and focused only on more cars, and not more and better transportation systems that integrate with the built and non-built environment. It is as though you are making a statement of value that more general purpose lanes will solve problems. It won't.	Specific design alternatives that would reduce impacts but were not considered; Misleading
I-311-535	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 52	518	Walter Oelwein	"The eastbound HOV lane allows HOVs to bypass the queue, reducing congestion in the eastbound general-purpose lanes." "Eastbound HOV travel times would be reduced by nearly 40 minutes with the 6-Lane Alternative options because the HOV lane between I-5 and Medina would be completed" This analysis is suspect, since there is no evidence that there will be a queue by today's traffic patterns. There is never a back-up to 405 from eastbound 520. Secondly, where there are HOV lanes on eastbound 520, they are never necessary to use, as it is rarely backed up where those HOV lanes are located. That project was a waste. So your claims of "nearly 40 minutes" is suspect, since this does not seem to be the main problem with the corridor, but you are advertising it as such.	Misleading, Error
I-311-536	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 52	519	Walter Oelwein	"Local Arterial Traffic" Again, only focus on peak times, when the main difference between the options is the improved non-peak times of Option K.	Misleading, Omission
I-311-537	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 52	520	Walter Oelwein	"Local arterial traffic operations along Montlake Boulevard NE and NE Pacific Street would improve with all options compared to the No Build Alternative, except for Montlake Boulevard northbound approaching NE Pacific Street under Options K and L." Another example of anti-Option K bias, when it is not clear how Option A is so great at funneling traffic and Option K is so poor that you can make this kind of evaluative statement, especially since Option K has some cars that bypass the Montlake bridge and reduced the total number of stoplights.	Misleading, Error

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-210

Please see the response to comment I-311-164 regarding the aesthetic effects of noise walls. Also note that noise reduction strategies included with 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 (see Section 5.7 of the Final EIS). Please see the response to comment C-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-211

The comment is incorrect. As discussed in Chapter 2 of the SDEIS, the new reversible HOV ramp would connect the SR 520 center HOV lanes with the I-5 reversible express lanes south of SR 520 and is included in all of the SDEIS options.

I-311-212

The purpose of the visual quality assessment is to disclose how the existing visual quality conditions would change due to the location, size, and character of the new facility. See the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-213

Please see the response to comment I-311-010 regarding views from East Shelby Street. Views from East Shelby Street in Roanoke were evaluated and it was determined that the second bascule bridge under Option A would not change the visual quality of the view and that the Option L bascule bridge would change the visual quality slightly. Also

I-311-538	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 53	521	Walter Oelwein	"Option K would result in the most reliable travel times for SR 520 buses because they would not be affected by bridge openings." This directly contradicts the first sentence in the section, which specifically outlines Option K as being worse. This is inconsitent, and it appears this information stating that Option K is more recent, and it is the first citation that I could find that states the advantage of no bridge openings. This calls into question the rest of the analyses throughout the SDEIS, which clearly has not considered this. The SDEIS is contradictory, incomplete and error prone.	Error, Omission
I-311-539	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 53	522	Walter Oelwein	"Northbound congestion would improve the most with Option A or its suboption because the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection does not introduce additional corridor congestion. Options K and L would have longer travel times because of increased congestion approaching the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection." This is a claim that is repeatedly made in the SDEIS, but is not supported. How, exactly, does Option A not introduce more cooridor congestion? All three options provide addtional lanes to funnel traffic, and all three options have the same amount of demand through Montlake/Pacific street. The best I can understand is that Option K does too well at getting people on the 520, so more people will use it, causing more cooridor congestion? This analysis does not make sense, yet it is a cornerstone of your argument that Option A is better. This is clearly misleading and incorrect	Misleading, Error
I-311-540	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 54-56	523	Walter Oelwein	Option A commentary: "would improve", "adds capacity" "would benefit" "would improve", "congestion and delays would decrease, improving transit travel times" "would improve even more" "would improve" "would remove a bottleneck" "continue to benefit transit" "but with less congestion" "travel times would be better" "avoid signal delay" "enter directly" "reducing delay" Option K commentary: "would allow buses to bypass general purpose traffic congestion" "would benefit" "would be able to bypass the Montlake Bridge" "Delay. . .would worsen" "increased congestion" "over capacity" "back up and block" "delaying" "would improve""travel times would be affected" "no longer be able to bypass" "would improve substantially""would improve""would improve" In looking at the comparative analysis, rhetorically, there is a clear bias toward Option A. "Would improve" is used consistently, while in Option K, while there is some "would improve", there is frequent citation of worsening of events. This section still does not explain why the Pacific Street intersection is SO BAD with Option K, since the same amount of traffic has to go through that same spot with Option A. I can see why the Legislative Work Group was snowballed into recommending Option A.	Misleading, Error
I-311-541	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 63	524	Walter Oelwein	"Option A has a much wider footprint and would extend SR 520 approximately 120 feet north of its current location." This needs to be stated elsewhere in the SDEIS for it to be a fair assessment of the impact of Option A. Only here is it really obvious that the wider footprint has an impact. Otherwise, it is implied that Option A is the same as the others, which clearly isn't the case.	Misleading, Omission
I-311-542	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 64	525	Walter Oelwein	"However, Options K and L both propose to extend West Montlake Place East to the intersection of Montlake Place East and East Lake Washington Boulevard." This isn't mentioned really much elsewhere, but this seems to really improve the design of the Montake Blvd exchange -- rather than have two intersections near the Hop-in, you have one. This aspect of the design isn't articulated much -- and its benefits -- elsewhere in the document. Only when it shows the negative aspects of the design (loss in parking), is it highlighted. This indicates to me Anti-Option K bias.	Misleading, Omission

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

see the responses to comments I-311-016 and I-311-150 for additional information regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge.

I-311-214

The use of the word “design” is and consistent with generally accepted usage for transportation and roadway projects. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues. The purpose of the visual quality assessment is to disclose how the existing visual quality conditions would change due to the location, size, and character of the new facility. See the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS.

I-311-215

Page 62 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report notes that “The east end of the new bridge … would be farther north, which could have a moderately positive effect for Montlake Playfield views. A wider west end of the bridge would affect views from the homes next to the bridge on the north side, making the bridge more dominant in eastward views.”

The stormwater system would be designed as an integrated part of the bridge structure at a later stage of design. WSDOT would minimize the visual intrusiveness of exposed pipes and basins wherever feasible.

Visual effects of noise walls are discussed on pages 3, 63, and 68 through 72; and measures for reducing these effects are discussed in the Mitigation section of this report starting on page 77. Please see the response to comment I-311-164 regarding the aesthetic effects of noise walls. Also note that, noise reduction measures included with 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

I-311-543	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 64	526	Walter Oelwein	"However, Option A would eliminate the gas station, its entire parking lot, and thus all five parking spaces. It should be noted, though, that because the gas station itself would be removed, the associated demand to park in this lot would also be eliminated. Therefore, there would be no effect on the community by removing the lot itself." This seems to be making an rhetorical argument in favor of Option A, and the argument isn't necessarily true. First, you shouldn't be making rhetorical arguments in favor of one option over another -- you specifically call out how this loss of a gas station and parking has "no effect", when clearly this is not true-- losing a gas station and its parking obviously has an effect. Now -- you also gloss over what is there if there is no gas station. In Option A's case, there is an expanded off ramp. This is not "no effect" - it is a larger road and interchange and no local gas station (and parking). To specifically call out that this has "no effect" is incorrect. Similarly, with option K, with its loss of parking on W. Montlake Place, you make no rhetorical argument such, well since the gas station stays, then I guess it's the same amount of parking that is lost with K and A.	
I-311-544	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 64	527	Walter Oelwein	"Option A would not affect these six spaces. However, Options K and L both propose to extend West Montlake Place East to the intersection of Montlake Place East and East Lake Washington Boulevard." This analysis is incomplete and error prone. With Option K, you have W. Montlake Place extending to the north side of the (preserved) gas station. That means that there is very limited traffic on the once highly busy E. Roanoke Street in comparison to before. Would it stand to reason that you could ADD parking up and down both sides of that street? There won't be a 25 bus stop there any more (that's now on Montlake Place E.), and I'm sure that the Hop-in would reconfigure the entrance to their back-parking lot to the north side, leaving more parking. On the Eastbound part of Montlake Place East it is two lanes (to handle the traffic, remember?), well now that's diverted to a brand new road (W. Montlake Place), so that means that the right lane on Montlake Place East would be used for on street parking. I estimate that this would add about 15 parking spaces. I find it curious that in the one place where Option K actually makes parking better, you make it sound like Option K is worse.	Incomplete, Error, Specific design options not considered.
I-311-545	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 69	528	Walter Oelwein	"However, Option K would eliminate the entire parking lot to provide a new access between Lake Washington Boulevard and SR 520. This lot appears to be highly utilized as an access to area trails and parks." You fail to mention that this space will also create new parkland, and you don't do much research to identify how this lot can be replaced, as you do in the areas where Option A removes parking. For Option A, it's, "We can find parking elsewhere." and Option K it's, "Parking is lost, sorry. "	Incomplete, Error, Specific design options not considered.
I-311-546	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 74	529	Walter Oelwein	"West Approach (north half - 4 lanes, includes work in Union Bay) 30 months 54 months (Includes Foster Island lid) 30 months" In the Pedestrian Section, you explicitly say that the Foster Island bridge is for each option. But here, it is only associated with Option K. This make Option K look worse than the other options. So which is it?	Error
I-311-547	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 78	530	Walter Oelwein	"All Options: Delmar Drive E closed. Traffic would detour to Boyer Ave E or 10th Ave E." This is a really bad idea, and you need to suggest alternatives to sending people down 11th Ave (a.k.a. "Devils Dip"). It is extremely steep, narrow, and cannot handle that kind of capacity. It is also an omission, since this graphic should say "via 11th Ave" instead of just Boyer. This is important, since this glosses over the more contentious aspects of this detour. (Really, it's a bad idea).	Error, Specific options not considered
I-311-548	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 78	531	Walter Oelwein	"Potential Detour Route" I think that you need to be a little more clear -- "potential" makes it sound like it may be something else. Perhaps, "Proposed detour route" instead.	Error

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

where the reasonableness and feasibility of a noise wall is still be evaluated (see Section 5.7 of the Final EIS). Please see the response to comment C-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-216

NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report and existing conditions are considered in all analyses. The “appropriateness” of the existing bridge and freeway is not part of the analysis. The purpose of the visual quality assessment is to disclose how the existing visual quality conditions would change due to the location, size, and character of the new facility. See the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-217

Design development is an ongoing process, and the design options presented in the SDEIS are at a sufficient level of detail to compare their environmental effects. Environmental impact assessments are begun early in the design process so that the design may be improved by the input from stakeholders. If the public had to wait for the final design before commenting, there would be no opportunity for their comments to influence the design. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues.

NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect

I-311-549	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 83	532	Walter Oelwein	One thing to note is that Boyer and Fuhrman are potential haul routes, but there is no mention on the impact of traffic on this stretch of road in the local traffic section of the SDEIS. Do you see the obvious contradiction? It's close enough to be a haul route, but not affected by the project itself. This demonstrates that the analysis is incomplete, and needs to be included: What is the impact of Fuhrman/Boyer when the project is completed? If it's impacted by construction, surely it will be impacted by the project completion.	Omission
I-311-550	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 87	533	Walter Oelwein	I don't see any mention of Fuhrman/Boyer in this listing of haul routes. So you should remove Furhman/Boyer as being a haul route in Section 83 (Exhibit 10-6)	Error
I-311-551	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 95	534	Walter Oelwein	It's still not clear why Fuhrman/Boyer are needed as a haul route. This needs to be explained	Omission
I-311-552	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 120	535	Walter Oelwein	"Option K was chosen as the representative build option for comparison in this chapter because it has the potential to result in slightly higher volumes along the SR 520 corridor compared to the other options." OK, so you choose Option K when you think that the cumulative effects will be better, yet throughout the rest of the document you repeatedly state that Option A is "improves" things the most. So why didn't you choose Option A? In order for this SDEIS to be complete, you need to choose the option that you are advocating, and compare it -- objectively -- to the one you are not.	Omission
I-311-553	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Section 139	536	Walter Oelwein	"The public response to the proposed design options was not favorable, forcing the state to reconsider the configuration of the Westside interchange near Montlake Boulevard and SR 520." Correct, because you did not offer any "designs," you offered default roadway placement. Had you done the project with an actual design thinking mentality, hired qualified designers, and identified stakeholder interests, you wouldn't be putting yourself through this difficult process of doing an SDEIS on multiple configurations. By continuing to offer the sad Option A, that has support only from those who live far away from the interchange, you are continuing this pain. Drop Option A and focus on Option K. I would prefer that this statement include how WashDOT actually came up with the design options, and how it attempted to meet the project needs without dragging local residents and so many others through a difficult mediation process. Did Rem Koolhaus have to go through a mediation process to get the Seattle Public Library built?	Omission
I-311-554	Tranportation Discipline Report part 3	Overall	537	Walter Oelwein	For the record, I was on Montlake Blvd today, March 6, 2010, a Saturday at 3pm, not peak period by any stretch of the imagination. Because of the traffic volume and the bridge going up frequently, the traffic was backed up to the 45th street viaduct and to 15th street on Pacific. This is the consequence of having a draw bridge in blocking people heading onto 520 from the North. I can't believe that Option A or L are even discussed in this document, since this is a really stupid problem to replicate and exacerbate. This kind of traffic problem needs to be studied and noted in this SDEIS for this document to be complete.	Specific design options not considered, Omission

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report and existing conditions are considered in all analyses. The “appropriateness” of the existing bridge and freeway is not part of the analysis. The purpose of the visual quality assessment is to disclose how the existing visual quality conditions would change due to the location, size, and character of the new facility. See the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS.

As discussed on page 62 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report “the width of the new Portage Bay Bridge would make it more dominant,” however the spacing of the columns and the added height would reduce the visual effects of the wider bridge. Exhibits 2-4, 2-5, and 2-6 of the report show different perspectives of the Portage Bay Bridge with each option.

I-311-218

The comment’s characterization of the visual quality analysis is incorrect. The quoted text is accurate in explaining that Option K is narrower and would have less of an effect on the NOAA campus than Option A. Exhibits 2-4, 2-5, and 2-6 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report show different perspectives of the Portage Bay Bridge with each option, and display that the added width is not discernable from most viewpoints.

I-311-219

This section of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report is concerned with the Portage Bay Bridge and its effects. The Montlake bascule bridge is not visible from the Portage Bay Bridge. Effects from the new bascule bridge under Options A and L are evaluated in the Montlake landscape unit (beginning on page 64 of the report) because the bascules are in Montlake, not Portage Bay.

I-311-555	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 13	538	Walter Oelwein	"This discipline report describes indirect and cumulative effects expected to be associated with the proposed Interstate 5 (I-5) to Medina: Bridge Replacement and High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Project (I-5 to Medina project) and discusses potential mitigation measures." This section should have started instead with, "Here's how the I-5 to Medina 520 project improves our environment," rather than, "Here's how we are going to mitigate the effects." The fact that you need to start with mitigation indicates that you have made no effort to make this an appropriate project for the natural and built enviornment, and the FIRST measure you take to make it a better project for the region is via mitigation, a defeat to the project's adverse effects. This indicates that the project is faulty from the start, and needs to be reconsidered instead to, "Here's how we are designing a transportation corridor that reflects our current values and meets the needs of the cooridor that specifically ENHANCES the natural and built enviornment." Instead, as it reads, it says, "Here's the DAMAGE our project causes, and a few ways we can make to COVER OVER the DAMAGE." It would be a more honest writing to indicate this more outright, rather than hide behind the soft term of "mitigation."	Specific design options not considered, Omission
I-311-556	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Overall	539	Walter Oelwein	Do you cover indirect effects of ineffectively designing a project that is illegal, making it impossible to meet the core need of enhanced safety? In this case, it is reasonable to assess that an indirect effect of this project is a bridge collapse.	Omission
I-311-557	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 15	540	Walter Oelwein	"evaluate a new set of community-based designs for the Montlake area in Seattle." Why are these designs "community-based." This implies that the designs aren't professional and are of less merit. If you are going to call out specific designs as community-based, you need to call out the kind of designs the non-community-based "designs" are. Here is what I propose: "Default roadway placement inserted by WashDOT without regard to community impacts." or "Larger freeway footprints placed without regard to design possibilities or considerations by inexperienced WashDOT staffers." This should be noted everywhere in the SDEIS for any references to "community input" to be valid. If it didn't come from the community, you must state where it DID come from.	Error, Omission
I-311-558	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 18	541	Walter Oelwein	"The proposed width of the roadway would be approximately 18 feet narrower than the one described in the Draft EIS, reflecting public comment from local communities and the City of Seattle." Again, why do you specifically call out where this idea came from? And if you can make it narrower, why didn't you do this in the first place? What was the incentive to make it wider than the current 115' span? Where did this idea come from -- you talk about the idea for where the narrower footprint came from -- where did the wider footprint come from? If it was a qualified freeway designer, would they have said, "Let's make it 133'!" No, they would have known the community input and transportation needs, and created a bridge that best reflects the needs of the cooridor --both traffic and community. Since you specifically call out community input, you are now obliged to call out EVERYWHERE in the SDEIS where input for other ideas. The 133' proposal should say, "133' proposal offered by WashDOT staffers WITHOUT REGARD FOR COMMUNITY INPUT or CONTEMPORARY FREEWAY DESIGN". This needs to be repeated throughout the SDEIS for it to be accurate. As such, it seems to call out local residents as the problem--they are the ones who made you narrow the bridge width, they are the ones creating new designs. They are the ones prolonging the process. If you had designed a reasonable bridge that met the non-secret needs, you wouldn't have had to go through these extra iterations.	Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered
I-311-559	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 18	542	Walter Oelwein	Exhibit 3: Nowhere in this SDIES is it clear to me why the shoulders and the HOV lanes have to be so wide. You can cut down the shoulders at least 3 feet apiece, as well as the HOV lane 1-2 feet. Why isn't this done?	Specific design alternatives not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-220

See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues. The purpose of the visual quality assessment is to disclose how the existing visual quality conditions would change due to the location, size, and character of the new facility. See the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS.

I-311-221

Please see the response to comment I-311-164 regarding the aesthetic effects of noise walls. Also note that 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. Please see the response to comment C-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative, and regarding quieter concrete pavement.

I-311-222

Design development is an ongoing process, and the design options presented in the SDEIS are at a sufficient level of detail to compare their environmental effects. Environmental impact assessments are begun early in the design process so that the design may be improved by the input from stakeholders. If the public had to wait for the final design before commenting, there would be no opportunity for their comments to influence the design. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues.

I-311-560	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 19	543	Walter Oelwein	"Citizen recommendations made during the mediation process defined this option to include sound walls and/or quieter pavement, subject to neighborhood approval and WSDOT's reasonability and feasibility determinations." Again, I object to you calling out when it is a citizen recommendation when you don't indicate where other recommendations came from. You are now obliged to state, "WashDOT has made no effort to identify how to make the freeway quieter, and instead placed similar roadway construction techniques from the prior freeway. We have waited for citizens to identify how to keep noise to a minimum, and we have proposed nothing. We would prefer that citizens fight amongst themselves to determine the best way to keep noise down, and not enlist any expertise ourselves to make sure that the new, wider freeway has less noise impact from the start." Everywhere you state citizen input changing the project, you need to state WashDOT's input in making it an insufficient project that requires further citizen input. If it is a good idea, then WashDOT needs to actively embrace the idea as though it is its own -- rather than defer to citizens as to what the best approach is.	Omission
I-311-561	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 19	544	Walter Oelwein	"Citizen recommendations made during the mediation process defined this option to include sound walls and/or quieter pavement, subject to neighborhood approval and WSDOT's reasonability and feasibility determinations." The fact that you cannot assert whether there will be noise walls or quieter pavement indicates that this project design is incomplete, and the environmental impact, whether primary or indirect can be assessed. It is easy to imagine that a 6 lane freeway without any noise mitigation across Portage Bay would create a net negative or depressive effect on property values, and create indirect losses for the City of Seattle, stunting growth for a central area of the city near a major employer. With extensive noise mitigation (beyond just noise walls and quiter pavement -- i.e., no trucks at certain times or on weekends, lower speed limit, no combustion engines, noise canceling speakers--hey this is one citizen's input on noise abatement - -you're the experts -- or are you? -- this could be much different.) Therefore it is clear that this SDEIS is grossly incomplete and any analysis of the cumulative and indirect impacts will not be reasonable, since you don't even know the nature of the project.	Incomplete, Error, Specific design options not considered.

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-223

Please see the response comment I-311-219.

I-311-224

Design development is an ongoing process, and the design options presented in the SDEIS are at a sufficient level of detail to compare their environmental effects. Environmental impact assessments are begun early in the design process so that the design may be improved by the input from stakeholders. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues.

I-311-225

Please see the responses to comments I-311-016 and I-311-150 regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge. While it is true that Option K would not affect the existing Montlake Bridge, it would have other visual quality effects. See the response to comment I-311-153 regarding the visual quality analysis.

I-311-226

Design development is an ongoing process, and the design options presented in the SDEIS are at a sufficient level of detail to compare their environmental effects. Environmental impact assessments are begun early in the design process so that the design may be improved by the input from stakeholders. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues.

The purpose of the visual quality assessment is to disclose how the existing visual quality conditions would change due to the location, size,

I-311-562	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 21	545	Walter Oelwein	"Citizen recommendations made during the mediation process defined this option to include only quieter pavement for noise abatement, rather than the sound walls that were included in the 2006 Draft EIS. However, because quieter pavement has not been demonstrated to meet all FHWA and WSDOT avoidance and minimization requirements in tests performed in Washington State, it cannot be considered as noise mitigation under WSDOT and FHWA criteria." This disclaimer about quieter pavement appears throughout the SDEIS as part of the general description of Option K. It is unclear as to what this statement about how quieter pavement does not meet the tests performed in Washington state is germaine to the overall description of Option K. First, it distracts from the description, making it seem as though Option K has noise abatement problems, when it doesn't. Second, it makes it seem like quieter pavement is off the table, which it isn't, since it takes a careful parsing of the statement to show that WashDOT's tests show it not capable of being noise abatement, yet it somehow does qualify as noise abatement in other areas of the country. This needs to be re-written to say, "WashDOT does not know how to create noise abatement for this transportation corridor -- we have no ideas. The ideas suggested by citizens are better, but we can't even test the pavement well enough. We give up!" This would be a more accurate statement rather than the clouding of the issues in a summary of Option K. Third, it is still not clear what WashDOT plans to do to create noise abatement -- other than attempt to settle disputes with citizens via the SDEIS. I expected to see a list of all the things that WashDOT plans to do to make noise abatement possible, only to find that WashDOT is trying argue AGAINST noise abatement measures as insufficient, but abjectly refusing to offer alternative suggestions. Anywhere this statement about quieter pavement not meeting the testing standards needs to be followed with all of the things, if any, WashDOT is doing to make it so that it IS a quieter freeway. I have yet to see anything other than a tepid endorsement of noise walls, which don't really make sense, since many residences reside above the freeway. WashDOT, you need to bring something more to the table here rather than try to settle scores via the SDEIS. You're just adding more work. Offer your full list of noise abatement in the summary or revise the whining about quieter pavement to say that you commit to doing it.	Incomplete, Error, Specific design options not considered.
I-311-563	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 22	546	Walter Oelwein	"Noise mitigation identified for this option would include sound walls as defined in the Draft EIS." Why not say, "via WashDOT input, we are refusing to add quieter pavement like is being suggested for Option K?" This would make it a more consistent writing style where you cite community input. What's WashDOT's input wherever a decision to include or not include something is mentioned. Here is a location where you are obliged to do this.	Incomplete
I-311-564	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 26	547	Walter Oelwein	In this section you clearly outline the priorities of the project, based on likelihood of disaster. First, the middle bridge. Second, Portage Bay bridge Third, the West Approach of the bridge. How come WashDOT has recently advocated starting the project in Medina? This isn't on the priority anywhere. This makes this entire SDEIS invalid, since even still during the comment period, you are doing something completely different from what is documented in the SDEIS. You need to re-write the document to reflect why starting on the east side is so important, when you systemically document the earthquake and winde-related dangers of the west side. Also, if this is the priority, shouldn't the designs proposed be such that they offer to fix the instability issues first, rather than adding capacity as the first order of business? This incosnsistency found throughout this document calls intoquestion the accuracy of the SDEIS.	Error, Incorrect info, Omission

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

and character of the new facility. See the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS.

I-311-227

Landscaping of lids would be included under all the design options; however, the specifics of the landscaping would be decided upon at a later date. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues.

I-311-228

The heights of retaining walls and other engineering requirements are different from aesthetic treatments and architectural details. Although aesthetic treatments are possible with Option K, the overall size and form of the structures were developed to a sufficient level of detail for analysis in the SDEIS.

Design development is an ongoing process, and the design options presented in the SDEIS are at a sufficient level of detail to compare their environmental effects. Environmental impact assessments are begun early in the design process so that the design may be improved by the input from stakeholders. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues.

I-311-229

All SDEIS options would increase the roadway from the existing 4 lanes to 6 lanes. Option K would require the more road surface in this area for the SPUI.

I-311-565	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 30	548	Walter Oelwein	"Assess Consequences and Develop Appropriate Mitigation and Enhancement Strategies—Assess consequences of indirect effects and develop strategies to address unacceptable outcomes." Would re-design of the project be something that could count as a "strategy to address unacceptable outcomes?" In this project, I would like to know what the acceptible bar is. I would have expected a net improvement on each area of impact, rather than a net loss -- we shouldn't be spending this much money without striving to achieve this. It is easy to see how this project, with its additional lanes creates a net loss in many area, so it should go back to the drawing board: Start with a better design-- say a tube or tunnel using design options that WashDOT rejected without fully exploring.	Specific design alternatives not considered
I-311-566	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 43	549	Walter Oelwein	Open space and waterfront. -- this section has no background or commentary, when there could be. For example, the street end at Edgar St. was reclaimed by local residents in 1980 and created a small park. Just recently, at South Portage bay, local residents have reclaimed and established the South Portage Bay Park. So just to call it "open space and waterfront" does not accurately describe the pained and ongoing efforts to improve the local environment by local residents.	Incomplete
I-311-567	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 45	550	Walter Oelwein	"resulting in increased property values." Here you specifically cite as historical reference, and presumably because it is important to understand what is important, the property values. Is the impact of the I-5 to Medina project on property values being assessed in the SDEIS? If not, then why is property values mentioned here in relation to the I-90 bridge being developed? If so, what is the net impact of increasing the size of the bridge on the property values nearby? I have not seen any commentary on this, but it must be important, since it is mentioned specifically here -- at the moment where the first Lake Washington bridge is built -- to have an impact on property values. I would like this SDEIS to state specifically what the anticipated impact of property values would be with the no-build, option A, L, K. Or else this analysis is not complete.	Incomplete
I-311-568	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 45	551	Walter Oelwein	"For the Eastside communities, the new bridge would lead to even more residents and greater development pressures." You mention the impact of the initial bridge construction -- for EASTSIDE communities. But what about the Westside communities? You do not mention that the residents -- in the area since the 1800's now had to deal with a large above-ground freeway that brought noise, traffic, visual blight and pollution. Also, the bridge forever scarred the Washington Park Arboretum, established earlier in this essay as an early park in the City of Seattle. There is no mention on the benefits of the bridge to the residents of the City of Seattle, so it can be established with the publishing of this SDEIS that the 520 bridge benefitted people on the Eastside, but not on the Westside. This section has the opportunity to establish the terrible design that the original SR520 brought to the sensitive area, but you don't. This makes this section grossly incomplete.	Incomplete, Omisssion, No support

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-230

The SDEIS options have different effects in different areas. While Option K minimizes the effects on the Montlake Bridge, it would have other visual quality effects. See the response to comment I-311-153 regarding the visual quality analysis. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues. See the responses to comments I-311-016 and I-311-150 regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge.

I-311-231

The quoted text is an accurate description of the visual quality effects of Option K. The heights of retaining walls and other engineering requirements are different from aesthetic treatments and architectural details. Although aesthetic treatments are possible with Option K, the overall size and form of the structures were developed to a sufficient level of detail for analysis in the SDEIS. Design development is an ongoing process, and the design options presented in the SDEIS are at a sufficient level of detail to compare their environmental effects. Environmental impact assessments are begun early in the design process so that the design may be improved by the input from stakeholders. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues.

I-311-232

The visual quality effects of the new bascule bridge, when opened, would be temporary and minimal when compared to existing conditions. Openings of the bascule bridges in Option A would be synchronized, and due to the added capacity, the waiting cars would clear more quickly once the bridges closed. Please see the response to comment I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A.

I-311-569	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 45	552	Walter Oelwein	"an engineering feat of outstanding proportions" This is an engineering feat, to be sure, but is it an architectural feat? No. Is it an aesthetics feat? No. Is it a feat of engineering that successfully preserves the natural and built enviornment? No. This needs to be called out specifically for this section to be valid. It needs to articulate that in addition to the positive "engineering" accomplishment, it is a massive failure in terms of integrating a transporatation corridor with the local enviorment. It might be worth stating that in other urban areas, it was de facto assumed that new road or transporation development should take place underground, as has been done in major cities throughout the world since the 18th century. This section glorifies the "engineering feat" but completely neglects the ongoing price of that feat, and how it was, indeed built, but built on the cheap -- using parkland so that they didn't have to buy land from land owners. This section needs to be re-written to further indicate how the people who have been living with SR520 in their backyard feel about it.	Omissin, Error, No support
I-311-570	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 46	553	Walter Oelwein	"many of which function today as Seattle suburbs" This is an abject incorrect statement. To call Bellevue and Redmond suburbs of Seattle is to mischaracterize their contributions as employment centers. People in Seattle commute to Redmond just as much as vice versa. The so-called "reverse commute" is much worse than the "regular commute." So to intimate in any way that "today" this corridor is to serve for suburbanites to come into the city is blatantly incorrect. This is important since the "design" (or as I believe is more accurate, default roadway placement) decisions indicate this mentality still exists -- such as the non-sensical Option A HOV lane to I-5. Also, this is an especially insideous statement in that it implies that there are residents living in the prestine suburbs, and the industrial jobs are in Seattle, when Seattle actually has a better residential quality of life (better bus service, closer transit stops, narrower roads) than the car-centric Eastside. This is important, because if you had indicated this in the history of the area, it would have made it easier for the designers (should you have hired them) to create designs that reflect the values of the local residents: Reduce cars, reduce the impact of freeways, improve transit, improve parkland. Instead, the "design" reflects the car-centric culture of the Eastside.	Omission, Error, No support
I-311-571	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 46	554	Walter Oelwein	"Medina has become one the most affluent residential communities in the region. Today Bellevue, Kirkland, and Redmond are prosperous and growing commercial and residential communities." I expect to see (and I don't) a similar explanation about the relative affluence of the close-in neighborhoods of Seattle: Capitol Hill, Montlake, Roanoke Park, Laurelhurst, Madison Park. These are very affluent areas of the city, and provide an enormous amount of tax revenue in a very small area of land. For the freeway to dominate it so much has a severe impact. If this is not articulated, then this SDEIS is incomplete.	Omission, Error, Incomplete
I-311-572	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 47	555	Walter Oelwein	"The Washington Park Arboretum lost approximately 60 acres of lagoon area to the SR 520 project." You could improve this statement by saying what the environmental impact of this was back then. It sounds like the existing 520 bridge caused severe environmental impact that never has been assessed. This project should be the catalyst to try to mitigate and restore the mistakes and damage caused back then. At the very minimum, you could provide a statement about how the residents felt about having a freeway cut through their parkland, across Portage Bay, and the visual and noise impact (not to mention the pollution) of this freeway.	Omission, Error, Incomplete
I-311-573	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 47	556	Walter Oelwein	"Growth Centers are...." This inset emphasizes the importance of pedestrian, bicycle, and mass-transit options. Other than the bike-lane on 520, what have you done to reflect these values? None. This needs to be explicitly mentioned in the SDEIS: The 520 project does not reflect the goals of growth centers. It focuses on car transportation, freeways, and things that reduce the appeal of residential and job growth.	Omission, Error, Incomplete

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-233

The new bascule bridge under Option A would not be visible from Marsh Island. The new bascule bridge with Option L would be visible from Marsh Island; however, effects would be minimal due the distance of the bridge.

I-311-234

The quoted text is an accurate description of the visual quality effects of Option K. The heights of retaining walls and other engineering requirements are different from aesthetic treatments and architectural details. Although aesthetic treatments are possible with Option K, the overall size and form of the structures were developed to a sufficient level of detail for analysis in the SDEIS.

Design development is an ongoing process, and the design options presented in the SDEIS are at a sufficient level of detail to compare their environmental effects. Environmental impact assessments are begun early in the design process so that the design may be improved by the input from stakeholders. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues.

I-311-235

The quoted text is an accurate description of the visual quality effects of Option K. The heights of retaining walls and other engineering requirements are different from aesthetic treatments and architectural details. Although aesthetic treatments are possible with Option K, the overall size and form of the structures were developed to a sufficient level of detail for analysis in the SDEIS. Design development is an ongoing process, and the design options presented in the SDEIS are at a sufficient level of detail to compare their environmental effects. Environmental impact assessments are begun early in the design

I-311-574	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 49	557	Walter Oelwein	"Continued growth in the region is seen as an opportunity to restore watersheds, develop more environmentally sensitive approaches to treating stormwater, enhance habitat, and pioneer new technologies and industries that benefit both the environment and the regional economy (PSRC 2008)." This statement seems directly in opposition to the main features of the 520 project: More lanes, bigger footprint, more parkland destroyed, more noise and visual blight. This needs to be stated outright in the SDEIS: "Our plan for increased overland freeway does not serve to meet these opportunities. We have opted for default roadway placement increases, and hoped that someone else restores watersheds, and pioneers new techonologies and industries. . ."	Incomplete, Error, Specific design options not considered.
I-311-575	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 51	558	Walter Oelwein	Exhibit 17a does not show the restoration of the South Portage Bay park. This is generically shown as part of Montlake Playfield, but this is not accurate. It needs to be called out as specifically a new park, because this was not accessible or usable before.	Error, Incorrect info, Omission
I-311-576	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 61	559	Walter Oelwein	"Finally, the analysts suggest ways by which cumulative effects could be mitigated. WSDOT does not mitigate cumulative effects because it does not have jurisdiction over the many non-WSDOT projects that contribute to them. Even so, WSDOT is required to disclose cumulative effects and to suggest practical mitigation options that the responsible parties could take (WSDOT et al. 2008)." I believe this to mean that WSDOT does have the ability to mitigate cumulative effects for things within its jurisdiction, and the analysts are obliged to suggest things to WSDOT that mitigates the cumulative effects. By this I mean that WSDOT is a responsible party, and if they suggest designs that create a negative cumulative effect, they need to re-deisgn the project so it creates a net positive cumulative effect for the areas it has jurisdiction over. As it is worded, it makes it appear that WSDOT can suggest a large freeway through sensitive areas, and then say that it has no jurisdiction over cumulative effects. This section needs be re-written to more squarely place the onus on WSDOT to provide designs that minimize cumulative effects.	Incorrect info, Omission
I-311-577	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 62	560	Walter Oelwein	"The transportation analysis conducted for the I-5 to Medina project focuses on the potential effects that the project might have on traffic volumes and the flow of vehicular traffic for both freeway and local street traffic" This is incorrect, and needs to state that it does not take into account local street traffic for streets that serve as a proxy for 520/I-5 when 520 is clogged: Namely Fuhrman/Boyer and Delmar/Lynn.	Incorrect info, Omission
I-311-578	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 62	561	Walter Oelwein	"A major change in the corridor will be tolling on SR 520 and new westbound and eastbound HOV lanes. These changes will alter driver behavior, causing some drivers to change their travel mode (to bus or carpool), time of day for travel, or route (some drivers will avoid SR 520 and either drive around Lake Washington on SR 522 or use I-90)." You need to add, "Or attempt to take nearby surface streets to save money on tolls." (For example: Why would someone take 520 to Montlake when they could take surface streets and pay nothing -- increasing congestion on surface streets).	Omission

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

process so that the design may be improved by the input from stakeholders. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues.

I-311-236

NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report and existing conditions are considered in all analyses. The “appropriateness” of the existing bridge and freeway is not part of the analysis. The purpose of the visual quality assessment is to disclose how the existing visual quality conditions would change due to the location, size, and character of the new facility. See the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the responses to comments I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues, I-311-016 and I-311-150 regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge, and I-311-104 regarding the characterization of visual quality effects.

I-311-237

The visual quality analysis notes the potential effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A. It also notes that the new bascule bridge under Option L could be noticeable from a number of viewpoints in the Montlake neighborhood, Foster Island, and Laurelhurst.

The design of the new bascule bridge would be context sensitive to minimize its effects on the setting and view of the historic Carl F. Gould Montlake Bridge. Please see the responses to comments I-311-016 and I-311-150 regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge with Option A and the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-579	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 62	562	Walter Oelwein	"cut transit travel time by up to 3 minutes for westbound travel and 40 minutes for eastbound travel, depending on the time of day" This repeats a gross error in the transportation discipline report, and should be immediately suspect. OK -- so Westbound you cut travel time by 3 minutes, and eastbound -- it's up to 40 minutes! That doesn't pass the sniff test. In the Transportation Discipline report, you assert that traffic will be backed up going eastbound to North and South 405, at times all the way to I-5. This is patently absurd, as currently, with no-build, traffic is never backed up even on that off ramp to 405. Where you get this in your model needs to be re-examined, because that on-ramp -- of all the on-ramps related to 520 -- NEVER backs up. If it did, you would be hearing big worries from the reisdents of Medina, Clyde Hill and Bellevue. Please do not use this error about eastbound to 405 to justify the 520 expansion project.	Error
I-311-580	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 62	563	Walter Oelwein	"These changes will improve traffic circulation and decrease congestion" This statement is logically inconosistent to other parts fo the report and needs to be corrected. You specifically call out Option K as the option that increases congestion, because it allows so much more traffic to go through Montlake -- you cite this as having a negative impact on traffic circultion. Yet here you say that as traffic circulation increases, congestion decreases. Please correct this to take a stand: Does the change decrease congestion? If so, you need to point this out for Option K in the Transportation Discipline report.	Error, Incorrect info, Omission
I-311-581	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 63	564	Walter Oelwein	"The project will cause some loss of parking spaces around the Montlake area at the University of Washington." This is based on a faulty analysis in the Transportation Discipline report. In it, you state that Option K will remove parking spaces on E. Roanoke Street near the hop in. This misses the fact that Roanoke Place will not be an arterial any more, and, as it is a 4 lane road -- with parking -- could easily handle MORE parking in the future. So you need to state more precisely: With the Exception of Option K, which actually improves on-street parking in the Montake area -- UNLIKE the other options L and A.	Error, Incorrect info, Omission
I-311-582	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 63	565	Walter Oelwein	"Loss of parking near the University of Washington (particularly Parking Lot E-12 under Option K)." Here you specifically call out the losses provided by Option K, but you earlier did not identify the GAINS provided by Option K. This indicates anti-Option K bias and not fully considering the option's merits.	Error, Incorrect info, Omission
I-311-583	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 64	566	Walter Oelwein	"No additional, quantifiable, indirect effects were identified for the transportation analysis." I'm going to object to this statement: Because you have not studied the amount of traffic (cut-through or otherwise) on Delmar/Lynn and Fuhrman/Boyer, this analyis is incomplete. If 520 backs up, then people take these streets, as they are the surface option. Since there is no discussion about these corridors here or in the Transportation Discipline report, this conclusion is faulty and needs to be reassed. The local residents would be glad to meet with you to tell you how much "cut-through" traffic there is in Montlake and Delmar during peak times, so there must be indirect or cumulative effects of this project.	Error, Incorrect info, Omission

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-238

See the response to comment I-311-237.

I-311-239

The bascule bridges proposed in Options A and L would be at the same level as the existing Montlake Bridge and therefore could not be considered to be “soaring” above the adjacent areas. There are “amazing views of the Montlake Cut” from parts of the Portage Bay area, particularly the Roanoke area, but as noted in the response to comment I-311-010, neither of the proposed bascule bridges would have a high visual quality effect on those distant views.

I-311-240

See the response to comment I-311-002. The use of the word “design” is and consistent with generally accepted usage for transportation and roadway projects.

I-311-241

The exact wording used for Option L was not used for the description of Option K. However, the comment’s characterization that the description of Option K was “worded less positively” is not consistent with the text of the report. As stated on page 67 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report regarding the proposed lid under Option K, “pedestrians, cyclists, and disembarking or departing bus and light rail commuters could have an improved experience due to being separated from vehicular traffic and having unobstructed views.”

I-311-242

The requested change was not made because the effect of scale on gateways is subjective.

I-311-584	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 62	567	Walter Oelwein	"What direct and indirect effects will the project likely have on transportation?" I have to say that this section seems woefully incomplete. Really -- no indirect effects? When you add up the noise, visual issues, increase in population, extra-wide lanes, Sound Transit etc. This would surely have an impact (either good or bad) on property values, and the amount of revenues the City of Seattle and King County would take in from this extremely valuable piece of land. For example, the Foster Island park, under Option A, would be much worse than it is today -- doesn't this have some sort of indirect impact in how people view the City of Seattle, and whether it is a "green" place --when it builds a new freeway through a nice park like that, repeating mistakes of the past? So I'll help you identify some indirect effects: National and Global Reputation; Property Values; Attitude toward civic engagement; Attitude toward green space; ability to manage traffic in a 21st century manner; unwilingness to invest in 21st century mass transit (lowering investment in the area, as it will be perceived as provincial). There are many intangilble things that this project expresses, and this is the precise place to identify them. Do you need to reach out to the community for us to tell you this?	Omission, Error
I-311-585	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 65	568	Walter Oelwein	"The configuration of SR 520 adds to the problem because of the limited capacity of its four lanes, the incomplete HOV system, the need for traffic entering SR 520 on the westbound approaches to the Evergreen Floating Bridge to weave through the HOV traffic, and SR 520's narrow shoulders" Shouldn't you add "the lack of tolling of this highly valuable corridor" and "the lack of mass transit". These are things that "add to the problem" but are being ignored in this analysis.	Omission, Incomplete
I-311-586	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 65	569	Walter Oelwein	"Congestion on SR 520 also backs up traffic onto local streets such as Montlake Boulevard and Lake Washington Boulevard, creating travel delays and circulation problems on local streets and through the Arboretum and University of Washington campus." Since you specifically called out Optoin K's "reduction in Parking in E12" earlier in this document, here is a chance for you to specifically call out Option A as a failure: "These travel delays will be enhanced by adding a second draw bridge across Montlake with Options A and L, but not K." C'mon -- say it!	Omission, Incomplete
I-311-587	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 65	570	Walter Oelwein	"Congestion on SR 520 also backs up traffic onto local streets such as Montlake Boulevard and Lake Washington Boulevard, creating travel delays and circulation problems on local streets and through the Arboretum and University of Washington campus." This also misses the opportunity to state that when traffic backs up, many people choose to use surface streets, such as Delmar/Lynn and Furhman Boyer to cut through. This is an area that has not been studied, and the potential for a huge impact on the local area (we don't know whether positive or negative -- it needs to be studied.)	Omission, Incomplete
I-311-588	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 66	571	Walter Oelwein	"Travelers will continue to face congestion in some areas, particularly during the morning and evening commutes." And you need to say, "And with Options A and L, at all other times of the day, when the first and second bascule bridge need to frequently open."	Omission, Incomplete

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-243

As discussed on page 62 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report “the width of the new Portage Bay Bridge would make it more dominant,” however the spacing of the columns and the added height would reduce the visual effects of the wider bridge. Exhibits 2-4, 2-5, and 2-6 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report show different perspectives of the Portage Bay Bridge with each option, and display that the added width is not discernable from most viewpoints. Because the West Approach structures would have a more discernable change, the effects would be greater in this area than the Portage Bay Bridge.

I-311-244

The requested change was not made because the text is accurate and changing the language would not change the analysis or findings. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-245

NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report and existing conditions are considered in all analyses. The“appropriateness” of the existing bridge and freeway is not part of the analysis. The purpose of the visual quality assessment is to disclose how the existing visual quality conditions would change due to the location, size, and character of the new facility. See the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-589	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 66	572	Walter Oelwein	"investments in the region's transportation system will be targeted to preserve the existing system, improve system efficiency, increase choices to users, and provide strategic capacity improvements to meet future travel needs." OK, let's see how I-5 to Medina stands on this: Preserve the existing system (actually -- no, because it makes it bigger and more obnoxious); Improve system efficiency (Only Option K does this, since Options L and A have the same inefficiencies of the current system, also, the lack of the Montlake freeway station for all options in general would seem to make the system less efficient); increase choices to users (Nope. Only thing added is a bike lane, no mass transit, fewer busses); and strategic capacity improvements (I think you could claim that the HOV lanes are going to do this, but it doesn't seem strategic enough -- is this really what we need -- more HOVs?). My analysis shows that this project doesn't meet the regional transportation needs. Not sure why you're pushing for it so bad. If it's safety that's the problem, then fix the safety issues.	Omission; Incomplete
I-311-590	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 66	573	Walter Oelwein	"causing worsening congestion on SR 520 and the connecting local street system" You do not do an analysis of Fuhrman/Boyer or Delmar/Lynn, or with tolling, so this statement is by definition incomplete. Perhaps it will make things better with tolling? Perhaps people will be so frustrated with the bridge they'll decide to locate closer? Perhaps you make it one general lane and one HOV lane, so that transit could get through? This does not seem to be analyzed, so this section is incomplete.	Incomplete
I-311-591	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 66	574	Walter Oelwein	"Travel times for eastbound traffic would increase by 60 minutes." I cannot emphasize enough that this assessment needs to be looked at again. If it actually takes an ADDITIONAL 60 minutes to go eastbound, a) people would not pay the toll, as there is no point in doing this b) they would take alternate routes -- most likely i-90 or even south or north -- remember, they have 90 minutes here -- or just not go at all (telecommute), and re-locate or go at off-peak times. This is a completely unreasonable assumption in your traffic models, and needs to be reassessed for this SDEIS to have any validity at all.	Error, Incorrect info, Omission
I-311-592	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 66	575	Walter Oelwein	"Without the project, two of the 39 study intersections would experience worse level of service operation (that is, increased delay at intersections) during the morning commute, and operation of nine study intersections would worsen during the evening commute (see Chapter 2, Transportation Discipline Report [WSDOT 2009h])." First you didn't study two important intersections: Eastlake and Fuhrman and Boyer and Lynn. Second, your analysis of Option K's Pacific street intersection made the contracting argument that it increases traffic flow and increases congestion.	Omission
I-311-593	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 66	576	Walter Oelwein	"Truck traffic traveling through the SR 520 construction zone from construction vehicles and delivery of materials" In the transportation discipline report, you are very vague as to where these trucks will be -- will they be on the detour routes?	Omission
I-311-594	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 66	577	Walter Oelwein	"Additional lane closures and road detours, particularly on the local street system, which would cause slowdowns and some drivers to alter their routes (this may result in more cut-through traffic in neighborhoods)" Here cut-through traffic is specifically cited as an environmental impact, yet there is no mention about cut-through traffic not related to construction impacts, when this is an ongoing issue in the Roanoke Park/Portage Bay neighborhood. So which is it -- cut through traffic has an impact or not?	Omission

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-246

The comment's characterization of Option K's visual effect is inaccurate. Please see the response to comment I-311-153 regarding the visual quality effects of Option K compared to Option A. Additionally, see the response to comment I-311-012 and comment I-311-118 regarding effects on Foster Island.

I-311-247

Please see the response to comment I-311-153 regarding the visual quality effects of Option K compared to Option A. As discussed in comment I-311-118, added land (from the landbridge) to the Foster Island area would be primarily for recreational use and would not be restoring the wetlands that previously occupied this space. Although visually this may be more appealing to people using the park, it would still remove natural areas. Also see the response to comment I-311-012 regarding effects on Foster Island.

I-311-248

The term "formalized" here is used to call out the difference between the existing natural area compared to the proposed land bridge, which would be man-made and would be used for recreation. See the response to comment I-311-012 and comment I-311-118 regarding effects on Foster Island.

The visual quality analysis was conducted in accordance with FHWA's visual quality and aesthetics impacts assessment methodology and WSDOT's Environmental Procedures Manual, using the checklist provided in Exhibit 459-1 of the manual. The purpose of adhering to an approved and established methodology is to conduct an objective, unbiased evaluation. See the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS and I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the

I-311-595	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 67	578	Walter Oelwein	"Additional lane closures and road detours, particularly on the local street system, which would cause slowdowns and some drivers to alter their routes (this may result in more cut-through traffic in neighborhoods)" It should be noted that in the Transportation Discipline report, you are extremely vague as to which roads will be shut down. You do provide a map of "potential" closures, but not any disucssion about how you would actually detour traffic on 11th (both north and south of Roanoke), which are highly narrow, highly residential roads. There's parking on both streets. So this is a request to improve this discussion, because it will have an impact on the indirect and cumulative effects (home values, training people to use these streets as arterials, etc.).	Omission, Error
I-311-596	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 67	579	Walter Oelwein	"With or without the project, there will be additional demand for transit options, including buses and light rail. It is anticipated that the overall transit demand would increase 51 percent under the No Build Alternative and 14 percent under the 6-lane Alternative by 2030 (see Chapter 2, Transportation Discipline Report [WSDOT 2009h])" OK, in looking at this, it makes an argument to keep the 4-lane structure and build light rail. It appears as though the design of the project is such that it encourages driving, rather than taking transit. You are making an argument to re-think the 6-lane HOV configuration, and identify how to make this a mass-transit corridor, instead of a car-corridor. You could do that, you know!	Error
I-311-597	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 68	580	Walter Oelwein	"Similarly, tolling and the focus on increased transit opportunities would reduce demand for use of the SR 520 corridor by single-occupancy vehicles. There would be increased opportunities for non-motorized travel, which would also reduce some vehicle traffic." Again, this seems to argue that the freeway should be as narrow and unobtrusive as possible, since with tolling you can increase mass transit demand and decrease SOV demand. Why is the freeway twice as large again? Your analysis does not match the design. You need to take this analysis, and create a design that reflects the increase in transit demand, ability to decrease SOV demand via tolling. Instead, you created a design, and then did the traffic analysis. This is backwards, and needs to be revised for this project to be viable and worth investing in.	Error, Specific options not considered
I-311-598	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 68	581	Walter Oelwein	"Cumulative construction-related effects can be mitigated by developing a comprehensive plan to control traffic during construction and a public outreach/communication plan to inform people of such things as lane closures, detours, and delays." OK, you've already failed on this. Here you have the SDEIS that is supposed to document the impact of construction, and you have no discussion about how you are going to manage 11th Ave. E (north and south of Roanoke) as detour points. So you have not communicated at all on this level. These streets do not appear capable of handling the extra traffic, especially since 11th is essentially one-lane and very steep, not suitable for arterial-style traffic.	Error, Specific options not considered
I-311-599	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 68	582	Walter Oelwein	"Measures to minimize disruption of access to businesses and properties. Details on required street and lane closures including timing. Measures to minimize impact on transit operations. Traffic enforcement measures, including use of police officers. Measures to minimize the impact of traffic and parking from construction workers." This section totally punts -- the question of the section is "how could it be mitigated", and then you say, "we'll take measures to mitigate." You have not supplied anything other than a logical loop. This section needs to be re-writen so that it at least makes logical sense. Only the second bullet point qualifies as an actual defined mitigation measure, the other four are essentially rephrasing, "mitigation." This is a big deal, because throughout the SDEIS, you discuss how quieter pavement doesn't count as mitigation, yet you are obliged to find mitigation. So you just say, "We'll mitigate if we can." So consistently in this document you talk about mitigation, but provide sketchy, if not zero, information about what you are actively doing to make it a worthwhile project for those most affected by it.	Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues.

I-311-249

Statements such as the one mentioned in the comment use “could” rather than “would” or “will” because the viewer’s experience may be considered subjective.

I-311-250

As discussed in comment I-311-118, added parkland to the Foster Island area would be primarily for recreational use and would not be restoring the wetlands that previously occupied this space, as with Option A. Although visually this may be more appealing to people using the park, it would still remove natural areas. See the response to comment I-311-012 and comment I-311-118 regarding effects on Foster Island.

I-311-251

The width of the bridge in the West Approach area is discussed on page 70 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report. It states that “the west approach bridge through Union Bay and east to Lake Washington would be much wider than the existing bridges and this could change boaters’ and park users’ experience.“ Additionally, the text referenced in the comment is from a section discussing the effects of Option L, not Option K.

I-311-252

Please see the responses to comments I-311-156 regarding NEPA requirements. Because this section is titled “Would the project create new sources of shadow, glare, or light?” and Option K produces no new sources of light, it the lack of effect was not called out.

I-311-600	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 69	583	Walter Oelwein	"Overall, the amount of land use converted from civic/quasi-public, park, and commercial and single-family residential use represents a small percentage of these types of land uses within the City of Seattle." This is a disengenuous summary. First, measuring it against the overall percentage of Seattle's usage of this kind of space is a horrible metric, and should be stricken from this document. What freeway project would actually have a "large" percentage converted to freeway? This is absurd. Instead, you need to articulate it in terms of no-build, collapsed freeway, or 6-lane. How much usage does the collapsed freeway gain? How much does 6-lane vs. No build take up? It looks like the 6-lane alternative is twice as big as the original. How is this not discussed explicity? Next, since this is the indirect and cumulative impact report,	Error, Incorrect info, Omission
I-311-601	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 69	584	Walter Oelwein	"No substantial change to the overall urbanized land use pattern in Seattle would occur, and no indirect effects on land use patterns would occur." This is, by definition, incorrect. First, it is acknowledged that you are taking away up to 15.7 acres of land for freeway usage. Therefore it would have an indirect impact in making these non-freeway uses less desirable. Visits to Foster Island would be less frequent. Marsh Island now is more in the shadow of a freeway. WAC users would be more intimidated to paddle under the freeway. The Arboretum is seen less and less as a sancutary, but a corridor in whict to build large freeways. It is articulated that building freeways next to historical districts is OK, diminishing the value of the city's history. Home values increase at a lesser rate-- what would be the indirect effects of that? This is what I expectded to see in this is the section the indiret effects of the project, and to say that there would be "no indirect effects" on land use reveals that this analysis is woefully incomplete.	Incomplete, Error, Specific design options not considered.
I-311-602	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 70	585	Walter Oelwein	"To conduct the cumulative effects assessment on land use, the analyst relied primarily on two regional planning documents:" So it was one analyst looking at two documents? Would interviews with the local residents and those who actually use the land nearby be able to provide any input on the "indirect and cumulative impacts?" Here's what they would say, "I would not boat on Portage Bay, with the extra-wide freeway." "I would not go to the Arboretum as much, with the extra-wide freeway." You need to have done a better job of identifying the impacts, rather than look at a few documents and say "no indirect or cumulative impacts on land use" (of a greatly expanded, noisy freeway). This analysis is incomplete.	Incomplete, Error, Specific design options not considered.
I-311-603	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 71	586	Walter Oelwein	"Much of this growth has occurred on the Eastside where, since the 1970s, Bellevue and Redmond have become urban centers." This is inconsistent with another section of this document which specifically lists these same communties as "suburbs". This inconsistency makes the SDEIS incorrect in its analysis.	Error, Contradictio n
I-311-604	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 71	587	Walter Oelwein	"According to the Transportation 2040 Draft EIS, the total number of housing units in the central Puget Sound region increased from approximately 683,000 in 1970 to about 1,484,000 units in 2006." This discusion also needs to include a discussion of the more immediate study area -- the communities near the 520 bridge expansion. Not providing a look at the changes and demographics of the immediate area makes this SDEIS incomplete.	Error, Incorrect info, Omission

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-253

Please see the responses to comment I-311-156 regarding NEPA requirements.

I-311-254

Environmental impact assessments are begun early in the design process so that the design may be improved by the input from stakeholders. The design is developed in parallel with mitigation planning, community comments, and permitting requirements. If the public had to wait for the final design before commenting, there would be no opportunity for their comments to influence the design.

See the response to I-311-001 regarding the purpose of the SDEIS and the process for identifying the alternatives presented. Please see the responses to comments I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues, I-311-153 regarding the purpose of a visual quality and aesthetics assessment, and I-311-010 regarding the methodology of the visual quality assessment. As stated in the response to Comment I-311-002, the project is a transportation project, and its purpose and need are related to transportation safety and mobility.

I-311-255

Environmental impact assessments are begun early in the design process so that the design may be improved by the input from stakeholders. The design is developed in parallel with mitigation planning, community comments, and permitting requirements. If the public had to wait for the final design before commenting, there would be no opportunity for their comments to influence the design.

See the response to I-311-001 regarding the purpose of the SDEIS and the process for identifying the alternatives presented. Please see the response to comment I-311-030 regarding the workgroups that coordinated with WSDOT and FHWA in the development of mitigation

I-311-605	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 72	588	Walter Oelwein	"As described above, this finding was supported by the land use analysis in the Transportation 2040 Draft EIS, which incorporated reasonably foreseeable changes in central Puget Sound's future land use, population, employment, and travel patterns, including the SR 520 project." I find this discussion lacking in that it doesn't seem to acknowledge that removing up to 15.7 acres is a dramatic take-away from the parks and other land for an urbanized area. You are actually making an argument for taking the 520 bridge underground/underwater. With the region growing, with the 520 corridor so important for transportation, why didn't you then say, "we need this land for growth!" Instead, you're saying, "We'll expand 520, and it doesn't take away land!" This is the wrong thinking, and works at cross purposes to the urban planning necessary to sustain growth in the already built enviornment. You need to re-think this project such that it actually PROVIDES LAND for growth and recreation in a highly valuable area. This is what the analysis shows, so the project should reflect this.	Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered
I-311-606	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 73	589	Walter Oelwein	"Although these conversions would reduce the area of land available to a small extent, they would cumulatively convert only a small portion of the total land in the central Puget Sound region over the next 30 years. The SR 520 project's contribution of between 11.1 and 15.7 converted acres would not be substantial in a regional context." This analysis is incomplete and needs to then discuss, and in a specific project area context. . . it takes away 15.7 acres of parkland in one of the most coveted urban parks in the world. Why is it not articulated this way, when this is how the local residents feel about the project. To provide only the "regional" percentage is disengenuous, because it is impossible that a freeway would be able to take anything other than a "small portion." Again, your arguments seem to say, "there will be steady urban growth" and "we are taking away urban growth area". This is an argument to re-think the freeway from above ground to below ground -- so you can meet your transportation needs and preserve the urban area for long term growth.	Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered
I-311-607	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 73	590	Walter Oelwein	"Regional and local planning organizations are the focal points for gathering public input and suggesting priorities for the future land uses." Wait. The priority is on minimizing the transportation corridor footprint (as the local planning agencies consistently state), but this project actually maximizes the transportation corridor footprint. So this project is in contradiction to the regional plan. This needs to be reconciled through a different design that actually gives back land for regional growth.	Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered
I-311-608	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 73	591	Walter Oelwein	"Because the proposed project would replace part of an existing transportation corridor through an urban area that has already been developed, it would not change land use or development patterns." This analysis is incomplete. The larger freeway will indeed change land-use and development patterns -- it is a large freeway that runs through several neighborhoods! You need to provide a discussion of this impact in the Impact Statement. You can't just say, "Well, it won't change anything." You've doubled the size of a freeway during a time when carbon footprints, green building, energy efficiency, density, etc. are all on the upswing, and with a large freeway, do you think that we are articulating a vision that is in synch with this trend? Would the development be altered in the area -- where a premium on density and urban living cannot have the best air quality and noise quality? This project has a HUGE impact on the future development of the west-side neighborhoods through what it reflects: Big roads, SOVs, no mass transit, and little regard to minimizing the footprint. Think of the alternative: If you put the bridge underground, what impact would THAT have on development in the area? Would home values increase? Would people want to develop the areas near the UW campus as higher density?	Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

measures and design refinements that are included with the Preferred Alternative. Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-256

The generally accepted organization for environmental impact analyses has been followed by this project. This accepted organization is to present the project, describe the existing conditions of concern for the discipline, then disclose project effects. By putting the mitigation discussion and options after the disclosure and discussion of project effects, the reader may have a clearer understanding of those options. This organization mirrors the sequence of the assessment. See the response to I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues.

”Green over gray” refers to the WSDOT commitment to screen structures with vegetation.

I-311-257

Please see the response to comment I-311-164 regarding the aesthetic effects of noise walls. Also note that, noise reduction measures included with 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. Please see the response to comment C-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative. Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to

I-311-609	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 73	592	Walter Oelwein	"The analyst concluded that construction-related effects of the 6-Lane Alternative on economic activity would be positive but temporary, and that long-term operation of the proposed project would not directly or indirectly affect the economy. For these reasons, the analyst concluded that the proposed project would not contribute to lasting trends from other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable actions that would have a cumulative effect on economic activity." This analyst's analysis is clearly cursory and incomplete. Readers of the SDEIS want to know what the impact of the bridge project will be. There is a basic concern that having a large freeway that doesn't reflect the core values of increased density, green construction, high-quality of life (no freeway noise), etc. would have a negative long term impact on the local community and potential growth of the region. This discussion is not had -- When you go to Texas, and see all of the soaring freeways, the wide laned traffic corridors, it tells you that this place has lots of room to build, land is not valuable, cars are king, we don't care about emissions, etc. When you go to London, and there is a robust Underground, cars have to pay to get inside the city, etc., this tells you that traffic is not tolerated, alternate transporation is preferred, and they're going in the direction of improving the livability of the city. This project goes in the "Texas" direction, and will certainly have an impact on the long-term image of the city, its growth and investment prospects, and if you don't actually have the land to expand -- like they do in Texas -- it also means that we're pretty stupid. I expected to see this level of thinking in the SDEIS, but it is not here, making this an incomplete document, and we're still wondering what the impact will be of creating a wider freeway is.	Incomplete, Omisssion, Specific Alternatives not explored
I-311-610	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 74	593	Walter Oelwein	"After construction, the operational project would result in several long-term benefits to community cohesion." There is agreement that the lids will improve cohesion, and this is supported. However, this discussion again lacks the larger issue of identifying the best usage of land and water. The project articulates that an additional 15.7 acres for transportation is needed, and this is the BEST usage of this land and water, when the option of having this same transportation corridor underground/underwater would not only preserve the 15.7 acres, not have a 115' wide freeway in a highly priced natural environment, and would actually RESTORE massive amounts of acerage for parks and developments. I expected to see this level of discussion, and without it, this SDEIS is incomplete and faulty. The local residents are gravely concerned that an extra-wide freeway -- as though land through this urban corridor was not valuable -- reflects the wrong values. The local residents expected the designs to reflect these values, and instead reflected thinking of the mid 20th century. So there will be improved cohesion, but the noise and visual blight of a massive freeway still enhances the mistakes of the past. This project analysis needs to reflect this for it to be complete.	Incomplete, Omisssion, Specific Alternatives not explored
I-311-611	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 75	594	Walter Oelwein	"Because the proposed project would have no long-term adverse direct or indirect effect on social elements, including public services and utilities, the analyst did not conduct a cumulative effects assessment (WSDOT et al. 2008)." Again, I would have expected the analyst to actually engage with the social elements -- presumably the people living near the corridor, to gain an understanding and assessment of the "social elements." The analyst would have quickly understood that there are indeed cumulative effects: A large freeway creates noise and visual blight that hurts the overall neighborhood feel, and in a highly prized location in city center, the impacts are magnified. This section clearly admits that there is no "social" in addressing the social impacts. This section also reveals that the analysts are relying on insufficient information to make their assessments, and in this case, no assessment at all. The local residents wholeheartedly disagree with this assessment that there are no cumulative social impacts to this project.	Incomplete, Omisssion, Specific Alternatives not explored

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-258

Environmental impact assessments are begun early in the design process so that the design may be improved by the input from stakeholders. See the response to I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues. Also see the response to comment C-311-005 regarding design enhancements included with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-259

Please see the response to comment I-311-164 regarding the aesthetic effects of noise walls. Also note that noise reduction measures included with 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. Please see the response to comment C-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-260

Please see the response to comment I-311-164 regarding the aesthetic effects of noise walls. Also note that, noise reduction measures included with 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. Please see the response to comment C-311-057

I-311-612	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 75	595	Walter Oelwein	"Without the project, neighborhoods along the corridor would retain their current characteristics and would not benefit from lids across SR 520 or a regional trail connecting areas east and west of Lake Washington." What do you mean, "Would not benefit"? The neighbors would argue that this corridor risks gradual erosion of quality of life, as a large and massive freeway with noise and visual blight still runs through it and all parkland nearby. To say that this is "retained" is poor and unsubstantiated analysis. If there were no 520, or if the 520 corridor was placed underground, I could imagine this area being a major growth area for the city, and not the status quo that the analysts conclude. This is horrible, incorrect, and mis-informed analysis and needs to be re-done with greater understanding of the social impact of having a large, noisy freeway that runs through parkland and residential neighborhoods.	Incomplete, Omisssion, Specific Alternatives not explored
I-311-613	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 76	596	Walter Oelwein	"The proposed project would benefit community cohesion as previously noted, but would also provide a social benefit through greater access to transit and improved transit service." In this section on social elements, you discount the impact of noise and visual blight on residences and parkland. It isn't articulated at all. When outside, and you can hear the freeway from a mile away, this has a social impact in that you are literally less social when outside. Seriously. You are less likely to be out on your deck, invite people over, and enjoy the outside. The same goes for going to the Arboretum. With a large freeway nearby, you are less likely to be social there. With a doubled-in-size freeway, this likelihood goes down further. This analysis is woefully incomplete.	Incomplete, Omisssion, Specific Alternatives not explored
I-311-614	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 76	597	Walter Oelwein	"The environmental justice analysis concluded that long-term operation of the SR 520 project would result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on low-income populations, and that all such effects would be related to tolling." You are making an argument to provide improved public, high-speed transportation, yet this wasn't designed in from the start. You should do the analysis first, and then the project design second. This is the conundrum you've gotten yourself into -- 8 lanes? 6 lanes? OK, 6 lanes. . . ok, now lets do the environmental analysis . . hmmm. . this affects low income populations disproportionately. If you had designed in high occupancy transit from the start, you would be able to say, "We are making it easy and affordable for low income populations to swiftly get to growing employment centers." This section indicates the faulty nature of the project, and needs to be revised to reflect the needs of the population, not interest groups who assume that more lanes is better.	Incomplete, Omisssion, Specific Alternatives not explored
I-311-615	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 73	598	Walter Oelwein	"WSDOT will continue to coordinate closely with the Muckleshoot Tribe to understand the extent to which the wider bridges would affect access to their usual and accustomed fishing areas." This statement indicates that the analysis is incomplete. I expect to see the results of the understanding of the extent the wider bridge would have in this document, not a commitment to find out the results. When you have the results of the extent the wider bridges affect fishing areas, then put it in the impact statement. This section reveals this document to be incomplete and unsupported. Additionally, this methodology of working with the Muckleshoot Tribe indicates that it is a best practice to interview affected populations. Earlier in this document you indicate that your analysts have not examined the cumulative social impacts because the analyst didn't figure there were any. Well, here you have an admittedly wider bridge span, and you anticipate (but have not pursued) the impacts to fishing. Similarly, you need to anticipate the wider-span's impact on the social impact of the local residents.	Incomplete, Omisssion, Specific Alternatives not explored

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-261

It is a project goal that aesthetics are integral to the new facility and not an appliqué. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-262

Comment noted. Noise reduction measures included with 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. Please see the response to comment C-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-263

Design development is an ongoing process, and the design options presented in the SDEIS are at a sufficient level of detail to compare their environmental effects. Environmental impact assessments are begun early in the design process so that the design may be improved by the input from stakeholders. If the public had to wait for the final design before commenting, there would be no opportunity for their comments to influence the design. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues. Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-616	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 80	599	Walter Oelwein	"Current socio/economic conditions highlight the importance of affordable mobility throughout the region." I would like an analysis that indicates what affordable mobility looks like. It would assume it is not via the expectation of purchasing a car, car insurance, gas and then tolls. I would assume that it is providing reliable public transportation. This project appears to have not taken this into account in the initial design. Therefore the project is not having the appropriate impact.	Specific alternatives not explored
I-311-617	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 80	600	Walter Oelwein	"Recent and current trends and stressors (such as continued regional population growth, urbanization and global climate change) indicate that the condition of fish and aquatic habitat would most likely continue to degrade into the reasonably foreseeable future." If you had done this analysis first, rather than at the end of the deisgn, then you would have taken a different approach to the design. You would have said, "Let's figure out a way to make this bridge create more habitat, rather than take it away." This would have led you to propose only underground/underwater solutions.	Specific alternatives not explored
I-311-618	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 83	601	Walter Oelwein	"Cumulative effects on low-income populations from tolling could be minimized by regional planning efforts to improve transit service and implement light-rail across the region." Again, this should be a design objective, rather than a mitigation plan. If you are going to "mitigate" the cumulative impact on low-income populations via increased light-rail, then you should design-in light rail as part of this project. This way it is actual improvement, actual investment, and meets the socio-cultural needs. Instead, you make a vague assertion that light rail will be improved across the region, but in this huge project, with an "important" transportation corridor, it is not designed as part of it. This means that you need to identify this SDEIS as faulty, as the impact is negative and not getting the benefit from the investment in time, space, noise, money, etc.	Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered
I-311-619	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 83	602	Walter Oelwein	"Ultimately, providing affordable housing in urban centers so that people could live closer to work would mitigate the adverse effects of expenses, potentially including tolling, that are associated with the daily commute." Ok, why do you have to wait for the "ultimate" moment? You should have designed this project as a way to address these problems, rather than just wait around until it is ultimately possible. Let's say you put 520 underground. You have now just increased huge amounts of acerage in a close-in neighborhood. You could put low-income housing there near public transporation. Instead, you are taking away up to 15.7 acres, creating all sorts of negative effects on precisely the areas that need to be examined on how to make things better. Your lack of design-thinking has prevented a massive opportunity, and needs to be addressed in this SDEIS.	Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered
I-311-620	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 84	603	Walter Oelwein	"Between 5.0 and 7.6 acres of parkland would be permanently converted from recreation use to WSDOT right-of-way, depending on the 6-Lane Alternative option." OK, again, you didn't talk about this in the social effects. Removing 7.6 acres of parkland has social effects, and needs to be directly acknowledged in the SDEIS. You would also benefit from doing an analysis that says, "OK, if we put the 520 bridge underground, how much parkland would we GAIN?" This needs to be articulated in the SDEIS to know what we are potentially missing out on with this project, that forever instills a large freeway where it could be put in a place that allows for large footprint, but without the noise and reclamation of parkland.	Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered
I-311-621	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 84	604	Walter Oelwein	"Option L would introduce a visual intrusion from a new bascule bridge across the Montlake Cut (a bascule bridge is a moveable bridge with a counter weight that continuously balances the span as each side is raised, somewhat similar to a drawbridge)." This is a major omission. You need to indicate that the second bascule bridge of Option A would introduce a visual intrusion. I would argue that it is worse than Option L, because it just makes the Montlake Blvd stretch seem more like a major freeway.	Omission

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-264

Please see the response to comment I-311-012 and comment I-311-118 regarding effects on Foster Island.

I-311-265

This table summarizes effects from the standpoint of a finished facility or structure, not construction effects.

The Portage Bay row of the table focuses on effects in the Portage Bay landscape unit. The Montlake bascule bridge is not visible from the Portage Bay Bridge due to tall mature trees in the western Shelby-Hamlin neighborhood. Effects from the new bascule bridges under Options A and L are evaluated in the Montlake landscape unit because the bridges are in Montlake, not Portage Bay. The visual quality effects of the new bascule bridges, when opened, would be temporary and minimal when compared to existing conditions.

I-311-266

The quoted text contained a typo and should read "OPTION K high: same as Option A" because Option A's width is the same as Option K's for the Portage Bay Bridge. This has been corrected in the errata included as Attachment 1 to the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report.

I-311-267

Traffic can have an effect on visual character and quality, as noted on page 44 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report: "In general, however, this is a vehicle-oriented environment and the aesthetic experience of pedestrians here is diminished by traffic, in particular at the Montlake Boulevard-Pacific Street intersection, the Montlake Boulevard overcrossing, and the Montlake transit stop under the Montlake overcrossing."

I-311-622	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 84	605	Walter Oelwein	"Options K and L would result in the greatest effects by moving the existing interchange east into McCurdy and East Montlake parks, which are primarily used for passive recreation activities such as walking, kayaking, canoeing, and bird watching." This discusses the impact on McCurdy and East Montlake park, but you don't mention the effort to keep Option K narrow throughout the corridor, nor do you mention how Foster Island is torn further apart by the wide footprint and no landbridge of Optoin A. This needs to be addressed if you are going to single out Option K and L. Option K and L were specifically designed by local residents to best preserve the parkland, and the fack that your analysis does not indicate this shows an anti-Option K/L bias that needs to be reconciled throughout this SDEIS.	Omission, Error
I-311-623	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 84	606	Walter Oelwein	"Many visitors and residents rent canoes here to explore the shoreline areas in the Arboretum north and south of the roadway." You go into a comparative analysis between Options A, L, and K, but do not mention in the impact of recreation on a bridge width that is twice the size. The existing freeway and its on-ramps makes it a less desirable recreational location (when it could be the absolute best), and this needs to be stated that we are starting from bad and moving to worse. Canoeing under a 115' span will not be very desirable, and may have a long-term impact on this recreational activity that brings to the character of the area. I'm surprised that this is not mentioned in the SDEIS, and indicates the cursory analysis that has been performed in this document.	Omission, Incomplete
I-311-624	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 84	607	Walter Oelwein	"Options A and L have a higher profile than Option K, meaning that, comparatively, the structure height above the water is greater and there are fewer columns that would be needed to support the roadway through the Arboretum. These higher profiles would help to minimize negative indirect effects on canoeing in the Arboretum." This needs to be re-written to indicate that Option K does not have a second bascule bridge, making thie kayaking better. This argument about higher profile is spurious -- I don't really think that it would be much different experience how high the bridge is -- it's a massive concrete freeway that cuts across a recreational area and causes damage to it as such. This is what it should say and the relative difference of the how high the bridge is is minimal -- it's all bad.	Omission, Incomplete
I-311-625	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 84	608	Walter Oelwein	"For many visitors, this could create a permanent perceived barrier and reduce the appeal to explore areas south of the roadway in the Arboretum." This discussion about Option K shows an anti-Option K bias and needs to be removed or re-written. Option K is the endorsed option by the residents -- they endorse it because it causes the least amount of damage to the recreational area, and this should be reflected in the analysis. Also--in many areas of this document, you indicate the actual design of the bridge structure is "To be determined", so for you to confidently say how far apart the columns are in this area seems to indicate that you do have an actual design in mind. Either amend this section or all of the other sections where you mention that you plan to actually design the bridge. Finally, you need to indicate that -- as part of the cumulative effects on recreation -- 520 bridge hurts recreation in the area. This is an obvious point that needs to be stated. The existing structure is foreboding, loud, cuts off recreation, etc. I expected to see this in the analysis, because it does have an impact. I would have then expected to see an analysis of what it would be like to canoe under a 115' foot bridge. The fact this isn't indicated in this SDEIS shows it it incomplete.	Omission, Incomplete

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

Opening of the bascule bridges in Option A would be synchronized, and due to the added capacity, the waiting cars would clear more quickly once the bridges closed. Please see the response to comment I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A.

I-311-268

The new bascule bridge of Option A would not be visible from most locations in Montlake; therefore, the overall rating of unity would not change due to the new bridge. Views from and along the Montlake Cut would change; however, the design of the new bascule bridge would be context sensitive to minimize its effects on the setting and view of the historic Carl F. Gould Montlake Bridge. Please see the responses to comments I-311-016 and I-311-150 regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge.

I-311-269

The visual quality assessment uses a professionally accepted, descriptive terminology and assessment methodology to ensure that evaluation results are objective and not biased by personal preferences. Trained professionals conduct the visual quality evaluations and all assessment reports are given close scrutiny by the design and environmental teams before the document is released. Given the definitions and evaluation tools for the visual quality ratings (vividness, intactness, and unity), unity was low for Option K. Please see the response to comment I-311-010 regarding the Visual Quality assessment included in the SDEIS.

I-311-270

The new bascule bridge of Option A would not be visible from most locations in Montlake; therefore, the overall rating of unity would not

I-311-626	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 85	609	Walter Oelwein	"Option K includes a lid across Foster Island, which would require substantial fill on either side of the lid to connect the lid to ground level. This would change the setting of Foster Island to more of a manicured urban park, which could affect the "integrity" of Foster Island for park users that prefer a more natural experience." OK, this is the first time in the document that I've noticed the landbridge across Foster Island referred to as a "lid". If this is the case, then you need to fix all other areas of the document that indicate it as a "land bridge." To me, "lid" sound like an earnest effort to reclaim parkland, eliminate the poor effects of a massive freeway cutting through it, and actually bring back the character of the island, rather than say that the "integrity" is hurt by the "manicured landscape." You need to indicate that the "integrity" is affected by a massive freeway soaring over Foster Island with Options A and L. YOu need to indicate the the "integrity" is affected by the noise, shadows, pollution, etc. You need to indicate the additional acreage provided by the lid with Option K, and add that into your calculations throughout this document. Finally, it is not clear why the lid necessarily requires a "manicured" landscape. Landscape architects can easily design a way for it to grow-in seamlessly with the current landscaping. This wouldn't take much time, and for it to be called out as a negative on Option K is absurd. Can you please indicate what the landscaping for Options A and L are? I believe that it would be are a large, dark, tunnel that has no landscaping, light, greenery, and would be much more "formal" in that it is brutalist and 115' wide and worse than the existing terrible pedestrian tunnel on Foster Island. This section needs to be re-written to better reflect the costs and benefits of adding a wider freeway, and then indicating the relative merits equally rather than calling out Option K's "formal landscape" as a negative while ignoring the brutal experience of Options L and A.	Omission, Incomplete, Error, Specific Design alternatives not discussed
I-311-627	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 85	610	Walter Oelwein	"Many of the direct and indirect effects to park and recreational resources would be positive by encouraging greater use of recreational resources, improving connectivity and linkages between parks, and improving noise levels and visual quality in certain locations." This is a dubious statement that needs to be revised in order for the document not to be lying to the general public. How does a wider footprint become "positive" right after discussing the impact on Foster Island? This statement is not supported, and appears to be inserted as basic text. I actually want to know where these "certain locations" are that are going to be better, because all I can see in the plans are a wider footprint over the existing parks. If you are specifically talking about the lids over Montlake and Delmar, then this needs to be stated. Overall, this section is hard to follow and doesn't help understanding of the impact of the project.	Omission, Incomplete, Error,
I-311-628	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 85	611	Walter Oelwein	"Park areas are protected under both federal and local regulations; mitigation in the form of replacement property, enhancement of existing park and recreational facilities, and/or replacement of lost functionality would be implemented." This statement reflects the "put the road down, then mitigate" attitude of this project, rather than the "let's try to maximize the design of this project." If you had gone into the project with a design challenge to actually restore the parkland to its prior state -- prior to the first 520 bridge or before -- you would have more earnestly identified construction designs underground that would meet the design goals. Instead, you have a middling project where the best you can say is that you are going to mitigate the damage that it will cause long term. Not impressive at this level of investment.	Omission, Incomplete, Error,
I-311-629	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 86	612	Walter Oelwein	"In 1936, John Olmsted made his last visit to the city to plan the Washington Park Arboretum." I would recommend a note that specifically states that Mr. Olmsted never designed a freeway to cut through the Washington Park Arboretum. The fact that this history is missing shows that this SDEIS is not earnestly trying to illuminate the impact of the 520 project.	Omission, Incomplete, Error,

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

change due to the new bridge. Views from and along the Montlake Cut would change; however, the design of the new bascule bridge would be context sensitive to minimize its effects on the setting and view of the historic Carl F. Gould Montlake Bridge. Please see the responses to comments I-311-016 and I-311-150 regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge and I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A.

I-311-271

Like Option A, the new bascule bridge would not be visible from many locations in Montlake, therefore the overall rating of unity would not change due to the new bridge. The design of the new bascule bridge would be context sensitive to minimize its effects on the setting and view of the historic Carl F. Gould Montlake Bridge. The visual quality assessment uses a professionally accepted, descriptive terminology and assessment methodology to ensure that evaluation results are objective and not biased by personal preferences. Trained professionals conduct the visual quality evaluations and all assessment reports are given close scrutiny by the design and environmental teams before the document is released.

I-311-272

The effect of noise walls on visual quality was evaluated under Option L. Option A of the SDEIS does not include noise walls in the visual quality analysis. However, visual effects are noted at the top of page 63 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report: “If sound walls [on Portage Bay Bridge] were desired by the community, the walls would block lateral views and diminish the sense of panorama.”

Please see the response to comment I-311-164 regarding the aesthetic effects of noise walls. Also note that, noise reduction measures included with the Preferred Alternative would reduce noise levels along the corridor to the point that noise walls are not recommended in the Seattle

I-311-630	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 86	613	Walter Oelwein	"Park and recreational resources are valued highly by Seattle residents." You need to also note, "Seattle residents, as a general rule, do not like large freeways cutting through parks and recreational resources." This is a bottom line fact that needs to be included with such a statement that indicates parks and recreation are important.	Omission, Incomplete, Error,
I-311-631	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 87	614	Walter Oelwein	"For example, traffic increased substantially on Lake Washington Boulevard, part of the 20-mile greenway originally envisioned by the Olmsted Brothers, following the construction of SR 520 in the 1960s, affecting the recreational setting of the Washington Park Arboretum." It should be indicated here WashDOT's complicity in this impact -- here are some things that you can write to improve understanding. "WashDOT did nothing to make sure Lake Washington Boulevard's traffic was at a level appropriate for the green space in its original 520 designs. 50 years later, we have done nothing but use it as an extended on-ramp, huring the character of the Olmstead park. Now, with the new designs, we have made no effort to design in a way to improve the park-like character of the park, and instead plan only to keep using it as an extended on-ramp." Without an honest discussion of what the existing 520 does, and the lack of design to address core impacts of the current and future design, this discussion is woefully incomplete.	Omission, Incomplete, Error,
I-311-632	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 88	615	Walter Oelwein	"Unlike the experience of past years, however, today's transportation improvement projects include mitigation in the form of replacement parkland." This statement makes an argument for addressing design flaws and aggressive take-overs of past projects. How is it OK to not use current investment to make things better, rather than just mitigate further freeway expansion? This statement requires an explanation from WashDOT why the current 520 design -- and lack of mitigation/destruction of parkland -- is still considered acceptible, and doesn't need to be addressed in this project.	Omission, Incomplete, Error,
I-311-633	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 88	616	Walter Oelwein	"In part, Section 4(f) requires "all possible planning" to minimize harm to affected properties. Section 6(f) stipulates that replacement property be provided, with agreement by agencies with jurisdiction." This makes an argument to put the 520 project underground. This way the 520 project actually creates replacement propert for other projects, rather than being the taker-away-er. Whenever you make a discussion of why you didn't decide to put the 520 project underground (such as in the executive summary), you need to cite that you missed opportunities to fulfill the law's intent to increase parkland in the study area.	Omission, Incomplete, Error,
I-311-634	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 88	617	Walter Oelwein	"Parklands in Seattle are further protected under Ordinance 118477, which specifies that all lands and facilities held now or in the future by the City of Seattle for parks and recreational purposes must be preserved or mitigated by providing replacement "land or a facility of equivalent or better size, value, location and usefulness in the vicinity, serving the same community and the same park purposes." Again, this appears to be an argument for not having a wider freeway overground through parkland, but for putting the freeway underground, and restoring parkland. This should apear in the executive summary as the following, "We did not take into account opporutnities to enhance City of Seattle parks, and identify ways to actually improve them. Instead, we started with the assumption of increasing the road size and hoping we don't violate City of Seattle ordinances in the review process."	Omission, Specific design options not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

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. Please see the response to comment C-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-273

Vividness is defined as is the degree of drama, memorability, or distinctiveness of the landscape components. The difference of 35 feet between Options A and K bridge widths in the eastern half of the bridge would not be measurably affect the vividness rating for views in the Portage Bay landscape unit. Please also see the response to comment I-311-272 and Exhibit1 2-1 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report for visualizations of the widths of the three options.

I-311-274

Option A of the SDEIS did not include noise walls in the visual quality analysis. Visual quality ratings are determined by assessing the proposed design in its future context. The design width and height are the essential dimensions that are used for the evaluation. See the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-275

Design development is an ongoing process, and the design options presented in the SDEIS are at a sufficient level of detail to compare their environmental effects. Environmental impact assessments are begun early in the design process so that the design may be improved by the input from stakeholders. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS

I-311-635	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 88	618	Walter Oelwein	"In compliance with the regulatory requirements discussed above, WSDOT and FHWA are working with the City of Seattle, the University of Washington, the State's Recreation and Conservation Office, and the National Park Service to identify appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that no long-term adverse effect on parkland and recreational resources would result from construction of the proposed project." This list of mitigations needs to be in the SDEIS, not the plan for discussions. A project that cuts through a park like this needs to start with these discussions, not wait until AFTER the SDEIS is published to reveal what these mitigations might be. It is unclear how WSDOT is going to identify ways to make this 115' span acceptibly mitigated. It should have approached the project with the attitude, "We want to return to Seattle parkland that we took away 50 years ago."	Omission, Specific design options not considered
I-311-636	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 89	619	Walter Oelwein	"Under any design option, the new interchange at Montlake Boulevard would permanently change the local visual environment with wider roadways, a new Portage Bay Bridge with a different appearance from the one there now, noise walls, and large stormwater treatment ponds with landscaped surroundings." This is an error-prone statement that indicates an anti-Option K bias. This statement implies that there is a second bridge with all design options. This sentence should start with "With the exception of Option K, which preserves the visual integrity of the area. . ."	Error
I-311-637	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 89	620	Walter Oelwein	"The bridges proposed under Options A and L would be similar to the existing bridge passing over Foster Island." This cannot possibly be true, since the bridge is twice as wide. Consider this an error that needs to be re-written as the following: "The bridges proposed under Options A and L would be significantly larger than the existing bridge passing over Foster Island, creating detrimental visual impact."	Error
I-311-638	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 89	621	Walter Oelwein	"With regard to Foster Island, Option K would have the greatest effect on visual quality and aesthetics from the removal of nearby forest and the addition of fill soil to create the land bridge." Here is an example of you calling the bridge over Foster Island a "land bridge" where earlier you call it a lid. A lid sounds much better, since it would effectively hide the doubled-in-size freeway running through park area. The fact that the authors continually cite that the fill somehow makes Foster Island worse - - but not a large 115' freeway under Options A and L -- is simply hiding something, and needs to be re-written to not reflect anti-Option K bias.	Error, Incorrect info, Omission
I-311-639	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 90	622	Walter Oelwein	"The proposed project would not produce indirect effects on visual quality and aesthetics because all changes to structures, landforms, and vegetation would be confined to the project area along the SR 520 corridor." This statement is incorrect. The visual quality of the corridor will be significantly worsened by a doubled-in-size freeway, the indirect effects of the lower visual quality will be fewer visitors to the area, lower esteem to the area, indicators that this area is not forward thinking. There are consequences of making a big freeway in an urban park -- this section is obliged to identify them, or else this analysis is incomplete, and the impact is not disclosed.	Error, Incorrect info, Omission
I-311-640	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 90	623	Walter Oelwein	"First, the analyst relied on the results of the visual quality assessment for direct effects," This was riddled with errors and omissions and does not reflect the general sentiment of people familiar with the local area. Therefore, this indirect effects analysis will be incorrect. I would imagine that over time, since freeways are the larger priority with this project, and not architecture, landscaping, and natural parkland, the indirect and cumulative visual effects is an ongoing statement of the values of the local area -- that we value freeways, roads, cars and not people, pedestrians, recreation, and public transport.	Error, Incorrect info, Omission

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues.

The purpose of the visual quality assessment is to disclose how the existing visual quality conditions would change due to the location, size, and character of the new facility. Visual quality ratings are determined by assessing the proposed design in its future context. The design width and height are the essential dimensions that are used for the evaluation. See the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS.

I-311-276

The flyer-over ramps start near 10th Avenue Bridge in Roanoke and do not influence Portage Bay visual quality ratings. Additionally, as discussed in Chapter 2 of the SDEIS, the new reversible HOV ramp would connect the SR 520 center HOV lanes with the I-5 reversible express lanes south of SR 520 and is included in all the SDEIS options.

I-311-277

The visual quality assessment uses a professionally accepted, descriptive terminology and assessment methodology to ensure that evaluation results are objective and not biased by personal preferences. Trained professionals conduct the visual quality evaluations and all assessment reports are given close scrutiny by the design and environmental teams before the document is released.

The averaged total rating for Option K was lower than Option A due to Option K's severe environmental and visual impacts on Foster Island due to the deforestation required to build the land bridge. Option A would have lower effects than Option K. Option K impacts are high in the Montlake area due to the tall walls needed for the depressed SPUI and the tunnel entrance. Please note that all options have lids over Montlake.

I-311-641	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 90	624	Walter Oelwein	"On balance, the cumulative effect on visual quality and aesthetics within the SR 520 study area and surrounding central Puget Sound region would be an increasingly urban visual character, to which the proposed project would make a small contribution with both beneficial and detrimental visual elements." Calling a freeway "Urban" isn't correct. It needs to be stated as "large roadway." Urban environments can be very pleasant, and the term urban implies a high density of people. Just about any street in Paris is pleasant, and is designed as such. Walking across Roanoke Street over I-5 is more of a "freeway" environment. There is a low density of people and buildings, and a high density of high-speed cars. This is much different. The discussion on the visual character of the bridge needs to better articulate what a bridge with cars on it is like, in comparison to an urban environment that is not freeway-centric. Please revise this section to indicate that the existing bridge adds an incongruous speeding freeway aesthetic to the Portage Bay environment, and that the expanded bridge takes it even further.	Omission
I-311-642	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 93	625	Walter Oelwein	"In general, an adverse cumulative effect on visual quality and aesthetics can be minimized by community planning efforts that establish context-sensitive architectural and design standards," This is a disengenuous statement that does not reflect the community's experience with the 520 project, so why would we expect this to be the case for other architectural projects. Namely, the 520 bridge through the West-Side neighborhoods is not unto itself context-sensitive. This needs to be acknowledged in the SDEIS: "The local residents do not feel that the current designs for the 520 bridge are context-sensitive." Next, I expected to see specific measures that would be taken to "mitigate" (I'm not sure what they would be, hence I'm reading the document), but instead I'm seeing a "We'll figure it out later" attitidue, which does not meet the standard of answering the question at the heading, "How could the cumulative effect on visual quality and aesthetics be mitigated?" If the project itself cannot be context-sensitive, how would other architecture be context-sensitive? Also, since the 520 bridge becomes the dominant context in the local area, do we now expect future architecture to be neo-brutalist freeway when making context-sensitive architecture? This section needs to be re-written to actually list out what the possible mitigations are for putting a massive freeway through neighborhoods, a bay and parklands.	Omission, Error
I-311-643	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 93	626	Walter Oelwein	"Puget Sound Regional Council, which is composed of jurisdictions at many different levels, takes visual quality into account as a shared community value contributing to the quality of life throughout the region" This statement is an argument against the current designs for 520 and needs to make a re-set to the project from an aesthetic perspective. If the values of the community is to contribute to the visual quality, how is it that you have no designer that can take credit for enhancing the visual quality of the area? Instead, you have "options" that reflect creativity in design only from local residents. For this SDEIS to be accurate, you need to say, "WSDOT did not address this goal in arriving at initial ideas for the roadway. We simply place a larger roadway over the existing footprint, and then realized that for it to meet the regional values, we had to do something else, so we engaged in a long negotiation with various interest groups and came up with three options that we have to write a EIS for comparing all of these."	Omission, Error, Specific design options not considered
I-311-644	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 93	627	Walter Oelwein	"increasing urbanization." I object to the concept that the freeway is considered "urban". Freeways such as these are more likely to be found in ex-urban and sub-urban locales. In Paris, freeways have been hidden underground. In Vancouver, no freeways go near downtown or the close-in neighborhoods. The freeway into San Francisco is an architectural delight, but then the freeway disappears into surface streets. You need to change the term to "freeway environment" because it is completely inhospitible to people.	Error

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

Please see the responses to comments I-311-012 and I-311-118 regarding effects on Foster Island, I-311-153 regarding the visual quality analysis, and I-311-010 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-278

The difference between the professional visual quality analyst's scores and the neighborhood scores are most likely due to a misunderstanding on the part of the neighborhood assessor of the terminology and rating system used for visual quality assessment. The visual quality assessment uses a professionally accepted, descriptive terminology and assessment methodology to ensure that evaluation results are objective and not biased by personal preferences. Trained professionals conduct the visual quality evaluations and all assessment reports are given close scrutiny by the design and environmental teams before the document is released. Please see the response to comment I-311-010 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS.

Please see the response to comment I-311-030 regarding the workgroups that coordinated with WSDOT and FHWA in the development of mitigation measures and design refinements that are included with the Preferred Alternative. Please see the response to comment C-311-005 regarding design enhancements included with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-279

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-645	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 94	628	Walter Oelwein	"from visual intrusion caused by more prominent roadway and bridge structures." The term "visual intrusion" is not mentioned in the Visual Quality section (with the exception of Option L's bascule bridge), but it is mentioned in the cultural resources section. This needs to be corrected, because this would make the document internally inconsistent. In this section, it is assumed that the wider freeway is a "visual intrusion", yet this is not mentioned in the visual quality section, so it appears that you are hiding something in the Visual Quality assessment.	Error, Omission
I-311-646	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 94	629	Walter Oelwein	"No indirect noise effects were identified from construction or operation." OK, this is an incomplete analysis then. There is a general concern in the local neighborhoods that increasing traffic will creating more cut-through and spill-over traffic. With that is car-noise. Delmar/Lynn and Furhman/Boyer are streets that deal with much of this noise, especially during commuting hours. With the generally agreed up on increase in traffic, there is curiousity and concern that surface-level street noise will increase as a result of the ineffectiveness of this project. Or, perhaps, maybe this project would be successful at reducing/preventing cut-through traffic. We don't know, it isn't analyzed.	Omission
I-311-647	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 93	630	Walter Oelwein	"Even with noise walls present, however, relative noise levels would still increase between now and 2030, because traffic volumes would increase over time. For a detailed discussion of these effects, see the Noise Discipline Report (WSDOT 2009b)." If this is the case, then is it not clear that the basic design is inadequate? You state earlier that the current design is actually louder than in other areas near freeways, and then you state that, yes, this contemporary freeway, over time, is going to be even louder. Now this is unacceptable design, and you are making an argumnet to identify ways to make noise better (espeically in the context of the failed bridge noise efforts of the past). So you are now obliged to state what the alternative would be: Put the bridge underground so that there would be noise levels similar to pre-520. This has many other benefits. Additionally, I expect to see in your analysis additional noise abatement strategies, such as quieter pavement, lower speed limits, and other things that traffic engineers across the world have come up with. Yet this document only mentions noise walls, which this statement demonstrates as ultimately ineffective. Back to the drawing board, WSDOT!	Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered
I-311-648	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 99	631	Walter Oelwein	This section is entirely lacking. Given that noise is a big factor in choosing a household, having an ongoing source of noise nearby, and edified, will surely have an impact on home values. I would expect a discussion on this here. With lower home values, there are effects of lower tax revenues and economic activity. This has a cumulative impact I'm sure. I'm surprised that this hasn't come up at all, since this is a big issue with putting a freeway in an urban environment. This could also create a "tipping point" in the direction of putting the freeway underground (and the bike lane over ground), because this would surely enhance home values, and would possible create additional revenue for the state. We don't know because this has not been analyzed.	Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-280

The use of a design competition for the Portage Bay Bridge was a recommendation from the mediation group that the State could consider. The design of any option or build alternative, not just Option A, would be in accordance with WSDOT design manuals and would involve the Seattle Design Commission. The Seattle Design Commission currently participates in design discussions and will continue to be involved as design development progresses. WSDOT's design manuals are mandatory design documents and provide primary standards that would be used for any alternative.

The decision-making process for this project has lasted over 10 years and has incorporated extensive participation from stakeholder groups, communities, and the public. See the Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Discipline Report and Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for further information. Please see the responses to comments I-311-001 regarding the purpose of the SDEIS and the process for identifying the alternatives presented, I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues, I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding the range of alternatives and options evaluated and the consideration of a tunnel.

I-311-281

Certain elements in the SDEIS were evaluated under one option, but could possibly be used in others. For example, noise walls were analyzed for visual quality under Option L, however they could be used on any option. This allows for an analysis of the effects of different elements, and allows for some design flexibility and refinement and the project progresses. Please see the response to Comment I-311-280 regarding a design competition.

I-311-282

Simulations are provided for the alternatives under consideration based

I-311-649	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 99	632	Walter Oelwein	"How could the cumulative effect on noise be mitigated?" This entire section basically expresses hope that things will get better, without taking responsibility beyond noise walls. This section identifies how urban centers are important, yet you are designing a large elevated freeway throughout. You need to reconsider this proposition and figure out how to get the freeway out of noise-producing, and put it underground. Or, actively offer up lots of ways to keep cars quieter or just have a quiet train (Monorail?) use the corridor instead of cars. This section reflects the poor design thinking throughout this project. A design goal would be to reduce or eliminate noise from the freeway -- perhaps the thing that makes this project most undesirable for anyone near it -- this would mean as a starting point putting it underground. All other options totally fail to meet this design goal. Instead, you put the default roadway placement down, and then hoped you could figure out how to mitigate it. You failed. So the Environmental Impact of the project: Poor. This is not something that you want to put on your resume.	Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered
I-311-650	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 104	633	Walter Oelwein	"Major efforts are underway to reduce vehicle miles traveled and to improve the overall efficiency of the transportation system." This statement is in contradiction to much of the rest of this document. If "major efforts" are underway to reduce vehicle miles traveled, then why create a larger freeway? You need to align your freeway design to these "Major efforts." The current default roadway expansions are not aligning to this, and this is an argument to re-design the freeway to support these major efforts.	Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered
I-311-651	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 104	634	Walter Oelwein	"How could the cumulative effect on air quality be mitigated?" Wherever you ask this question, you should also have a section that asks, "What are the design elements that support this goal?" (i.e., "How did we design this project to have the most positive impact on air quality?") This needs to be added for all of the discipline reports, because otherwise it isn't clear about what you've actually done to make this a positive project on all of the things that you are obliged to report the impact on. If you were obliged to answer this, you could better argue in favor of the project, rather than apologize for the project's shortcomings and identify elements that need to be mitigated. So for air quality, if you designed the project for being underground, you could say, "We designed the project to be underground so that emmissions from cars -whatever the technology -- will not be spewed into the air, and will be captured and managerd, contributing to the long-term goal of reducing pollutants." With this current design, you can say, "We have no design elements aimed at improving air quality. Instead, we have many design that add to pollutants -- by adding more lanes, we have increased capacity, meaning more cars and thus more pollutants. The design of this project does not aim at improving air quality." This would be an appropriate assessment of the impact of this project.	Error, Omission, Specific Design Alternatives not considered
I-311-652	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 105	635	Walter Oelwein	"proportional to the e higher construction" This appears to be a typo	Error
I-311-653	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Overall	636	Walter Oelwein	The indirect and cumulative effects analysis is uncreative and does not reflect many of the intangibles that this section has the opportunity to identify. There is much concern by the local residents that this freeway, as a wider car-centric entity, creates the wrong image of what this city strives to become -- a leader in creating a sustainable transportation, commercial, and residential living. The overall message of this freeway is much different: We put highways through parkland, we don't know how to do mass-transit, we are car-centric. This has wide-spread indirect and cumulative effects: Employers will not locate here, people will not see the Pacific NW as desirable. This has the chance to erode future investment, or indicate that further transportation investments are going to be car-centric.	Specific alternatives not explored

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

on existing conditions. WSDOT considered a wide range of alternatives before narrowing them down to those evaluated in the Draft EIS. Removing and not replacing the bridge did not meet the purpose and need of the project and therefore, was not considered. Please see the response to comment I-311-007 regarding the range of alternatives evaluated for the SR 520 project.

I-311-283

Exhibit 2-8 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report is an accurate simulation of the view looking west toward Portage Bay Bridge from mid-point of Montlake Boulevard overpass. Exhibit 2-9, which is located on the referenced page, is an accurate simulation of the view looking east toward 24th Avenue East from mid-point of Montlake Boulevard overpass. Neither exhibit is made to “hide” nor “deemphasize” any part of the project. Visualizations have been updated for the Preferred Alternative and are included in Attachment 2 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

I-311-284

Exhibit 2-10 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report is referenced on page 65 the report in the first paragraph, which discusses the UW triangle area. The greatest visual effects are in the SR 520-MOHAI area and are discussed on page 66 (all) and reference Exhibits 2-15 and 2-21.

I-311-285

Exhibit 2-11 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report illustrates that the Option K lid over Pacific Street would not interfere with views of the distance and Mount Rainier (Exhibit 2-11, Attachment 2). The ratings summary notes that “In the southeast campus area of the university, intactness and unity could increase if the depressed

I-311-654	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Overall	637	Walter Oelwein	This report shows very little in terms of mitigation for the indirect and cumulative effects of the project. Most of the time, it is reliant on "working with the community" in the future, when there is nothing being offered as possible ways that "working with the community" would actually make the overall enviornment better. This kind of language needs to be replaced with other language that specifically brainstorms ideas for mitigation on the various indirect and cumulative effects. If, after 10 years of study, WSDOT is unable to offer ideas, then it is not qualified to document what mitigations are, making this analysis and report suspect.	Specific alternatives not explored
I-311-655	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Overall	638	Walter Oelwein	This document needs to describe how the design of the bridge specifically addresses the various needs of the project. Offering mitigation for each of the domain areas implies that the project is a failure from the start, and mitigation is necessary for correcting the poor impact it has on the various components being studied. In addition to this examination, the project needs to discuss what elements of the design specifically aimed at making the various disciplines BETTER. For example, I would have rather read about how, in deciding to replace the bridge, the designers thought through specicially what they are going to do to make it the quietest freeway possible. This is frequently done in discussing green building design, "We put in cisterns to reclaim water, we put in flushless toilets, etc." I expect this level of discussion for a 4.5+ billion dollar freeway. Instead, we get, "We're building a freeway, and if the people want noise walls, I guess that we can put them in. It's up to them. We don't think that there's a lot of noise, so whatever."	Incomplete, Specific alternatives not explored
I-311-656	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 110	639	Walter Oelwein	"How could cumulative effects on energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions be mitigated?" This section is entirely uncreative and needs to be revised. Here are some ideas: Shut down the freeway on the weekends. Lower the speed limit. No trucks at certain hours. Only electric, low-noise vehicles allowed, turn it into a recreation facility during the weekends, convert more lanes to high occupancy transit. If you are serious about mitigating greenhouse gas emission,s you need to identify how this project can contribute to this effort, rather than just state the various things that are happening external to the project. This, as well as other sections that reflect a similar amount of lack of creativity, need to be written. You're not off the hook, WSDOT! Be creative and document these ideas.	Incomplete, Specific alternatives not explored
I-311-657	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 111	640	Walter Oelwein	"There would be no adverse indirect effects associated with the operation of stormwater quality treatment facilities as part of the project action." This is entirely incorrect. One obvious one that have been brought up to WSDOT on many occasions is that the stormwater quality treatment basins underneath the bridge are ugly. It's fair to say that not much thinking has been put into the design of these catch basins. This has an indirect effect of making the visual quality worse, and, in turn, the cumulative effects are also impacted (ugly freeways = lower quality of life). This needs to be documented and discussed for this SDEIS to meet minimum standards.	Incomplete, Specific alternatives not explored

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

intersection results in the removal of overhanging wires, lamps, and signage and creates better pedestrian and vehicle orientation and circulation." The walls and canyons mentioned in your comment refer to the SR 520 lid at Montlake and the SPUI for the tunnel, not the Pacific St lid.

I-311-286

Exhibit 2-14 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report is an accurate simulation of the view looking from east end of Shelby Street across East Montlake Park toward Marsh Island. Exhibit 2-15, which is located on the referenced page, is an accurate simulation of the view looking northeast from Lake Washington Boulevard at MOHAI and McCurdy Park trees. Neither exhibit is made to "deemphasize" any part of the project. Visualizations have been updated for the Preferred Alternative and are included in Attachment 2 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

I-311-287

Exhibit 2-15 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report is illustrating the effect of the Montlake lid and is referenced in the Montlake landscape unit discussion on project effects. Foster Island is discussed in West Approach landscape unit section (see pages 69-72 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report) and has its own visualizations.

Exhibit 2-16, which is located on the referenced page, is an accurate simulation of the view looking south from Foster Island's north shoreline toward SR 520. A visualization of the view looking northwest at south entrance of Foster Island pedestrian tunnel under SR 520 was added to the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report Addendum as Exhibit 2-34.

I-311-658	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 115	641	Walter Oelwein	"In general, Option K would have more operational effects from the project than Options A and L. Wetland fill from Option K would be three times more than from Option L and nine times more than from Option A. Option K would have the greatest shade effects from project operation, and Option A would have the least. Option K would have the most fill effects from project operation on buffers, followed by Option L, then Option A. Option L, however, would have the most effects from shading, and Option K would have slightly more shading effects than Option A." I contest this analysis entirely, and believe it needs to be re-done. Option K has the narrowest footprint, it moves underground a large stretch of road, so it doesn't make sense that Option K has the most shade effects. Additionally, Option K has additional lid space (as is specifically documented in this report), which would add to the ecosystem, so this analysis appears to discount this impact. Option A, in contrast, has the widest roads, the most surface roads, and the highest bridge span. That doesn't seem to translate to the best option. I suspect that this analysis reflects anti-Option K bias by the project members. Secondly, the comparison to the no-build altenative is missing in this section, which effectively hides the fact that this is a much wider road, so the shade effects are much worse, and needs to be articulated here.	Incorrect, error, omission
I-311-659	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 117	642	Walter Oelwein	"Transportation systems, which are a component of the overall urban development pattern within the Central Puget Sound Region, have historically played a key part in these ecosystem changes (PSRC 2009a)." This section needs to cite the original 520 project's wetland impact specifically. This discussion hides the issue that the original 520, which this plan essentially doubles, was a poorly conceived project from a "protect the wetlands" perspective. Instead, you address this section as though the existing 520 project is somehow acceptible, even though it cuts through large wetland areas. While you mention the construction of 520 as contributing to the wetland destruction, you need to revise this section to indicate what impact 520 has had over the years.	Incorrect, error, omission
I-311-660	Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Section 118	643	Walter Oelwein	"WSDOT avoided many impacts to wetlands through careful identification of sensitive areas early in the design process. Where avoidance was not possible, effects were minimized by raising bridge heights, treating stormwater, and improving water quality functions of aquatic wetlands". This is the first time I hear about "the design process" in this SDEIS. However, I disagree with the assessment that avoidance is not possible. If you put it underground far enough, you would avoid wetland damage-- and create acreage of new wetlands. You need to cite that, despite this obvious opportunity to improve wetlands, WSDOT specifically rejected this option early in the process, but hasn't stated why. Instead we get higher bridges, stormwater off of concrete, etc.	Incorrect, error, omission

The margins and font of this exhibit have been adjusted to properly display in this document

I-311-288

The visual quality effects of the new bascule bridge, when opened, would be temporary and minimal when compared to existing conditions. Please see the responses to comments I-311-016 and I-311-150 regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge and I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A. Please see the response to comment I-311-153 regarding the visual quality effects of Option K.

I-311-289

Comment noted. Exhibit 2-23 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report is an accurate simulation of the view looking west from northeast corner of East Montlake Park toward Montlake Bridge.

I-311-290

Please see the response to comment I-311-010 regarding views from East Shelby Street. Views from East Shelby Street in Roanoke were evaluated and it was determined that the second bascule bridge under Option A would not change the visual quality of the view and that the Option L bascule bridge would change the view slightly. Please see the responses to comments I-311-016 and I-311-150 regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge.

I-311-291

The Phased Implementation scenario was discussed in the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report on Pages 60-61 and 74 as well as in the SDEIS on Page 6-132. The landscape units correlate to the project components in the SDEIS Phased Implementation Scenario. See the response to Comment I-311-074 regarding revised potential phasing.

I-311-292

The exhibit indicated the presence of a new bascule bridge through a text label.

I-311-293

Please see the response to comment I-311-149. The SDEIS Options A, K, and L, as well as the Preferred Alternative are all 6-lane options and are correctly described in the EIS documents.

I-311-294

The Preferred Alternative has been designed to minimize SR 520's footprint as much as possible while allowing room for HOV lanes and the shoulders required to satisfy current safety standards regulated by FHWA and the Association of American State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). Highway lanes and shoulders are designed to standards that have been established to protect the safety of drivers. When circumstances warrant a change from these standards, WSDOT must request FHWA's approval of a "design deviation." WSDOT has already obtained approvals for design deviations for both lane and shoulder widths in response to community requests for a narrower roadway footprint. In the interest of safety, FHWA will not approve further narrowing of the corridor.

I-311-295

Please see the response to comment I-311-294 regarding the project footprint. The transportation analysis conducted for the SDEIS was consistent with industry standards, NEPA requirements, regional planning process, and FHWA traffic analysis guidelines for evaluating and comparing existing and future transportation project alternatives.

The analysis showed that the project's purpose of improving the movement of people and goods across SR 520 would be met with the 6-Lane Alternative. Please see the responses to comments I-311-003 and I-311-004 regarding the project purpose and need.

See the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project. The project is a replacement of an existing highway. It is a transportation project, with a purpose and need of improving safety and mobility for people and goods, as stated on page 1-3 of the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-296

Please see the response to Comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues. The comment's characterizations that WSDOT did not create "designs that meet the transportation and environmental needs," did not "do due diligence," and that the project "was conducted without the community in mind" are inaccurate. The project is a replacement of an existing highway. The decision-making process for this project has lasted over 10 years and has incorporated extensive participation from stakeholder groups, communities, and the general public. See the Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Discipline Report and Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) and the Range of Alternatives and Options Examined report (Attachment 8 to the SDEIS) for further information.

I-311-297

As explained on page 1-37 of the SDEIS, the SR 520 Variable Tolling Project will implement tolling on SR 520 in 2011 for the primary purpose of managing traffic congestion. This toll would remain in place until the construction of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project and would then be replaced with new tolls adopted by the Transportation Commission to provide project funding in accordance with the financing plan. Although

the state Legislature has authorized allocation of revenues from the Variable Tolling Project to fund the SR 520 Pontoon Construction Project and the SR 520, Medina to SR 202: Eastside Transit and HOV Project, the toll would be removed when the bonds for those projects are repaid, which is expected to be before 2030. Therefore, if the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project were not built, there would be no toll in effect in 2030, which is the year used to compare the No Build Alternative and the Build alternatives. This is why the baseline No Build Alternative assumption is that the SR 520 corridor would not be tolled.

The purpose and need of the SR 520 project is to improve safety and mobility for people and goods between Redmond and Seattle. It was shown in the Draft EIS that the Four Lane Alternative would not meet that purpose and need because there would still be congestion points along the SR 520 corridor that would impede bus and carpool travel more severely than the 6-Lane Alternative.

The 4-Lane Alternative evaluated in the 2006 Draft EIS was assumed to be tolled, and was determined not to meet the project purpose and need. As discussed in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS, tolled and “transit-optimized” 4-lane alternative options also would not satisfy the project purpose and need, and therefore have not been advanced for the project. In response to public comments, WSDOT conducted a sensitivity analysis of a tolled 4-Lane Alternative. This alternative was found to provide minimal improvements to mobility compared to No Build. The addition of the HOV lanes improves person-mobility to a much greater degree than any 4-lane option, particularly for users of transit and carpools. Section 5.1 of the Final EIS and the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) provide additional information.

I-311-298

Please see the response to comment I-311-297 regarding tolling and consideration of 4-lane alternatives.

The HOV policy for SR 520 is established by WSDOT within the authority allowed by the legislature, independently of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina Project. This means WSDOT could adjust the HOV lane policy in the future if doing so would better meet the intent of the authorizing legislation, while maintaining the HOV performance standard of speeds 45 mph or greater at least 90 percent of the time during peak hours. The performance standard is stipulated for SR 520 by ESHB 6392 (codified in RCW 47.56.870), which also designates a 3+ carpool requirement for use of the HOV lanes when the project is completed. The State's HOV lane operations policy would be used to identify when the HOV lanes' operational thresholds were met and when an adjustment to the occupancy requirement would be recommended; however, the State would need to request legislative approval to make any modifications.

I-311-299

See the response to Comment I-311-298 regarding the HOV lane designation for the SR 520 corridor. The 3+ assumption was evaluated in the Draft EIS, SDEIS, and Final EIS, and has been shown to result in free flow operations in the HOV lane with bus service levels near 600 vehicles per day.

I-311-300

The statement is part of the description of the 6-Lane Alternative evaluated in the SDEIS. The alternative and its design options were presented in the SDEIS for the purpose of NEPA environmental analysis. There are no plans at this time to expand the width of the roadway. If the final design is likely to have effects beyond those disclosed in the EIS, additional analysis may be required.

Regarding the "bid requests describing a larger profile" as mentioned in the comment, please see the response to Comment C-040-052 regarding a drawing presented in the SR 520 Pontoon Construction

Project Design-Build Request for Proposals. The depiction represents a possible future design consideration for bidders to consider. It does not represent the project that is proposed by WSDOT and evaluated in the EIS.

I-311-301
The lids are integral to the project design and would be constructed at the same time as the section of the SR 520 corridor in which they are located (e.g., the Montlake lid would be completed at the same time as the Montlake interchange improvements). WSDOT has never proposed to defer the lids until after completion of the SR 520 roadway improvements.

I-311-302
See the response to comment I-311-292.

I-311-303
Noise analysis for the SDEIS is consistent with current FHWA methodology, which is the accepted standard for mitigation of highway traffic noise. Please see the response to comment C-311-057 regarding quieter pavement, and regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-304
The text here explains that Option K was recommended to not include noise walls; however, WSDOT regulations require that noise walls be recommended where they meet the feasibility and reasonableness criteria. As discussed in the Noise Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SEIS), noise walls were analyzed for all SDEIS options.

Noise reduction strategies included with 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 as noted in the responses to previous comments), including lowering the speed limit on Portage Bay Bridge. See the responses to comments I-311-005 and I-311-057 regarding design enhancements and noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-305

Noise reduction strategies 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. Please see the response to comment C-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative, and regarding quieter concrete pavement.

I-311-306

Exhibit 1-8 illustrated prioritization of the Phased Implementation scenario that was evaluated in the SDEIS. See the response to Comment I-311-074 regarding potential phasing. The lids are integral to the project design and would be constructed at the same time as the section of the SR 520 corridor in which they are located (e.g., the Montlake lid would be completed at the same time as the Montlake interchange improvements). This was true for the Phased Implementation Scenario as well. WSDOT has never proposed to defer the lids until after completion of the SR 520 roadway improvements. See Chapter 3 of the Final EIS for a discussion of construction sequencing with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-307

See the responses to comments I-311-074 regarding potential project phasing and I-311-306 regarding the timing of construction of lids.

I-311-308

See the response to Comment I-311-306 regarding the construction of lids included with the project. Lids are integral to the project design and are not considered mitigation. Lids are transportation right-of-way and are not considered mitigation for effects on parks, although they will provide open space and benefits to active and passive recreation. Mitigation is an ongoing process and WSDOT will continue to work with local agencies and affected communities to develop mitigation measures throughout the design process. Mitigation, including both required and proposed mitigation, is discussed in Chapters 5 and 6 of the SDEIS and Final EIS.

I-311-309

Please see the responses to comments I-311-074 regarding potential phasing and I-311-306 regarding the construction of lids included with the project.

I-311-310

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report. Page 2-1 discusses freeway traffic, as mentioned in the comment. The nonmotorized transportation section (pedestrians and bicyclists) begins on page 2-11 and transit section begins on page 2-12. Additionally, Chapter 7 of the report discusses nonmotorized transportation effects and Chapter 8 discusses transit effects.

I-311-311

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report. Page 2-1 discusses freeway traffic, as

mentioned in the comment. The nonmotorized transportation section (pedestrians and bicyclists) begins on page 2-11 and transit section begins on page 2-12. Additionally, Chapter 7 of the report discusses nonmotorized transportation effects and Chapter 8 discusses transit effects.

I-311-312

See the response to comment I-311-004 for a discussion on how the 6-lane Alternative would improve mobility over the No Build Alternative. The growth associated with the No Build Alternative includes projected improvements in the transit network that has been provided by the transit agencies, therefore, the modeling effort completed already includes the mode shift to transit. Because the SR 520 corridor is already congested for long periods of the day under existing conditions, the addition of 17% more traffic during the day, and most of that growth occurring during the peak commute periods, would result in longer periods of congestion. More congestion along the corridor would also result in slower travel times for more people, or a degradation in person mobility.

I-311-313

See the response to comment I-311-004 for a discussion on how the 6-lane Alternative would improve mobility over the No Build Alternative. See the response to comment I-311-297 regarding tolling the No Build Alternative, and I-311-003 regarding why retrofitting the existing bridge is not a reasonable alternative.

I-311-314

Please see the response to comment I-311-297 regarding tolling the No Build Alternative, and I-311-003 regarding why retrofitting the existing bridge is not a reasonable alternative.

I-311-315

Please see the response to comment I-311-297 regarding tolling the No Build Alternative and consideration of 4-lane alternatives, and I-311-003 regarding why retrofitting the existing bridge is not a reasonable alternative.

I-311-316

Growth in regional traffic demand, including cross-lake demand, is based on population and employment growth. The statement reflects this concept. A more detailed discussion of traffic demand and the alternatives can be found in Chapter 3 of the Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS).

I-311-317

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report. Page 2-1 discusses freeway traffic, as mentioned in the comment. The transit section begins on page 2-12. Additionally, Chapter 8 of the report discusses transit effects.

I-311-318

The 4-Lane Alternative was analyzed in the Draft EIS and it was not determined to meet the project purpose and need. Please see the responses to comments I-311-003 and I-311-007 regarding the range of alternatives evaluated for the SR 520 project and I-311-297 regarding tolling the No Build Alternative and consideration of 4-lane alternatives.

I-311-319

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report. Page 2-1 discusses freeway traffic, as mentioned in the comment. The summary information for transit information can be found on page 2-12. Additionally, Chapter 8 of the report is dedicated to the discussion of effects on transit.

I-311-320

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report. Page 2-1 discusses freeway traffic, as mentioned in the comment. The summary information for transit information can be found on page 2-12. Additionally, Chapter 8 of the report is dedicated to the discussion of effects on transit and the removal of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station is discussed in pages 8-20 through 8-25 of the report.

I-311-321

As stated on page 1-5 of the Transportation Discipline Report, high-occupancy vehicles include vehicles with 3+ occupancy; that includes buses. The removal of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station is part of the underlying assumptions included in the transportation analysis for the build alternatives.

I-311-322

The decrease in general-purpose vehicle and person trips would be a result of implementing the 6-lane alternative. The decrease here is in comparison to the No Build Alternative.

I-311-323

The addition of HOV lanes to the corridor, with no increase in the existing number of general-purpose lanes, is expressly intended to improve the speed and reliability of transit service, providing an incentive to use transit. As noted in the discussion of project need on page 1-6 of the SDEIS, the prospect of substantially increased travel times in 2030 “makes it imperative that commuters be provided with travel choices that allow them to avoid driving along, and that the proposed project be built to support increased use of transit and HOVs.” As discussed in Section 5.1 of the SDEIS and Final EIS, HOV and transit commuters would

experience substantial travel time benefits in 2030 with the addition of the HOV lane.

I-311-324

As stated in the response to Comment I-311-017, based on standard methodology, the local study area reported in the Final EIS was determined by the change in traffic volumes on the local streets with the No Build Alternative versus the Preferred Alternative during peak hours; only intersections where traffic volumes would increase by more than 5 percent were included. Five percent was selected as the criterion because a change in traffic of that amount could result in measurable operational changes. If traffic volume increases were less than 5 percent on adjacent streets, the intersection was not included in the analysis. Thus, all intersections not included in the local study area would experience an overall change in traffic volumes during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours of less than 5 percent with implementation of the project.

I-311-325

As described in Chapter 5 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report, all of the 6-Lane Alternative options, except for Option A during the afternoon peak period, would result in an increase of up to 6 percent in vehicle demand across the lake compared to the No Build Alternative. However, project improvements to the SR 520 mainline and an additional HOV lane would increase vehicle throughput across the lake by up to 14 percent compared to the No Build Alternative. Option A with suboptions would have traffic volumes and operations similar to the No Build Alternative because ramp configurations and connections to the local street system, while different from today, would not substantially change traffic circulation patterns compared to the No Build Alternative. See Chapter 5 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report for additional detail regarding traffic volume changes on SR 520 and connecting ramps and roadways associated with Options A, K, and L. Chapter 6 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report further

describes the effects of the options on local roadway traffic volumes and operations. As shown in Exhibits 6-1 and 6-2 of the Transportation Discipline Report, traffic volumes on Lake Washington Boulevard would be similar with the No Build Alternative and Option A with suboptions during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours in the year 2030.

I-311-326

Please see the response to comment I-311-325 regarding vehicle demand and the analysis of the effects on local streets. As shown in Exhibits 6-5, 6-6, 6-8, and 6-9 of the Transportation Discipline Report, traffic volumes at the I-5 SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke and I-5/Northeast 45th Street interchanges would be similar with the No Build Alternative and Suboption A during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours in the year 2030.

I-311-327

Please see the response to comment I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A.

I-311-328

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report briefly summarized the findings and was not intended to include the level of detail contained in the rest of the document. Page 5-15 of the Transportation Discipline Report noted that both Options K and L “would increase roadway capacity in the Montlake area. Traffic patterns would shift in response to this new capacity…”

I-311-329

The comment’s characterization that the text is “vague and unsupported” and implies that “Option A relieves all congestion” is incorrect. Page 2-5 of the Transportation discipline report discusses the effects of all options, and states that “Option A would increase traffic volumes on SR 520” and that an auxiliary lane would “help reduce westbound congestion” not that

Option a would eliminate congestion. Chapter 2 is a summary of the key finding of the report, and detailed information on effects in the Portage Bay area can be found in Chapters 5 and 6.

I-311-330

As discussed on page 5-15 of the Transportation Discipline Report, “With the new structure (tunnel or bridge) across the Montlake Cut, both options would increase roadway capacity in the Montlake area. Traffic patterns would shift in response to this new capacity, increasing traffic volumes on the on- and off-ramps at the new Montlake area interchange. Without the westbound auxiliary lane between the new interchange and I-5 and the increase in traffic volumes on the ramps, the westbound on-ramp merge would be over capacity and congestion would spill back onto the local system.”

This section is discussing the Portage Bay Bridge, not the Montlake area; therefore it does not contain a discussion of the effects of the bascule bridge. Please see the response to comment I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A.

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report briefly summarized the findings and was not intended to include the level of detail contained in the rest of the document. As shown on Exhibit 6-10 of the Transportation Discipline Report, under Option K this intersection would be at Level of Service (LOS) of “D” in the afternoon peak and LOS of “B” during the morning peak hour, the same as the No Build Alternative and Option L.

I-311-331

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report. Page 2-1 discusses local street traffic, as mentioned in the comment. The summary information for transit

information can be found on page 2-12. Additionally, Chapter 8 of the report is dedicated to the discussion of effects on transit.

I-311-332

The information presented here is accurate and compares the options in a standard and measurable format. Please see the response to comment I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A. The transportation analysis describes the effects of each alternative or design option considered as whole, and the alternatives and options evaluated were identified through public processes, as described in previous responses.

I-311-333

As shown in Exhibit 6-3 of the Transportation Discipline Report, Options K and L would result in LOS F conditions at the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection, which would be the same as the No Build Alternative. The additional traffic being served by four new lanes of capacity across the Montlake cut (with Options K and L) would still converge at the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection. As shown in Exhibit 6-2 in the report, afternoon peak hour traffic volumes across the Montlake Cut and using the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection would increase by approximately 2,000 vph with Option K and 3,000 vph with Option L compared to the No Build Alternative in the year 2030. Traffic volumes across the cut would be higher with Option L than with Option K because no access to the SR 520/SPUI from Lake Washington Boulevard southbound would be provided due to the left-turn restriction. Drivers would continue north on Montlake Boulevard to the Montlake Boulevard/NE Pacific Street intersection and turn right onto the new bridge that connects to the SR 520/SPUI. Even with this additional volume, afternoon peak hour delays at the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific intersection would be slightly better with Option L than with Option K because a northbound right-turn

lane would be added to serve the additional northbound traffic crossing the Montlake Bridge to access the freeway.

I-311-334

The information presented here is accurate and compares the options in a standard and measurable format. Please see the response to comment I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A and the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-335

A summary level off peak evaluation was completed for the SR 520 Legislative workgroup and a brief description of the findings is provided on page 8-31. The SDEIS Transportation Discipline report focuses on the peak period traffic operations in an effort to develop an understanding of the project benefits for the majority of users on the SR 520 corridor. Please see Chapters 6 and 8 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for a discussion of travel time estimates for the new bascule bridge. Estimates are provided for the a.m., p.m., and off-peak periods. Also, see the response to comment I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A and the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-336

See the response to comment I-311-324 regarding intersections that were not included in the analysis.

I-311-337

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report. Page 2-7 discusses local street traffic, as mentioned in the comment. The summary information for transit information can be found on page 2-12. Additionally, Chapter 8 of the report is dedicated to the discussion of effects on transit and the removal

of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station is discussed in pages 8-20 through 8-25 of the report.
Please see the response to comment I-311-006 regarding the effects associated with the removal of the Montlake Freeway Station.

I-311-338
Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report. Page 2-7 discusses local street traffic, as mentioned in the comment. The nonmotorized transportation section (pedestrians and bicyclists) begins on page 2-11 and transit section begins on page 2-12. Additionally, Chapter 7 of the report discusses nonmotorized transportation effects and Chapter 8 discusses transit effects.

I-311-339
See the responses to comments I-311-335 regarding off-peak travel times and I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A and the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-340
See the responses to comments I-311-335 regarding off-peak travel times and I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A and the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-341
The comment's characterization that the text is "written to imply that busses exist only on Montlake Boulevard" is inaccurate. The removal of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station is discussed in pages 2-12 through 2-16 and pages 8-20 through 8-25 of the report. Please see the response to comment I-311-006 regarding the effects associated with the removal of the Montlake Freeway Station.

I-311-342

See the responses to comments I-311-335 regarding off-peak travel times and I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A and the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-343

The requested change was not made because the original statement is accurate and changing the language would not change the analysis or findings.

I-311-344

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report. Page 2-7 discusses local street traffic, as mentioned in the comment. The nonmotorized transportation section (pedestrians and bicyclists) begins on page 2-11 and transit section begins on page 2-12. Additionally, Chapter 7 of the report discusses nonmotorized transportation effects and Chapter 8 discusses transit effects.

I-311-345

As stated on page 2-6 of the Transportation Discipline Report, “the 6-Lane Alternative options would have the greatest effects on traffic volumes in the Montlake Boulevard interchange area.” Chapter 2 is a summary of key findings for the entire report and does not contain detailed analyses of all project effects. See Chapter 6 for information on local traffic and Chapter 7 for nonmotorized transportation. See the response to comment I-311-324 regarding intersections that were not included in the analysis.

I-311-346

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. Detailed analysis of

traffic demand can be found in Chapter 4 and analysis of effects on freeway and local street traffic is included in Chapters 5 and 6 of the report. Please see the response to comment I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A and the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-347

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. Effects on the arboretum are discussed in more detail in Chapter 7 of the Transportation Discipline Report, as well as in the Recreation Discipline Report.

I-311-348

Please see the responses to comments I-311-013 and I-311-297 regarding tolling. The existing conditions section is written to describe the current facilities in place, and would therefore not discuss tolling since there was no tolling on SR 520 when it was written. Tolling of the existing bridge is discussed in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS.

I-311-349

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. The existing conditions at the I-5/East Roanoke Street and I-5/NE 45th Street interchange areas are discussed on page 6-8 of the Transportation Discipline Report. The nonmotorized transportation section (pedestrians and bicyclists) begins on page 2-11. Additionally, Chapter 7 of the report discusses nonmotorized transportation effects.

I-311-350

Exhibits 6-1 and 6-2 of the Transportation Discipline Report show the expected volumes on Lake Washington Boulevard through the

Arboretum with all SDEIS options and suboptions. The No Build Alternative and Option A with Suboptions both have the same estimated p.m. peak hour volume of traffic; during the a.m. peak hour, Option A with Suboptions would have slightly higher volume than No Build. A more detailed discussion of the effects on Lake Washington Boulevard is included in Chapter 6 of the report.

I-311-351

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. This section discussed the effects on local streets with the "6-Lane Alternative" which would include all three of the SDEIS options. A more detailed analysis is included in Chapter 6 of the report as well as Section 5.1 of the SDEIS.

I-311-352

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. The “beginning of this document” stated in the comment is assumed to be Chapter 1, which contains background information for the project, including a description of the SDEIS Options. The executive summary also includes a brief summary and the suggested level of detail is more than typically used in introductory information.

I-311-353

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. See Chapter 6 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report for a comparison of traffic volumes, traffic circulation patterns, and intersection operations associated with the 6-Lane Options. Option K would increase traffic volumes in the SR 520 /Montlake Boulevard interchange area by 23 percent compared to the No Build Alternative because of the new capacity associated with the new interchange and crossing of the

Montlake Cut. By shifting SR 520 freeway traffic to the SPUI, drivers would choose to take advantage of the capacity made available on Montlake Boulevard. Option A and Suboption A provide an interchange configuration that is more similar to today. With the introduction of a toll, traffic volumes on Montlake Boulevard of the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection are expected to be similar to or slightly lower with Option A and Suboption A compared to the No Build Alternative (see Exhibits 6-1 and 6-2 of the Transportation Discipline Report).

I-311-354

The comment's characterization that the "impact has not been studied" and that the associated statements are "vague and minimizing" is inaccurate. Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. Chapters 5 and 6 contain detailed discussion on vehicle volumes on freeways and local streets.

Please see the response to comment I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A and the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-355

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. The existing conditions for nonmotorized transportation can be found in Chapter 7, on pages 7-8 through 7-18 of the report.

I-311-356

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. The existing conditions for nonmotorized transportation can be found in Chapter 7, on pages 7-8 through 7-18 of the report.

The Preferred Alternative includes many features designed to improve

the pedestrian and bicycle experience in the areas surrounding SR 520. As mentioned in the response to comment I-311-030, WSDOT has worked with various agencies and advisory boards, as part of the ESSB 6392 process, to develop recommendations for bicycle and pedestrian connections and amenities as part of the Design Refinements and Transit Connections Workgroup. The recommendations from this group can be found in the ESSB 6392: Design Refinements and Transit Connections Workgroup Recommendations Report (Attachment 16 to the Final EIS).

I-311-357

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. Additional information can be found in Chapter 7 and Chapter 8 regarding the bus and pedestrian connectivity. Specifically, the removal of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station is discussed in pages 2-12 through 2-16 and pages 8-20 through 8-25 of the report.

Please see the response to comment I-311-006 regarding the effects associated with the removal of the Montlake Freeway Station. Chapter 8 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report discusses the new Montlake lid transit stop and how it will accommodate off-peak bus activity between SR 520 and the local area as well as updates to the planned transit service in the area.

I-311-358

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. Chapter 7 of the Transportation Discipline Report provides a more detailed description of the potential effects on nonmotorized travel. For example, exhibits 7-3 and 7-4 of the report show pedestrian volumes taken at several key locations in the project study area. Chapter 8 of the report discusses transit effects and existing conditions, including the number of people boarding and alighting buses at key stops.

Additionally, a qualitative assessment of primary pedestrian and bicycle travel routes in the Montlake Interchange area has been conducted since the SDEIS was published and is now included in Chapter 7 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report. The focus of the evaluation is on comparing the No Build Alternative to the Preferred Alternative that was identified by WSDOT after publication of the SDEIS.

Pedestrian volume forecasts were prepared for the year 2030 to reflect forecasted population and employment growth, increased transit ridership, and changing travel behavior. These volumes are not described in Chapter 7 of the Transportation Discipline Report, but were used for the evaluation of local traffic effects. The results of the year 2030 local traffic analysis can be found in Chapter 6 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report.
Also see the response to comment C-311-005 for a list of design enhancements included with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-359
Please see the response to comment I-0311-358.

I-311-360
Under Options K and L, the existing SR 520 interchange with Montlake Boulevard and the existing Lake Washington Boulevard ramps would be removed and replaced with a SPUI near the current location of MOHAI. The SPUI would connect to Lake Washington Boulevard south of SR 520, near where the existing ramps connect to the boulevard. Since the Montlake interchange under Option A would be located at the existing interchange, removing the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps is possible under Option A.

The Preferred Alternative would not include construction of any new ramps in the Arboretum, and would remove both the existing Lake

Washington Boulevard ramps and the R.H. Thomson Expressway ramps. Access to Lake Washington Boulevard by westbound SR 520 traffic would be moved to a new intersection located on the Montlake Boulevard lid at 24th Avenue East.

I-311-361

This section focuses on the lack of travel time reliability that King County Metro deals with when planning and operating bus service on the SR 520 corridor and is not making any "arguments about how the project can improve travel times to the Montlake freeway station." The lack of reliability is directly related to congestion issues along the corridor that affect transit and this section is using available data to argue that improvement to the system would improve travel times, generally. Additional information about travel times for people along the SR 520 corridor will be provided in the Final Transportation Discipline Report.

I-311-362

See the response to comment I-311-360. The Preferred Alternative would reduce average traffic volumes in 2030 on Lake Washington Boulevard in the Arboretum compared to the No Build Alternative. Under the Preferred Alternative in 2030, a.m. peak hour volumes on Lake Washington Boulevard through the Arboretum would be 1,330 vehicles per hour with the Preferred Alternative, compared to 1,950 vehicles per hour with the No Build Alternative. P.m. peak hour volumes would be 1,410 vehicles per hour compared to 1,730 with the No Build Alternative.

I-311-363

Please see the response to comment I-311-007 and I-311-035 regarding compatibility with potential future light rail and high capacity transit on SR 520.

I-311-364

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. The removal of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station is discussed in pages 2-12 through 2-16 and pages 8-20 through 8-25 of the report. Please see the response to comment I-311-006 regarding the effects associated with the removal of the Montlake Freeway Station.

I-311-365

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. Chapters 7and 8 of this report discuss transit and nonmotorized transportation effects in more detail and the Sound Transit Link Light Rail project is discussed in pages 7-18 through 7-20 and 8-16 through 8-18.

I-311-366

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. Additional information can be found in Chapter 7 and Chapter 8 regarding the bus and pedestrian connectivity. Specifically, the removal of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station is discussed in pages 2-12 through 2-16 and pages 8-20 through 8-25 of the report.

Please see the response to comment I-311-006 regarding the effects associated with the removal of the Montlake Freeway Station. Chapter 8 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report discusses the new Montlake lid transit stop and how it will accommodate off-peak bus activity between SR 520 and the local area as well as updates to the planned transit service in the area. During the peak periods, Sound Transit and King County Metro have provided additional bus service that covers the same area as the Route 545.

I-311-367

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. The HOV lane that will be completed as part of the Medina to SR 202 project is assumed to operate as a 3+ HOV in the No Build configuration. As discussed on page 5-19 of the report, “the Evergreen Point Freeway Station on-ramp merge would be improved as a part of the Medina to SR 202: Eastside Transit and HOV project. This improvement would allow buses to enter the freeway at higher speeds than they currently do. The HOV and general-purpose lanes would both benefit from relocating the HOV lane to the inside of the corridor as well as other roadway improvements associated with the Medina to SR 202 project, such as wider shoulders and lanes and longer on-ramp acceleration lanes.” A description of the HOV lane information for the Medina to SR 202 project has been added to the Final Transportation Discipline Report for clarification.

I-311-368

Please see the responses to comments I-311-013 and I-311-297 regarding tolling.

I-311-369

The comment’s characterization that the report “gloss[es] over the positive impacts of Option K, and systematically quantif[ies] the impacts of Option A” to “make Option A better” is inaccurate. Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief and does contain the level of detail found in the rest of the report. Chapter 6 of the report discusses the effects on local street traffic in greater detail. Page 6-38 of the Transportation Discipline Report states that Option K’s “new tunnel and traffic turnaround would allow freeway traffic to bypass the Montlake bridge, reducing traffic volumes on Montlake Boulevard by approximately 1,400 vph in the morning peak hour and 2,200 vph in the afternoon peak hour compared to the No Build Alternative.”

I-311-370

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. Additional information can be found in Chapter 8 regarding transit effects. Specifically, the removal of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station is discussed in pages 8-20 through 8-25 of the report. Please see the response to comment I-311-006 regarding the effects associated with the removal of the Montlake Freeway Station.

There are currently several bus routes that exit from the SR 520 corridor and provide direct service across the Montlake bridge to the University area. These routes are assumed to continue to operate during the year 2030 analysis timeframe. For that reason, under Options K, the buses would continue to exit the SR 520 corridor travel through the tunnel and stop at the Pacific Street bus stop.

I-311-371

A newly constructed freeway transit stop in the center lanes would require that the State construct the facility to meet current design guidelines to gain FHWA concurrence with the design. This design would require the State to provide acceleration and deceleration lanes for the buses to exit and enter the freeway transit stop. It is the necessary space for these lanes that extend beyond the Montlake interchange area and would affect both Portage Bay and Foster Island that was considered by the community members through the ESSB 6099 Mediation Process. This is documented in the SR 520 – Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Westside Project Impact Plan dated December 2008 on page ES-4 as one of the “Common Elements and mitigation recommendations.” Further discussion regarding the already planned bus rapid transit service for the area is located on page ES-5 in the second bullet. This bus rapid transit service is noted as the transit agencies plan to address the removal of the “Montlake Flyer stop.”

Also, please see the response to comment I-311-006 regarding the

effects associated with the removal of the Montlake Freeway Station. See the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

The Preferred Alternative has been designed to minimize SR 520's footprint as much as possible while allowing room for HOV lanes and the shoulders required to satisfy current safety standards and allowing for future potential light rail. See the responses to comment I-311-148 and I-311-167 regarding the project footprint.

I-311-372

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. The same level of detail is not required to be repeated in multiple sections. Additional information regarding transit effects can be found in Chapter 8.

I-311-373

The comment's characterization that the report does not disclose the environmental effects and that "the differences between the options are not articulated when it make Option K better, but they are when Option A looks better" is inaccurate. The distance between the local bus stop and the Sound Transit University Link station are identical with all options considered in the SDEIS. Buses would all stop at the Pacific Street bus stop on the Montlake triangle and people would need to walk across Montlake Boulevard to access Sound Transit's University Link station. The quoted text describes one effect of removing the Montlake Freeway Station, and the result is specifically for transit riders who walk to the freeway station or transfer from local routes to board an SR 520 bus and travel eastbound. This is primarily relevant to people who arrive at the Montlake Freeway Station from the south. With Option K, it would not be possible to transfer to an SR 520 bus at the Montlake interchange; all

riders would need to access SR 520 buses at the Montlake Multimodal Center. Walk times for riders arriving by light rail at the Husky Stadium Station are not a relevant comparison in this context. The project would not affect walk times for riders who transfer between light rail and other modes of travel. Riders would access SR 520 and local buses at the same stop locations in the Montlake Multimodal Center, regardless of how the SR 520 corridor is designed. Additional information regarding transit effects can be found in Chapter 8.

I-311-374

The comment's claim that there would be "extra travel time for someone transferring from a bus in Option A to Sound Transit" is incorrect. As stated in the response to comment I-311-373, the transfer from he local bus stop and the Sound Transit University Link station is identical for all options. Only Options K and L would remove the option for people who are destined for areas south of Montlake to transfer at the Montlake interchange.

I-311-375

The comment's claim that there would be "Sound Transit riders would have to walk" a "half-mile to the bus" is incorrect. As stated in the response to comment I-311-373, the transfer from bus to Sound Transit University Link station is identical for all options.

I-311-376

The comment's characterization that the report contains an "anti-Option K bias," a "pro Option A bias," "ignore[s] the issues raised by the community," and that "Option A is estimated more rosily, and Option K is estimated in a more dire fashion" is inaccurate. As stated in the response to comment I-311-373, the transfer from bus to Sound Transit University Link station is identical for all options. The project would not affect walk times for riders who transfer between light rail and other modes of travel.

With Option K, it would not be possible to transfer to an SR 520 bus at the Montlake interchange; all riders would need to access SR 520 buses at the Montlake Multimodal Center.

I-311-377

WSDOT considered a wide range of alternatives before narrowing them down to those evaluated in the Draft EIS. Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 regarding benefits to HOVs that would result from the project and I-311-007 regarding the range of alternatives evaluated and the study of transit options on SR 520.

I-311-378

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-379

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. Chapter 10 of the report discusses construction effects on transportation in greater detail. A discussion on anticipated effects on local arterials begins on page 10-24, and includes an analysis of construction truck trips.

I-311-380

This section is discussing construction truck volumes. As stated on page 2-18 of the transportation Discipline Report, “Option K would have a greater effect on SR 520 traffic operations …because of the high number of estimated truck trips necessary for hauling to and from the tunnel and new interchange sites.”

I-311-381

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. Chapter 10 of the report discusses construction effects on transportation in greater detail, including required detour routes. The detour routes have been revised since publication of the SDEIS, and some of the closures are no longer necessary. Please see Chapter 10 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report as well as Section 6.1 of the Final EIS for updated information.

I-311-382

Chapter 2 of the Transportation Discipline Report is a summary of key findings for the entire report and is purposefully brief. Chapter 11 of the report discusses cumulative effects on transportation in greater detail. As stated on page 11-1 the Cumulative Effects Scenario “is used for traffic analysis and assumes future implementation of an extended regional package of transportation capacity improvements in addition to the I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project.”

I-311-383

Tables for vehicle demand, traffic volumes, LOS, and travel times are included throughout the Transportation Discipline Report. For example, Exhibit 5-20 shows the westbound afternoon peak period travel times between I-5 and SR 202. Updated information can be found in the Final Transportation Discipline Report.

I-311-384

The Sound Transit University Link station is included in the travel demand model. There is a description of background projects listed on page 4-4 of the Transportation Discipline Report that describes the background projects assumed for the year 2030 model, including light rail between SeaTac and Northgate.

I-311-385

The purpose for Chapter 3 of the Transportation Discipline Report is to define how travel demand models are developed, refined, and updated by PSRC and then ultimately used by various projects. This section also describes how various projects performed some level of modeling that involved the SR 520 corridor. Chapter 4 describes travel demand modeling assumptions used in the analysis for the I-5 to Medina Project.

I-311-386

See the response to comment I-311-324 regarding the intersection analysis. In the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report, the local traffic effects near the SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke Street interchange area were described in Chapter 6, and included an evaluation of traffic volume forecasts and travel patterns, and the effects of the project's on intersection performance at the 12 intersections, shown in Exhibit 6-7. The Roanoke Street/Harvard Avenue intersection was evaluated for operational effects; however, the Delmar Drive/East Lynn Street and Fuhrman/Boyer Avenue E were not included in the analysis because the project would result in little to no change in traffic volumes (less than 5 percent) and operations at these locations.

I-311-387

The effect of Montlake Bridge openings on traffic operations during the off-peak hours was included in the analysis performed for the Preferred Alternative. Please see Chapters 6 and 8 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report. Please see the response to comment I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A and the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-388

The effect of Montlake Bridge openings on traffic operations during the off-peak hours was included in the analysis performed for the Preferred

Alternative. Please see Chapters 6 and 8 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report. Please see the response to comment I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A and the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-389
Section 1.2 of the SDEIS includes a detailed discussion of the project purpose and need.

I-311-390
The Transportation Discipline Report is focused on mobility. Chapters 5 and 6 of the SDEIS and Final EIS describe the project's effects on other resources. Decision-makers consider effects on all of these resources.

I-311-391
A regional travel demand model was used to estimate vehicle and person demand in the SR 520 corridor. Refer to Chapter 3 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report for a description of how the travel demand was used to estimate future traffic volumes. Included is a description of the 4-Step Process used for estimating travel demand – trip generation, trip distribution, mode choice, and trip assignment. Three primary components make up a regional travel demand model. These include land use data, the transportation network, and a variety of algorithms that determine the amount of interaction between all of the transportation network elements.

WSDOT considered a wide range of alternatives before narrowing them down to those evaluated in the Draft EIS and SDEIS. Please see the response to comment I-311-007 regarding the range of alternatives evaluated for the SR 520 project. The Draft EIS evaluated 4-lane and 6-lane alternatives; the 8-lane alternative was considered before the Draft EIS was published but dropped from further evaluation as discussed in

Chapter 1 of the SDEIS and Chapter 2 of the Final EIS. A travel demand model was used to forecast demand generated by these alternatives. After publication of the Draft EIS, Governor Christine Gregoire identified the 6-Lane Alternative as the state's preference for the SR 520 corridor. From this point forward, analysis and subsequent environmental documents, including the SDEIS and Final EIS, have focused on the effects of the 6-Lane Alternative and various design options for the Montlake interchange area.

I-311-392

The travel demand modeling effort includes the transit stops along the bus routes similar to what is either in place or what is expected for future conditions by the transit agencies or project definition.

I-311-393

Chapter 4 of the Final EIS Transportation Discipline Report describes the measures of effectiveness for the freeway operational analysis, including congestion, speeds, travel times, vehicles served, and persons served. Chapter 7 of the report discusses nonmotorized transportation effects and Chapter 8 discusses transit effects. See the response to comment I-311-358 for a brief description of the types of analysis that were conducted for nonmotorized facilities in the Final Transportation Discipline Report.

I-311-394

See the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-395

Please see the response to comment I-311-088 regarding transportation

effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A and the Preferred Alternative. Standard practice for the traffic analysis is to evaluate the peak periods of operations. The only time the existing drawbridge opens is during the off-peak. Neither Option A or Option L reduce the capacity on the existing system, therefore there is no effect to report.
The methodology described in Chapter 4 of both the SDEIS and Final EIS Transportation Discipline Reports was generally used for evaluating local street intersections during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Additional analysis was conducted for the Final EIS to evaluate the effects of Montlake Bridge openings. The findings from this evaluation can be found in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS Transportation Discipline Report.

I-311-396

Please see the response to comment I-311-395.

I-311-397

The SDEIS and Final EIS traffic evaluation does take into account the effects of cut-through traffic on freeway and local traffic volumes and operations. Though cut-through traffic is not explicitly described, the effects of transportation network changes on travel behavior, travel demand, and traffic circulation/diversion is evaluated in the travel demand modeling process and all subsequent stages of analysis. The travel demand modeling process is described in Chapter 3 and the beginning of Chapter 4 of the SDEIS and Final EIS Transportation Discipline Report, prior to the steps referenced in the comment, described under the heading “How were local traffic volumes forecasted?”

The Preferred Alternative reduces the effects of cut-through traffic because it reduces the effects of freeway congestion on local roadways leading to and from freeways. See Chapter 6 of the Final EIS Transportation Discipline Report for more information regarding changes

in traffic patterns, traffic volumes and traffic operations related to the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-398
A summary level off peak evaluation was completed for the SR 520 Legislative workgroup and a brief description of the findings is provided on page 8-31. The SDEIS Transportation Discipline report focuses on the peak period traffic operations in an effort to develop an understanding of the project benefits for the majority of users on the SR 520 corridor. This level of analysis provides a relative comparison between options along the SR 520 corridor. Please see the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-399
Please see the response to comment I-311-397.

I-311-400
Please see the response to comment I-311-397.

I-311-401
Chapter 7 of the Transportation Discipline Report includes a detailed analysis of nonmotorized transportation; this was updated in Chapter 7 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report. See the response to comment I-311-358 for a brief description of the types of analysis that were conducted for nonmotorized facilities in the Final Transportation Discipline Report.

I-311-402
Please see the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-403

Please see the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-404

Refer to responses to comments I-311-324 regarding the intersection analysis and I-311-397 for information regarding the analysis of the effects of cut-through traffic.

Traffic volume changes in the SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke Street interchange were too low to meet the criteria. Therefore, the intersections evaluated in this area for the SDEIS were not included in the Final EIS evaluation.

I-311-405

With the Preferred Alternative, Montlake Boulevard would be restriped and reconfigured between SR 520 and the Montlake Cut to include two general-purpose lanes and one HOV lane for improved transit connectivity. In addition, a large new lid would be provided over SR 520 in the Montlake area, configured for transit and bicycle/pedestrian connectivity. The lid would function as a vehicle crossing and pedestrian crossing, a landscaped area, and open space. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS describes the Preferred Alternative.

Chapter 6 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report describes the effects of the Preferred Alternative on local streets. Included in this evaluation is a comparison of the project's effects on signalized intersections in the Montlake interchange vicinity. These effects are summarized in Exhibit 6-3.

See Chapter 5 of the Final EIS, and Attachment 7 of the Final EIS, which includes the Social Elements Discipline Report, the Land Use, Economics, Relocations Discipline Report, and the Recreation Discipline Report for a description of how the Preferred Alternative would affect the character of adjacent neighborhoods.

I-311-406

The section referred to in the comment discusses existing conditions and therefore does not discuss potential future light rail. Please see the response to comment I-311-007 and I-311-035 regarding compatibility with potential future light rail and high capacity transit on SR 520.

I-311-407

The statement on page 5-1 of the Transportation Discipline Report refers to design for safety and reliability, such as shoulders. Please see the response to comment I-311-007 and I-311-035 regarding compatibility with potential future light rail and high capacity transit on SR 520, and I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues. The use of the word “design” is and consistent with generally accepted usage for transportation and roadway projects.

I-311-408

Summaries are intended to provide an overview of the document and are purposefully brief. The same level of detail is not required to be repeated in multiple sections.

I-311-409

As shown in Exhibit 5-7 of the Transportation Discipline Report, freeway volumes and operations for the cross-lake portion of the bridge would be similar for all 6-Lane Alternative options (within 500 vph of each other). Therefore, this discussion was not included in the Executive Summary, which was intended to be a brief overview of the document and highlighted the differences between options.

I-311-410

The language used in the SDEIS does not offer bias for or against any of the options. The information presented here is accurate and compares

the options in a standard and measurable format.

The graphic referred to in the comment, Exhibit 5-7 of the Transportation Discipline Report, shows the vehicle volumes cross-lake portion of the bridge. The text referred to in the comment discusses the Montlake area, specifically the Portage Bay Bridge. Effects on the local system are discussed for all options in Chapter 6 of the report.
Additionally, “keeping the profile of the Portage Bay Bridge slim” is not a project goal. Please see the responses to comments I-311-003 and I-311-004 for information regarding the project’s purpose and need.

I-311-411

From a freeway perspective, all of the Montlake interchange options evaluated in the SDEIS would result in similar improvements to freeway operations as compared to the No Build Alternative. The options were designed to prevent the effects of “spill over” traffic during peak commute periods. Exhibits 5-9 and 5-10 of the Transportation Discipline Report show that SR 520 westbound morning general-purpose and HOV freeway operations would be similar with all 6-lane Alternative options in location and throughput (within 500 persons per hour of each other).

Exhibit 5-16 shows that Option K would have the highest demand as well as the highest throughput for the westbound afternoon commute on the floating bridge. However, none of the 6-Lane Alternative options would be able to serve all of the forecasted traffic demand because of congestion on I-5 and I-405.

I-311-412

For the SDEIS, no additional analysis was conducted to evaluate the effects during off-peak periods, such as when the Montlake bridge is open. Instead, the analysis focused on typical conditions during weekday commute periods in order to provide a relative comparison between various alternatives and options. Please see the responses to comments

I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-413

Please see the responses to comments I-311-013 regarding tolling and I-311-391 regarding the travel demand model and mode choice.

I-311-414

Congestion along the I-405 corridor is discussed on page 5-29 of the Transportation Discipline Report. The analysis concluded that the I-405 corridor would have a significant increase in traffic volumes in the year 2030 compared to today, which would result in congestion spilling back onto SR 520. The SDEIS analysis reported that, during the p.m. peak period, an eastbound SR 520 vehicle would experience congestion on SR 520 starting at the west bridge approach to the I-405 interchange due to congestion spilling back from the I 405 corridor.

With the updated travel demand model used in the Final EIS analysis, I-405 would still operate over capacity in the year 2030 but would have significantly less impact on SR 520. Eastbound SR 520 would be affected from the 92nd Avenue NE to the I-405 interchange area. For updated information regarding the travel demand modeling effort conducted for the Final EIS, please see Chapter 3 of the Final EIS Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 of the Final EIS). For information about freeway operations and how they would improve under the Preferred Alternative, please see Chapter 5 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report.

As described in Chapter 1 of the SDEIS and Final EIS, the tolling authority in Washington State is the Washington State Transportation Commission, which sets the toll rates, fees, and exemptions. The SR 520 Program is not the tolling entity and, therefore, does not have the authority to determine how the corridor will be tolled.

I-311-415

Please see the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-416

The State Legislature passed ESHB 6099 which requested a committee be developed that would review a range of potential toll strategies for the SR 520 corridor and then conduct outreach to obtain public opinion. The committee developed was the Tolling Implementation Committee. They concluded through their study and outreach that a segmental toll (a toll that varies along highway segments between interchanges) would not be pursued for the SR 520 corridor. For this reason, the Final EIS tolling assumption has been updated to include a single point toll that would be charged for people who cross the floating bridge portion of SR 520. Chapter 6 of the Transportation Discipline Report covers how the traffic volumes differ among the various options, with the No Build Alternative being representative of a no toll option. As you will see in Exhibits 6-1 and 6-2, Option A and Option A with suboptions are very similar in traffic volume to the No Build Alternative.

The project purpose and need does not include any mention of “spill over” traffic, but it does mention improving the mobility of people and goods between Redmond and Seattle.

I-311-417

Please see the responses to comments I-311-013 regarding tolling and I-311-297 regarding why the No Build Alternative is not tolled.
The maximum peak period toll rate used in the transportation analysis was indicated in the SDEIS as $3.81 (in 2007 dollars), from Scenario 7 of the SR 520 Toll and Traffic Revenue Report. The rates used in the analysis were reasonable assumptions based on the findings of tolling studies. The resulting travel demand at the assumed toll rates was reflected in the analysis. Information was provided in Chapter 1 of the

SDEIS about tolling studies such as the 2008 SR 520 Toll and Traffic Revenue Report, The Tolling Implementation Committee, and the Lake Washington Congestion Management Project. These studies evaluated ranges of toll amounts and tolling scenarios, as suggested in the comment, and their findings are publicly available.

Information about tolling was provided on pages 1-33 through 1-35 of the SDEIS. Tolling is not being evaluated as a traffic management tool in this EIS, as indicated by the comment. As discussed in Chapter 1 of the SDEIS, the purpose of tolling with respect to the SR 520, I-5 to Medina Project is revenue generation for construction of the project.

I-311-418

See the response to comment I-311-360 regarding removal of the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps. The Preferred Alternative would not include construction of any new ramps in the Arboretum, and would remove both the existing Lake Washington Boulevard ramps and the R.H. Thomson Expressway ramps.

I-311-419

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document and is purposefully brief. As noted on page 5-31 of the Transportation Discipline Report, Options A, K and L would all result in some spill back on to the local system.

I-311-420

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document and is purposefully brief. As noted on page 5-31 of the Transportation Discipline Report, Options A, K and L would all result in some spill back on to the local system. The project purpose and need does not include any mention of “spill over” traffic, but it does mention

improving the mobility of people and goods between Redmond and Seattle.

I-311-421

Including the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps would not “make things worse” as described in the comment. Because the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps already exist, Option A with suboptions did not show greatly increased traffic on Lake Washington Boulevard when compared with the No Build Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would reduce average traffic volumes in 2030 on Lake Washington Boulevard in the Arboretum compared to the No Build Alternative. Under the Preferred Alternative in 2030, a.m. peak hour volumes on Lake Washington Boulevard through the Arboretum would be 1,330 vehicles per hour with the Preferred Alternative, compared to 1,950 vehicles per hour with the No Build Alternative. P.m. peak hour volumes would be 1,410 vehicles per hour compared to 1,730 with the No Build Alternative.

I-311-422

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document and is purposefully brief. The same level of detail is not required to be repeated in multiple sections.

I-311-423

Option A, with a westbound auxiliary lane across Portage Bay, was defined as part of the ESSB 6099 mediation process and evaluated for the SDEIS. Similar options without a westbound auxiliary lane or with an eastbound auxiliary lane were not evaluated as part of the mediation process.

Modifications in the Preferred Alternative include providing a managed shoulder and eliminating the auxiliary lane that was part of Option A. Please see Chapter 5 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for a description of effects of the

Preferred Alternative on freeway traffic volumes and operations and Chapter 6 for a description of its effects on interchange operations.

I-311-424

Exhibit 5-20 in the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report does, indeed, show that travel time benefits would be slightly greater with Option K and L than with Option A or Option A with suboptions in the westbound direction during the p.m. peak period. Exhibit 5-24, on the other hand, shows that Option A would result in greater travel time benefits that Option A with suboptions or Options K and L in the eastbound direction during the p.m. peak period

I-311-425

Please see the response to comment I-311-297 regarding tolling the No Build Alternative and consideration of 4-lane alternatives.

I-311-426

Analysis completed for the SDEIS assumes that in the region traffic will grow based on information from the Puget Sound Regional Council land use estimates that correspond with local growth estimates. This background traffic growth is what is modeled in the No Build Alternative. As discussed in the response to comment I-311-297, tolling is not assumed with the No Build Alternative. It is the additional growth in traffic within the freeway system that would result in severe congestion. Today, there are regular congestion points on the SR 520 corridor that are in excess of 4 miles in length. Given the future growth in traffic, total freeway system congestion, and no toll on the SR 520 corridor, this analysis is reasonable.

I-311-427

See the response to comment I-311-426 regarding the travel demand model and forecasts for growth along the SR 520 corridor. Based on

these forecasts, the chokepoints that exist today will worsen substantially as travel corridors in the region, such as SR 520, I-405, I-90, SR 522, and I-5, continue to become more congested. The addition of continuous HOV lanes on SR 520 not only provides additional capacity in the corridor, but also provides a means for moving more people in lanes not subject to the same bottlenecks as general-purpose traffic.

I-311-428

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document and is purposefully brief. The same level of detail is not required to be repeated in multiple sections. Exhibit 5-21 does show that Option K would have the highest demand as well as the highest throughput for the westbound afternoon commute on the floating bridge. However, none of the 6-Lane Alternative options would be able to serve all of the forecasted traffic demand because of congestion on I-5 and I-405.

I-311-429

Please see the response to comment I-311-426. The referenced statement applies to backups on eastbound SR 520 from I-405, which is projected to be a chokepoint for the SR 520 corridor by the year 2030.

I-311-430

Please see the response to comment I-311-426. The referenced statement applies to backups on eastbound SR 520 from I-405, which is projected to be a chokepoint for the SR 520 corridor by the year 2030.

I-311-431

Please see the response to comment I-311-426. The referenced statement applies to backups on eastbound SR 520 from I-405, which is projected to be a chokepoint for the SR 520 corridor by the year 2030.

I-311-432

As described on pages 5-34 to 5-37 in Chapter 5 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report, congestion on SR 520 approaching the SR 520/I-405 interchange would be less with Option A compared to the other options (Suboption A, Option K, and Option L) because removing the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps with Option A would reduce traffic volumes (approximately 100 vph less) able to access SR 520. In stop-and-go congestion, 100 vehicles equates to approximately a quarter mile of congestion in two lanes. Please see the response to comment I-311-426. The referenced statement applies to backups on eastbound SR 520 from I-405, which is projected to be a chokepoint for the SR 520 corridor by the year 2030.

I-311-433

Improvements to section of the SR 520 corridor east of Lake Washington are part of a different project, the SR 520, Medina to SR 202: Eastside Transit and HOV Project. The description of proposed roadway improvements and associated effects for with this section of SR 520 on freeway and local traffic operations are discussed in the environmental documents for the SR 520, Medina to SR 202 project, which can be found here:
http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/EastsideEA.htm.

I-311-434

The analysis conducted for the Draft EIS,SDEIS, and Final EIS have addressed the issues you described. Please see the responses to comments I-311-297 regarding tolling the No Build Alternative, and I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Draft EIS considered two No Build scenarios – a Catastrophic Failure Scenario and a Continued Operation Scenario. The Continued Operation Scenario was

used as the baseline No Build Alternative to which the project team compared the Build alternatives. Please refer to the Draft EIS for more information regarding the effects of the Catastrophic Failure Scenario.

The potential effects of spillover traffic from the SR 520 mainline onto local roadways was included in the SDEIS evaluation of freeway and local traffic operations. Please refer to Chapters 5 and 6 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report for further information.

I-311-435
See the response to comment I-311-324 regarding intersections that were not included in the analysis. The Roosevelt/Eastlake/Fuhrman and Boyer Avenue E/E Lynn Street intersections were not included in the analysis because the project would result in little to no change in traffic volumes (less than 5 percent) and operations at these locations.

I-311-436
Please see the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-437
Please see the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-438
Please see the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-439
Please see the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-440
Please see the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-441
Please see the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-442
Please see the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-443
Exhibits 6-1 and 6-2 of the Transportation Discipline Report do not show future capacity; rather, the exhibits show that traffic volumes would be higher with Option K than Option A in all locations except on Montlake Boulevard. Operations effects are described later in Chapter 6.

I-311-444
See the response to comment I-311-443 regarding traffic volumes. See the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-445
See the response to comment I-311-443 regarding traffic volumes. See the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-446
As described in Chapter 6 of the Transportation Discipline Report, Option K would increase traffic volumes in the SR 520/Montlake

Boulevard interchange area by 23 percent compared to the No Build Alternative because of the new capacity associated with the new interchange and crossing of the Montlake Cut. By shifting SR 520 freeway traffic to the SPUI, drivers would chose to take advantage of the capacity made available on Montlake Boulevard. Comparisons of existing and year 2030 traffic volumes, with all of the options evaluated in the SDEIS, are shown on Exhibits 6-1 and 6-2. As shown in these exhibits, Option K would result in 1,000 more AM peak hour trips and 1,400 more PM peak hour trips than Option A on Montlake Blvd NE north of NE Pacific Place.

Exhibits 6-3 and 6-4 show that, with a few exceptions, most intersections in the Montlake interchange area would operate at acceptable levels (D or better) with all of the options evaluated. However, the additional trips using the local streets with Option K would result in some degradation in LOS at several locations. With regard to intersection operations at the westbound off-ramp intersection, the Montlake Boulevard/Pacific Street with Option K would operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour because this intersection also serves heavy traffic on Montlake Boulevard and Pacific Street, in addition to the traffic using the westbound off-ramp. With Option A, the westbound off-ramp intersection with Montlake Boulevard would operate at LOS B during the PM peak hour because this intersection would only serve westbound off- and on-ramp volumes and traffic on Montlake Boulevard. Option A is expected to operate more efficiently at the westbound off-ramp intersection in the year 2030 than at the Montlake Boulevard/Pacific Street intersection with Option K because fewer total traffic movements and traffic volumes need to be served.

I-311-447

The effect of Montlake Bridge openings on traffic operations during the off-peak hours was included in the analysis performed for the Preferred Alternative. Please see Chapters 6 and 8 of the Final Transportation

Discipline Report. Please see the response to comment I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A and the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-448

Freeway throughput is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Transportation Discipline Report and shown in Exhibits 5-5, 5-6, 5-7, 5-8 and 5-12. Option K is shown in these exhibits to have higher throughput across the floating bridge than Option A and the same throughput as Option L. For local streets, Option K would result in an increase in traffic volumes in the overall SR 520/Montlake Boulevard Interchange area of 23 percent compared to the No Build Alternative because of the new capacity associated with the new interchange and crossing of the Montlake Cut. With the shift of SR 520 freeway traffic to the SPUI, drivers would choose to take advantage of the capacity made available on Montlake Boulevard. Chapter 6 further explains that some local streets would experience greater traffic increases than others, with the greatest increase on Montlake Boulevard north of NE Pacific Street. Traffic volume changes associated with Option K and the other alternatives/options evaluated in the SDEIS are shown in Exhibits 6-1 and 6-2.

I-311-449

The requested change was not made because the text is accurate. The referenced text in Chapter 6 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report addresses average conditions on a typical weekday. The SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke Street interchange is not evaluated in the Final EIS, because traffic volumes in this area with the Preferred Alternative would be very similar to the No Build Alternative in the year 2030.

I-311-450

For the SDEIS analysis, some increase in traffic on local streets in the

SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke Street interchange area was assumed to occur due to implementation of a segmental toll. While most of the increase in traffic volume by the year 2030 would occur with the No Build Alternative, some additional local traffic volume increases would occur with the 6-Lane options due to some drivers changing their routes to avoid paying a toll. The differences in traffic volumes and operations in this interchange area associated with the various 6-Lane options are described on pages 6-43 through 6-45 in Chapter 6 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report. Refer to response to comment I-311-397 regarding the analysis of the effects of cut-through traffic.

For the Final EIS analysis, the tolling strategy was modified to be a single point toll. This modification occurred after an extensive outreach process completed with the Tolling Implementation Committee in 2008 found that there was very little support for a segmental tolling strategy. WSDOT also developed a Preferred Alternative after the SDEIS was published, which is similar to Option A, but with a number of design refinements that would improve mobility and safety while reducing negative effects. With these project changes, traffic volume changes in the SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke Street interchange area were minimized to levels less than 1 percent of the No Build Alternative; therefore, intersections located near this interchange were not evaluated in the Final EIS. See the response to comment I-311-324 regarding the intersection analysis.

The intersections located in the following interchange areas were thus not analyzed for the Final EIS: SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke Street, I-5/NE 45th Street, I-5/Mercer Street, and I-5/Stewart Street. The SR 520/Montlake Boulevard interchange area was the only are where traffic volumes are expected to differ for the No Build and Preferred Alternatives by 5 percent or more. These differences in traffic volumes are shown in Exhibits 6-1 and 6-2 in Chapter 6 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report. As described in this chapter and shown

in Exhibit 6-3, the Preferred Alternative would not degrade intersection operations in the Montlake interchange area during either the a.m. or p.m. peak hours compared to the No Build Alternative.

I-311-451

See the response to comment I-311-450.

I-311-452

As shown on Exhibit 6-7 in Chapter 6 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report, the E. Roanoke Street/Boylston Avenue E intersection would operate at LOS D or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours with the No Build Alternative and all of the 6-Lane Alternative design options. However, it is true that all of the 6-Lane Alternative design options would result in LOS F conditions at the E. Roanoke Street/Harvard Avenue E intersection. Improvements proposed for this intersection in the SDEIS include adding crosswalks on the north and west legs, which would reduce the amount of signal green time available for vehicles and increase delays. The E. Roanoke Street/Harvard Avenue E intersection was not evaluated in the Final EIS because the Preferred Alternative would result in little to no change compared to the No Build Alternative in traffic volumes and operations.

I-311-453

See the response to comment I-311 324 regarding the intersections included in the analysis. For any intersection beyond those studied, the overall change in traffic volumes through that intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours was less than 5%. Please see the Final EIS Transportation Discipline Report for detailed information regarding traffic volume changes and intersection operations with the Preferred Alternative. The Roosevelt/Fuhrman and Lynn/Boyer intersections were not evaluated in the Final EIS because traffic volume changes between

the No Build and Preferred Alternative were too low to meet the criteria for analysis.

I-311-454

The text portion of this section of the Transportation Discipline Report discusses existing conditions. Page 6-45 of the report discusses the transportation effects of the 6-Lane Alternatives in the I-5/NE 45th Street Interchange Area.

I-311-455

As described in Chapter 6 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report, "…freeway and local transportation systems should operate in a way that does not adversely affect each other. The intent of making changes to either system is to improve traffic conditions in one or both without adversely affecting the other." With the 6-Lane Alternative options, traffic volumes in the I-5/Mercer Street interchange area would be nearly identical to the No Build Alternative for all options, with an increase in up to 1 percent during the morning peak hour and no change during the afternoon peak hour. Intersection operations would be about the same as under the No Build Alternative.

The Mercer Street/Fairview Avenue N. and Fairview Avenue N/Valley Street intersections were not evaluated in the Final EIS because the Preferred Alternative would result in little to no change in traffic volumes and operations near the I-5/Mercer Street interchange.

I-311-456

As described Chapter 6 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report, "…freeway and local transportation systems should operate in a way that does not adversely affect each other. The intent of making changes to either system is to improve traffic conditions in one or both without adversely affecting the other." With the 6-Lane Alternative options, traffic volumes in the I-5/Stewart Street interchange area would be nearly

identical to the No Build Alternative for all options, with an increase in up to 1 percent during the morning peak hour and no change during the afternoon peak hour. Intersection operations would be about the same as under the No Build Alternative.
The Stewart Street/E. Denny Way intersection was not evaluated in the Final EIS because the Preferred Alternative would result in little to no change in traffic volumes and operations near the I-5/Stewart Street interchange.

I-311-457
Please see the response to comment I-311-297 regarding tolling the No Build Alternative.

I-311-458
See the response to comment I-311 324 regarding the intersections included in the analysis. For any intersection beyond those studied, the overall change in traffic volumes through that intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours was less than 5%. Please see the Final EIS Transportation Discipline Report for detailed information regarding traffic volume changes and intersection operations with the Preferred Alternative. The Roosevelt/Fuhrman and Lynn/Boyer intersections were not evaluated in the Final EIS because traffic volume changes between the No Build and Preferred Alternative were too low to meet the criteria for analysis.

I-311-459
See the response to comment I-311-324 regarding the intersection analysis. In the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report, the local traffic effects near the SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke Street interchange area included an evaluation of traffic volume forecasts and travel patterns, and the effects of the project's on intersection performance at the 12 intersections, shown in Exhibit 6-7. The Roanoke Street/Harvard Avenue

intersection was evaluated for operational effects; however, the Delmar Drive/East Lynn Street and Fuhrman/Boyer Avenue E were not included in the analysis because the project would result in little to no change in traffic volumes (less than 5 percent) and operations at these locations.

I-311-460

See the response to comment I-311-450 for a description of the effects of segmental tolling (as evaluated in the SDEIS) versus single point tolling (as evaluated in the Final EIS) on traffic volumes in the SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke Street interchange area.

I-311-461

Please see the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge. The effect of Montlake Bridge openings on traffic operations during the off-peak hours was included in the analysis performed for the Preferred Alternative. Please see Chapters 6 and 8 of the Final EIS Transportation Discipline Report.

I-311-462

The statement referred to in the comment regarding Option A was comparing the Montlake Interchange under Option and to the No Build Alternative. As stated on page 6-37 of the Transportation Discipline Report, Option K would result in an increase in traffic volumes in the overall SR 520/Montlake Boulevard Interchange area of 23 percent compared to the No Build Alternative because of the new capacity associated with the new interchange and crossing of the Montlake Cut. With the shift of SR 520 freeway traffic to the SPUI, drivers would choose to take advantage of the capacity made available on Montlake Boulevard.

I-311-463

As described on page 6-34 in Chapter 6 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report, with Suboption A, only right turns onto Montlake Boulevard would be allowed at the Montlake westbound off-ramp. Drivers destined for areas south of SR 520 would need to use the Lake Washington Boulevard westbound off-ramp to travel southbound on Montlake Boulevard. This is very similar to the No Build Alternative, except that U-turn movement at East Hamlin Street would no longer be provided. Restricting left turns at the westbound off-ramp with Suboption A would result in similar traffic circulation patterns in the Montlake interchange area as the No Build Alternative.

The effects of Suboption A and the other 6-Lane options on the East Roanoke Street/Harvard Avenue/SR 520 westbound off-ramp intersection can be found on pages 6-44 to 6-45 in Chapter 6 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report.
For the Final EIS, the Preferred Alternative is similar to Suboption A in that left turns would be restricted at the Montlake westbound off-ramp. Access from westbound SR 520 to areas south of the interchange area would be provided via 24th Avenue East. The effects of these and other design changes in the Montlake interchange area associated with the Preferred Alternative are shown and described in Chapter 6 of the Final EIS Transportation Discipline Report.

I-311-464

Please see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues. Also see Chapter 7 of the Transportation Discipline Report which discusses nonmotorized transportation.

I-311-465

Please see the responses to comments I-311-003 and I-311-004 regarding the project purpose and need. This graphic depicts the

configuration of Option A. Option A would include two general purpose lanes and an HOV lane. The Option A suboption would include two general purpose lanes only. The bullet “additional GP lane” is referring to one more general purpose lane than existing conditions. This Option A suboption configuration has not been carried forward to the Preferred Alternative that is evaluated in the Final EIS.

I-311-466

A third southbound lane on Montlake Boulevard between Lake Washington Boulevard and East Louisa Street was included in Option A in the SDEIS. This third lane was added during the ESSB 6099 mediation process to help alleviate the effects of southbound intersection delays and queuing through the Montlake Interchange area, due to added traffic associated with the removal of the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps. This configuration has not been carried forward to the Preferred Alternative, which is evaluated in the Final EIS.

I-311-467

The Preferred Alternative has been designed to minimize SR 520’s footprint as much as possible while allowing room for HOV lanes and the shoulders required to satisfy current safety standards regulated by FHWA and the Association of American State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). Please see the response to comment I-311-006 regarding the effects associated with the removal of the Montlake Freeway Station.

I-311-468

Design and treatment for the expanded Montlake lid with the Preferred Alternative are being developed through the ESSB 6392 workgroup process, and further coordination with the City of Seattle and surrounding communities. See the ESSB 6392: Design Refinements and Transit Connections Workgroup Recommendations Report in

Attachment 16 to the Final EIS. Please see the response to comment C-311-005 fregarding design enhancements included with the Preferred Alternative. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-469
The orange in Exhibit 6-19 of the Transportation Discipline Report represents the SR 520 regional bicycle/pedestrian path. It does not indicate any structure. Effects on nonmotorized transportation are discussed in Chapter 7 of this report.

I-311-470
The statement referred to in the comment regarding Option K is explaining why traffic volumes would increase on Montlake Boulevard compared to the No Build Alternative. Please see the response to comment I-311-446 regarding the analysis of Montlake Boulevard operations with Option K.

A statement for Option K similar to the quoted text regarding Option A, can be found on page 6-38: "Option K would not degrade operations at any intersections during the morning peak hour and one intersection (Montlake Boulevard/NE Pacific Street) during the afternoon peak hour."

I-311-471
Comment noted.

I-311-472
As shown in Exhibits 6-1 and 6-2 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report, peak hour traffic volumes on NE Pacific Street would be lower with Option A than with the No Build Alternative in the year 2030. Removal of the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps would reduce the amount of traffic traveling through the NE Pacific Street/15th Avenue NE

intersection as drivers from this area divert to other interchanges to avoid congestion near the Montlake Interchange. This would result in an improvement in LOS at this intersection with Option A as compared to the No Build Alternative.

I-311-473

The U-turn movement referred to in this statement is the U-turn at the Montlake Boulevard/East Hamlin Street intersection. Currently, drivers are able to exit via the Montlake Boulevard westbound off-ramp, head north, and make a U-turn at East Hamlin Street to travel southbound to locations south of the Montlake Boulevard/SR 520 interchange. With Suboption A, drivers destined to the south would no longer be able to make this movement and would need to take the Lake Washington Boulevard westbound off-ramp to reach their destinations.

I-311-474

The Preferred Alternative has been designed to minimize SR 520's footprint as much as possible while allowing room for HOV lanes and the shoulders required to satisfy current safety standards regulated by FHWA and the Association of American State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). See the response to comment I-311-006 regarding the Montlake Freeway Transit Station and how transit service would change to accommodate trips that currently use the station.

I-311-475

Page 6-39 of the Transportation Discipline Report discusses the effects of the SPUI under Option K, including benefits to local streets: "…congestion associated with on-ramps would be relocated away from the Montlake neighborhood, improving access and mobility through this area."

I-311-476

Comment noted. Chapter 8 of the Transportation Discipline Report discusses transit operations. Page 8-26 discusses the routing of buses under Options K and L. More detailed transit planning, including whether existing bus stops would be used, replaced, relocated, or removed, will be conducted after publication of the Final EIS, in coordination with transit agencies.

I-311-477

Exhibit 6-21 of the Transportation Discipline Report shows the main transportation facilities that would be constructed with Option K. Exhibit 6-20 shows the facilities at the Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection, which does not include a new bascule bridge. The report has described the options at the necessary level of detail.

I-311-478

The grade-separated pedestrian crossing is depicted in Exhibit 6-20 of the Transportation Discipline Report.

I-311-479

Exhibit 6-20 in the Transportation Discipline Report displays both Option K and L. The item referred to in this comment is a clarification that there is a right turn pocket shown, but is only included in Option L.

I-311-480

Pages 1-17 through 1-19 of the SDEIS explain the mediation process and the three mediation design options that were ultimately agreed upon by the group and evaluated in the SDEIS. The Montlake Boulevard NE/NE Pacific Street intersection included in the SDEIS was proposed by the mediation group and refined by the transportation team. Through the SDEIS analyses, Option K was found to have greater effects to natural resources than Option A. FHWA and WSDOT have identified a

Preferred Alternative that is similar to Option A but includes design refinements that respond to public and agency comments.

I-311-481
Exhibit 6-21 only highlighted the SR 520 regional bicycle/pedestrian path that would be constructed as part of the project. Connectivity to other trails, such as the Bill Dawson Trail is discussed in Chapter 7 of this report, and in more detail in the Recreation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS).

I-311-482
The requested change was not made because the original statement is accurate and changing the language would not change the analysis or findings. Please see the responses to comments I-311-446 regarding the analysis of Montlake Boulevard operations with Option K, as well as I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-483
The requested change was not made because the original statement is accurate. Please see the response to comment I-311-446 regarding the analysis of Montlake Boulevard operations with Option K. Also note that the term “improve” is also on page 6-39 in the discussion of Option K.

I-311-484
Please see the response to comment I-311-446 regarding the analysis of Montlake Boulevard operations with Option K and I-311-475 regarding Option K’s benefits to local streets.

I-311-485
The requested change was not made because the original statement is

accurate. Since Option K would be similar to the No Build Alternative, the term “improve” would not be accurate.

I-311-486

The term “acceptable” is used here as a technical term. All LOS grades above D are considered “acceptable.” Additionally, this intersection (the SPUI) cannot be compared to the existing or No Build Alternative because the intersection does not exist and would only be constructed with Option K and L.

I-311-487

Refer to Chapter 5 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report for additional discussion on the overall effects of the various Montlake interchange configurations on travel patterns and the interface between freeway and local traffic operations. Page 5-31, in particular, explains that more congestion would spill back from I-5 onto Portage Bay Bridge and the local system with Option A. With Options K and L, while less congestion would spill back from I-5 than Option A, the lack of a westbound auxiliary lane on Portage Bay would contribute to congestion spilling back onto the local system.

In Chapter 6 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report, some of this information was reiterated for Option K under the heading SR 520/SPUI Operations, because the new interchange configuration and associated traffic signal differ quite dramatically from the No Build configuration.

The term “spill back” is used throughout the document in descriptions for all options.

I-311-488

The language used in the SDEIS does not offer bias for or against any of the options. The information presented here is accurate and compares

the options in a standard and measurable format.

As stated on page 5-31, Option A would have higher traffic volumes across the Portage Bay Bridge resulting in “more congestion spilling back from I-5 onto the Portage Bay Bridge and the local system.” Please see the response to comment I-311-088 regarding transportation effects of the new bascule bridge under Option A and the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-489

The SPUI and the effects mentioned in the comment are associated with Options K and L. An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document and is purposefully brief. The organization of and language used in the SDEIS does not offer bias for or against any of the options. The information presented here is accurate and compares the options in a standard and measurable format.

I-311-490

For Option K, additional information regarding travel speed, weaving movements, and potential congestion is provided for the traffic turnaround in the Transportation Discipline Report due to its unique configuration for serving a relatively high volume of traffic. Since the configuration results in congestion and other negative effects, the fact that this configuration was developed through the mediation process was added to explain the reasoning for its inclusion.

I-311-491

With Option K, the west leg of the existing intersection (the SR 520 eastbound on- and off-ramps) would be replaced by the extension of W Montlake Place to form a four-legged intersection. By removing the connection to SR 520, more green time would be available for northbound and southbound traffic on Montlake Boulevard because the need to keep off-ramp traffic from backing onto the SR 520 mainline

would no longer exist. However, east-west traffic volumes from both the new extension of W Montlake Place and from Lake Washington Boulevard would still be relatively substantial. That said, the benefits to this intersection with Option K may be more clearly seen by comparing average intersection delays. With Option K, average intersection delay during the p.m. peak hour would improve to 55 seconds/vehicle (LOS E) as compared to 127 seconds/vehicle (LOS F) with the No Build Alternative in the year 2030.

Suboption K would not include the extension of West Montlake Place. Therefore, traffic operations at the Montlake Boulevard/Lake Washington Boulevard/SR 520 eastbound off-ramp intersection would improve to LOS C during the p.m. peak hour.

I-311-492

The requested change was not made because the original statement is accurate and changing the language would not change the analysis or findings. The language used in the SDEIS does not offer bias for or against any of the options. The information presented here is accurate and compares the options in a standard and measurable format.

I-311-493

Please see the response to comment I-311-446 regarding the traffic volumes for Option K. It is true that additional capacity would be provided at the Montlake Boulevard/Pacific Street intersection with Option K. However, this added capacity is not enough to serve the addition of the "extra spoke" (and new traffic movements) to the intersection, as well as the substantial increase in traffic volumes using this intersection.

I-311-494

The additional congestion to the north, south, and west, as referenced in the statement, is caused by queues extending from the worsening of

LOS/delays at the Montlake Boulevard/Pacific Street intersection only during a.m. and p.m. peak hours. This congestion is not reflected in the LOS reported for adjacent intersections.

Statements made in this section regarding Option K traffic operations and in the earlier section describing Option A traffic operations are in comparison to the No Build Alternative during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. As described in these sections, Option K would result in a worsening of operations at the Montlake Boulevard/Pacific Street intersection in comparison to the No Build Alternative while Option A would result in an improvement at this intersection in comparison to the No Build Alternative during the evaluated a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

I-311-495

The suggested statement and assertion of bias are inaccurate. The EIS describes public input where appropriate. The SDEIS provided a comprehensive analysis of effects based on the project design information available at that time.

I-311-496

The lids are integral to the project design and would be constructed at the same time as the section of the SR 520 corridor in which they are located (e.g., the Montlake lid would be completed at the same time as the Montlake interchange improvements). WSDOT has never proposed to defer the lids until after completion of the SR 520 roadway improvements.

I-311-497

The statement does not imply that design enhancements were not provided prior to the mediation process. See Chapters 1 and 2 of the SDEIS and Final EIS, the Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Discipline Report and Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS), and

the Range of Alternatives and Options Examined report (Attachment 8 to the SDEIS) for further information. Please see the response to Comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues. Mediation was conducted to develop and review design options; it did not substitute for the urban design considerations outlined in the responses to Comment I-311-002 and other comments in this letter.

I-311-498

An Executive Summary is intended to provide an overview of the document and is purposefully brief. The same level of detail is not required to be repeated in multiple sections.

I-311-499

Exhibit 2-20 of the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report has a visualization of the Montlake Triangle, looking southeast toward the Montlake Bridge. Additionally, Exhibit 6-20 of the Transportation Discipline Report shows an overhead view of the conceptual lid design.

I-311-500

The purpose of an EIS is to allow decision-makers to understand the environmental effects of project alternatives before design development progresses to the final design stage. The specific design of lids will be evaluated with project permitting, to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Despite the conceptual nature of the design, the analysis contained within this EIS provides sufficient assessment of the anticipated environmental effects from lid designs along the corridor, even though some design changes may occur during final design. The EIS provides analysis of the alternatives and design options at a level of detail sufficient to compare their environmental effects. See the response to

comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-501
This information was included in Chapter 6 of the Transportation Discipline Report. As stated on page 6-38: “Because the SPUI is located farther away from the local street system, congestion associated with on-ramps would be relocated away from the Montlake neighborhood, improving access and mobility through this area, especially south of the Montlake Cut.”

I-311-502
See the response to comment I-311-501.

I-311-503
The description of nonmotorized elements in this chapter incorrectly associated the Foster Island land bridge with all of the design options. This has been corrected in the Final Transportation Discipline Report. Exhibit 7-1, which depicts the future trail connections, showed the correct features. All of the design options met the project goal of providing nonmotorized trail continuity on Foster Island. Please see the response to comment I-311-012 regarding effects on Foster Island.

I-311-504
Chapter 7 of Transportation Discipline Report focuses on key locations in the study area that could be affected by the project. Exhibit 7-1 depicts the future trail connections, and has been updated for the Preferred Alternative in the Final Transportation Discipline Report. The Preferred Alternative would improve safety and enhance connectivity for all nonmotorized users by providing a separate crossing of I-5 south of East Roanoke Street, of SR 520 west of 10th Avenue East, and multiple pathways on the SR 520 lid between 10th Avenue East and Delmar

Drive East. Several of the streets mentioned in the comment are noted as streets used bicycles and were discussed in the ESSB 6392 design refinements and transit connections work group, in which WSDOT worked collaboratively with SDOT, Seattle Design Commission, the City of Seattle Pedestrian Advisory Board, and Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board to develop design refinements for pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the Montlake and Capitol Hill/Roanoke Park neighborhoods. Please see the ESSB 6392: Design Refinements and Transit Connections Workgroup Recommendations Report (Attachment 16 to the Final EIS), and the workgroup's white paper on bicycle and pedestrian connections and amenities at http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/6392workgroup.htm for more information.

I-311-505

Comment noted. The Preferred Alternative includes nonmotorized improvements in the SR 520/I-5/East Roanoke Street interchange area. As described in Chapter 7 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report, the Preferred Alternative would build a lid between 10th Avenue and Delmar Drive which would provide multiple paths across the lid and a separate trail west of 10th Avenue. A separate nonmotorized bridge would also be built on the south side of Roanoke St that would complete a nonmotorized path loop from Boylston Avenue along 10th Avenue to Harvard Avenue, providing connections to the Capitol Hill neighborhood and downtown.

A qualitative assessment of the pedestrian and bicycle travel route between the 10th and Delmar lid and downtown Seattle has been conducted for the Final EIS and is described in Chapter 7 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report.

I-311-506

See the response to comment I-311-504 regarding design refinements in

the Preferred Alternative and the qualitative assessment of nonmotorized travel that is included in Chapter 7 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report.

I-311-507

See the response to comment I-311-504 regarding design refinements in the Preferred Alternative and the qualitative assessment of nonmotorized travel that is included in Chapter 7 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report.

I-311-508

The project considered bicycle and pedestrian facilities early in development of alternatives; as discussed in the Range of Alternatives and Options Examined report (Attachment 8 to the SDEIS). WSDOT continued to consider how bicycle and pedestrian facilities could be refined, in order to increase the benefits of these facilities. Please see the response to Comment I-311-002 regarding the use of the word “design,” and how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-509

WSDOT did, in fact, engage with stakeholders before the Draft EIS was published. See the Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Discipline Report and Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) and the Range of Alternatives and Options Examined report (Attachment 8 to the SDEIS) for further information. Please see the response to Comment I-311-002 regarding the use of the word “design,” and how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues. As described throughout the SDEIS, Option K was found to have greater overall effects than Option A.

I-311-510
The EIS describes public input where appropriate. Please see the response to comment I-311-509 regarding stakeholder involvement. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities were a key area of interest for commenters on the Draft EIS.

I-311-511
Comment noted. The requested change was not made because the original statement is accurate.

I-311-512
The SR 520 Westside Project Impact Plan, developed in the 2008 Mediation Process, identified the Foster Island Land Bridge as a required design feature of Option K, and an optional feature of Options A and L. The SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report inaccurately described the Foster Island Land Bridge as a suboption for Options A, K, and L, characterizing it as a common feature among them. All of the design options meet the project goal of providing nonmotorized trail continuity on Foster Island. Please see the response to comment I-311-012 regarding effects on Foster Island.

I-311-513
Please see the responses to comments I-311-003 and I-311-004 regarding the project's purpose and need.

I-311-514
As an outcome of the ESSB 6392 workgroup process, recommendations developed by the pedestrian/bicycle subgroup include opportunities to enhance connections from the new SR 520 regional bike and pedestrian path to ensure its integration with other regional facilities, such as the Sound Transit U-Link Station, as well as with existing and planned City of Seattle bicycle and pedestrian networks. Seven primary nonmotorized

routes were identified and evaluated through this collaborative process. WSDOT will continue to work with the City of Seattle to ensure that future design refinements of the Preferred Alternative are compatible with and would not preclude future City of Seattle actions. The outcome of the ESSB 6392 process and evaluation of primary nonmotorized routes can be found in the Final Recommendations Report and is described in Chapter 7 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report.

I-311-515

Based on the analysis described in Chapter 7 of the Transportation Discipline Report, the statement is accurate.

I-311-516

The requested change was not made because the original statement is accurate.

I-311-517

The text is correct. It describes the HOV lane that exists on southbound Montlake Boulevard between Pacific Place and Pacific Street.

I-311-518

Please see the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-519

Please see the response to comment I-311-297 regarding tolling the No Build Alternative

I-311-520

The assumption regarding how bus service would operate in the future is directly related to information provided to the project team from the

transit agencies. The general service structure of transit is independent of whether there are freeway transit stops on the corridor. Please see the response to comment I-311-006 regarding the effects associated with the removal of the Montlake Freeway Station. Additional information about how transit patrons will be able to use the new Montlake lid transit stop is provided in the Final EIS.

I-311-521

Chapter 1 of the SDEIS (pages 1-31 through 1-33), and the updated Chapter 1 text for the Final EIS, discuss costs and funding for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project. Discussion of funding for the ST2 project is meant to support why ST2 Plan elements were not included in the baseline transportation analysis for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project. Instead, these plan elements were included in the cumulative effects analysis for the transporation discipline. For the Final EIS transportation analysis, the ST2 Plan elements were assumed to be part of the No Build Alternative.

I-311-522

Please see the responses to comments I-311-298 and I-311-299 regarding HOV lanes.

I-311-523

The HOV direct access off-ramp allows HOVs to exit onto Montlake Boulevard without the potential for being affected by congestion in general traffic lanes. The bus stop locations and lid configuration have been adjusted from the SDEIS options in the Final EIS. See Chapter 8 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report for more information on transit features.

I-311-524

A discussion of the changes to transit connections begins on page 8-21

of the Transportation Discipline Report. Please see the response to comment I-311-006 regarding the new configuration for the Montlake bus stops.

I-311-525

The Montlake Freeway Transit Station stops were removed in all of the design options considered in the SDEIS, based on a decision making process that was part of Westside mediation. The mediation process was mandated by Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6099 and is described on pages 1-17 through 1-19 of the SDEIS. The mediation workgroup consisted of members from adjacent neighborhoods, transit agencies, jurisdictions, and State agencies. Removing the Montlake Freeway Transit Station would minimize the width of the freeway through the Montlake area, reducing the width by up to 40 feet compared to keeping the station. The mediation workgroup did not recommend any design options that included the Montlake Freeway Transit Station stops. See Attachment 8 to the SDEIS, Range of Alternatives and Options Evaluated, for further discussion of how and why removal of the stops was considered.

The Preferred Alternative includes removal of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station stops; however, it also includes a modified Montlake Boulevard interchange and lid. Modifications include a full lid from Montlake Boulevard to the Lake Washington shoreline, and bus stops on the lid for both eastbound and westbound buses (see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS for a description of the Preferred Alternative). The intent is to provide greater pedestrian amenity in the central part of the Montlake neighborhood while simultaneously providing a better location and environment for the regional bus stops incorporated in the transit/HOV direct access ramps (see Chapter 2 of the Final EIS). At the option of the transit agencies, SR 520 buses will be able to exit at the Montlake interchange during the off-peak periods to service passengers to/from the Montlake lid transit stop. University Link light-rail service, expected to

be operational in 2016, will accommodate some of the trips that now use the bus stops. Chapter 8 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) provides further discussion of expected transit operations with the Preferred Alternative, including expected transit travel times, rider connections, and how future transit would incorporate service currently provided at the stops.

The EIS describes public input where appropriate. The Preferred Alternative has been designed to minimize SR 520's footprint as much as possible while allowing room for HOV lanes and the shoulders required to satisfy current safety standards regulated by FHWA and the Association of American State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO).

See Chapters 1 and 2 of the SDEIS and Final EIS and the Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Discipline Report and Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) for further discussion of public and stakeholder input. 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." Please see the responses to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues and I-311-006 regarding the replacement of functions currently provided by the Montlake Freeway Transit Station.

Regarding the Harvard/Roanoke Intersection, page 12-8 of the Transportation Discipline Report discussed a possible design modification that would improve this intersection. The mediation process recommended this modification not be included in Option A, and it was therefore included under Suboption A.

With the Preferred Alternative, operations at Harvard/Roanoke Intersection would be about the same as under the No Build Alternative. The SDEIS options would have resulted in higher traffic volumes through the intersection which would have increased congestion compared to No Build. The Preferred Alternative would not result in traffic increases, so congestion at the intersection would be similar to No Build.

I-311-526

Through continuous coordination between the State and the transit agencies and through more extensive workgroup processes (ESSB 6099 and ESSB 6392) it has been determined that the direct access ramps would be beneficial for transit service and necessary for reliable bus rapid transit to the area. Bus rapid transit service was described in the SR 520 Project – Westside Project Impact Plan dated December 2008 as a means to address the removal of the "Montlake Flyer stop." The bus rapid transit concept was first introduced through the SR 520 High Capacity Transit plan that was developed in response to the ESHB 6099.

I-311-527

This section of the Transportation Discipline Report is specifically discussing the replacement of functions of the Montlake Freeway Transit Station. A discussion of travel times can be found starting on page 8-26 of the report.

I-311-528

Option A would not require travel to the Montlake Triangle to transfer to a SR 520 bus. As stated on page 8-22 of the Transportation Discipline Report, riders could "board an SR 520 eastbound bus at the traffic island located at the entrance to the eastbound SR 520 on-ramp."

I-311-529

The transfer time at the Evergreen Point freeway transit station would be similar to the amount of time required for a person to walk from the Montlake freeway transit station to the intersection at Montlake Boulevard and Pacific Street. Because the transfer and walk times are similar and because the SR 520 program completion would provide a travel time savings for buses, there would be a net travel time savings for passengers destined to the University of Washington area. Through the ESSB 6392 coordination efforts, the State has refined the project's preferred alternative to provide SR 520 buses with the ability to exit SR 520 and serve transit patrons at the Montlake lid transit stop.

I-311-530

Please see the response to comment I-311-006 regarding the effects associated with the removal of the Montlake Freeway Station.

I-311-531

The text referred to in the comment is not located under the section for Options K and L. This section refers to all of the 6-lane design options.

I-311-532

Please see the response to comment I-311-007 and I-311-035 regarding compatibility with potential future light rail and high capacity transit on SR 520.

I-311-533

See the responses to comments I-311-297 regarding tolling the No Build Alternative, I-311-003 for an explanation of why a retrofit of the existing bridge is not a reasonable alternative, and I-311-002 regarding design consideration in the development of the project.

I-311-534

WSDOT cannot assume that because system freeway congestion is identified as a background condition for the project baseline analysis that the State legislature will adopt a tolling policy. Per the project's background project assumption for the year 2030, projects must be planned and programmed to be assumed as in place for the direct effects analysis. Projects that are reasonably foreseeable are covered in the cumulative effects analysis. The cumulative effects analysis chapter of the Final Transportation Discipline Report includes additional information regarding potential changes in traffic volumes on SR 520 that would result if tolls were implemented on various corridors.

I-311-535

Please see the responses to comments I-311-009 and I-311-414 regarding congestion on I-405.

I-311-536

For the SDEIS, no additional analysis was conducted to evaluate the effects during off-peak periods. Instead, the analysis focused on typical conditions during weekday commute periods in order to provide a relative comparison between various alternatives and options. Please see the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-537

Please see the responses to comments I-311-446 regarding the analysis of Montlake Boulevard operations with Option K as well as I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-538

Reliability of travel times is different from local arterial traffic operations.

Reliability is defined by how travel times vary over time. Please see the response to comment I-311-446 regarding the analysis of Montlake Boulevard operations with Option K.

I-311-539

Please see the response to comment I-311-446 regarding the analysis of Montlake Boulevard operations with Option K.

I-311-540

The language used in the SDEIS does not offer bias for or against any of the options. The information presented here is accurate and compares the options in a standard and measurable format.
Please see the response to comment I-311-446 regarding the analysis of Montlake Boulevard operations with Option K.

I-311-541

The Transportation Discipline Report analyzes transportation effects only. Operational effects on other resources were discussed in Chapter 5 of the SDEIS. The additional width and location of Option A would have resulted in the removal of several buildings owned by NOAA at its Northwest Fisheries Science Center. Since publication of the SDEIS design modifications have been made to avoid this effect. See Chapter 5 of the Final EIS for more information.

I-311-542

The local traffic effects of extending West Montlake Place are discussed on page 6-39 of the Transportation Discipline Report.

I-311-543

This section of the Transportation Discipline Report is specifically discussing the effects on parking. Effects on the neighborhood and removal of businesses are discussed in the Social Elements Discipline

Report and the Land Use, Economics, and Relocations Discipline Report.

I-311-544

This section of the Transportation Discipline Report discusses effects to the current parking supply and does not include potential added spaces. As shown in Final EIS Table 5.1-15, the Preferred Alternative would affect fewer parking stalls in the areas described in the comment than the SDEIS design options. Coordination among WSDOT, the City of Seattle, and affected land owners would be required to determine whether removed parking can be replaced and the actual parking measures that may be implemented as part of the project. If Option K were identified as the Preferred Alternative in the future, additional detail regarding replacement of parking would be provided during final design.

I-311-545

Effects on parks are discussed in Chapters 5 and 6 and the Recreation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). Also see the response to Comment I-311-041. The comment's characterization of the analysis is incorrect. As stated on page 9-11 of the Transportation Discipline Report, "Option A would have slightly higher parking effect in the Montlake area than Options K or L, including a loss of 70 percent of parking at the Hop-In Market." Replacement parking was discussed as potential mitigation for effects on the Hop-In Market. As discussed in Chapter 9 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report, the Preferred Alternative would not affect parking at the Hop-In-Market.

I-311-546

Please see the response to comment I-311-512 regarding the Foster Island Land Bridge.

I-311-547

The Delmar Drive road closure described in the SDEIS is no longer planned. Delmar Drive will be shifted onto a portion of the new lid while the existing bridge is removed and re-constructed. See Section 6.1 of the Final EIS for more information on road detours during construction.

I-311-548

The referenced exhibit indicated potential direct routes that people might have chosen for the indicated closures. However, people could choose other routes at their discretion, which cannot be predicted with certainty. Two of the closures described in the SDEIS are no longer planned and closure of the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps would be permanent. The description of traffic patterns during construction has been revised. See Section 6.1 of the Final EIS and Chapter 10 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report for more information.

I-311-549

The effects during construction along Boyer Avenue East and East Fuhrman are associated with temporary access to work bridges that will be required to build the Portage Bay Bridge. The access will not exist when construction is complete.

See the response to comment I-311-324 regarding the intersection analysis. Local street effects are reported for areas where traffic volumes are projected to increase by more than 5 percent due to the project, which is a standard criteria for evaluation. Boyer Avenue East and East Fuhrman Street would not be substantially affected after completion of the project.

I-311-550

Exhibits 10-6 and 10-7 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report list Fuhrman Avenue East and Boyer Avenue East as haul routes for the Portage Bay Bridge. Potential haul routes have been revised since

publication of the SDEIS and are discussed in Section 6.1 of the Final EIS and Chapter 10 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report.

I-311-551

Fuhrman Avenue East and Boyer Avenue East would be needed for haul truck activity to support construction of the Portage Bay Bridge. Work bridge access on the north and south sides of the existing and new bridges would be necessary along Boyer Avenue East in order to support construction, and in order to maintain traffic in the SR 520 corridor during project construction. A small construction staging area has been identified along Boyer Avenue East, within WSDOT right of way, just south of the existing Portage Bay Bridge. Access to that staging area would be from Fuhrman Avenue and Boyer Avenue as necessary. See Chapter 3 of the Final EIS, and Chapter 6.1 of the Final EIS for additional discussion about haul route assumptions, updated potential volumes along haul routes, and durations for haul route activity.

I-311-552

The comment's characterization of the analysis in incorrect. "Higher volumes" are not likely to result in "better" cumulative effects; instead, higher volumes result in a conservative analysis. The cumulative effects analysis is intended to show effects at a regional level, and differences between the SDEIS design options were minimal in this context.

I-311-553

WSDOT considered a wide range of alternatives before narrowing them down to those evaluated in the Draft EIS. Please see the responses to comments I-311-001 and I-311-007 regarding development of alternatives, I-311-030 regarding the workgroups that coordinated with WSDOT and FHWA in the development of mitigation measures and design refinements that are included with the Preferred Alternative, and

I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-554
Please see the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-555
See the response to Comment I-311-145 regarding methodology and I-311-256 regarding organization of environmental impact analyses.

I-311-556
The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Draft EIS considered two No Build scenarios - a Catastrophic Failure Scenario and a Continued Operation Scenario. The Continued Operation Scenario was used as the baseline No Build Alternative to which the project team compared the Build alternatives. Please refer to the Draft EIS for more information regarding the effects of the Catastrophic Failure Scenario.

FHWA and WSDOT developed conceptual project designs and conducted environmental analysis for a facility that would satisfy the intended purpose and need, could be constructed and operated in a legally compliant manner, and would minimize potential effects to the environment. FHWA and WSDOT will ensure the project complies with applicable policies and regulations.

I-311-557
The use of the word “design” is and consistent with generally accepted usage for transportation and roadway projects. See the response to I-311-002 and I-311-001 for more information on the public involvement process.

The Montlake Area was of particular concern to citizens and thus the design underwent considerable public review. The term “community-based” was intended to emphasize the input of the community on the design. The EIS describes public input where appropriate.

I-311-558

The EIS describes public input where appropriate. Attachment 8 of the SDEIS, Range of Alternatives and Options Evaluated, describes the decisions that went into determining the Draft EIS and SDEIS alternatives and design options. The Preferred Alternative has been designed to minimize SR 520’s footprint as much as possible while allowing room for HOV lanes and the shoulders required to satisfy current safety standards regulated by FHWA and the Association of American State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). Also see Chapters 1 and 2 of the Final EIS for further discussion of the planning process and alternatives, respectively. See response to Comment I-311-557.

I-311-559

See the response to Comment I-311-294 regarding shoulder widths. HOV lanes need to allow for buses, which are wider than most cars.

I-311-560

The EIS describes public input where appropriate. Please see the response to Comment I-311-556 regarding mitigation. Operational noise effects and potential mitigation for Options A, K, and L are discussed in Section 5.7 of the SDEIS and the Noise Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS).

I-311-561

The SDEIS defined some options to include noise walls and/or quieter pavement. However, based on WSDOT and FHWA policy, approved

noise mitigation must be considered where warranted based on specific criteria, with any alternative or option.

Based on WSDOT policy, the SDEIS evaluated noise walls for all design options, and made recommendations based on where they would meet feasibility and reasonableness criteria. The Noise Discipline Report provides further discussion and describes where noise walls were evaluated based on the FHWA noise abatement criteria, and where they would be recommended based on feasibility and reasonableness criteria.

However, based on concerns about the effect of noise walls on visual quality and aesthetics in the area, WSDOT has identified a number of noise reduction strategies in the Preferred Alternative. These noise reduction strategies would reduce noise in the Seattle portion of the project to the point that noise walls would are not recommended with the Preferred Alternative in this 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. Where noise walls are recommended, public input would determine whether they are constructed. This public input will occur after the EIS analysis. See Section 5.7 of the Final EIS and the Noise Discipline Report for more information. Also see the response to comment C-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative.

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 EIS analyses were conducted consistent with FWHA and WSDOT policy and meet NEPA requirements for an EIS. The visual quality analysis considers effects both with and without noise walls (see the

Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report). The indirect and cumulative effects analysis is expressly intended to evaluate effects on a regional level. The SDEIS Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report explained that noise walls would be considered to reduce or mitigate effects. The Final Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report explains how the Preferred Alternative reduces noise effects.

I-311-562

Noise reduction strategies included with 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. Please see the response to comment C-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-563

The requested change was not made because the original statement is accurate and changing the language would not change the analysis or findings. Please see the response to comment C-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative, and regarding quieter pavement.

I-311-564

The SR 520, Medina to SR 202: Eastside Transit and HOV Project is a separate project although it is part of the SR 520, Bridge Replacement and HOV Program. The SR 520, Medina to SR 202 project Environmental Assessment can be accessed at http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/EastsideEA.htm.

Funding and construction of the Eastside project does not preclude funding and construction of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project. As

described in Chapter 1 of the Final EIS, funding for the floating bridge—the most vulnerable portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina corridor—has been secured, and WSDOT has solicited proposals for construction of this portion of the project. Chapter 1 also describes construction sequencing for the project, which allows several years for full funding to be obtained through a variety of state and federal sources.

I-311-565

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project, I-311-556 regarding how the project complies with applicable policies and regulations, and C-311-005 regarding design enhancements included with the Preferred Alternative. Once completed, the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project will improve mobility, access, neighborhood connectivity, air quality, noise conditions, and water quality in the project area.

I-311-566

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. The Recreation and Ecosystems discipline report addenda (Attachment 7 of the Final EIS) discuss the effects of the Preferred Alternative to Montlake Playfield, and the adjacent aquatic environment.

I-311-567

The statement regarding property values was part of a description of past trends in the project area specifically related to the opening of bridges across Lake Washington. See the response to I-311-093 regarding economic effects of the project. The effect of the project on property values cannot be calculated with certainty.

I-311-568

NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report. However, the Affected Environment section of the Final Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report has been updated to include additional discussion of the original SR 520 corridor on the Arboretum and Westside communities.

I-311-569

The requested change was not made because the original statement is accurate and changing the language would not change the analysis or findings.

I-311-570

Transportation analyses conducted as part of determining the range of alternatives studied in the NEPA process are based on travel demand forecasts that account for expected growth in population and employment. Transportation demand modeling conducted for the project accounts for where people live and work in the region and where changes in population and employment are expected to occur.

The transportation analysis shows that the existing AM commute eastbound and PM commute westbound have similar vehicle volumes as the opposite commutes.

Growth in regional travel demand is based on growth in population and employment projected by local jurisdictions and the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) through the metropolitan planning process. Other factors considered in demand modeling include economic factors such as direct costs (parking costs, fuel costs, and tolls), available alternatives such as transit and its cost to riders, federal fuel efficiency

standards (accounting for an average fleet fuel efficiency based on the forecast year), and other regional economic factors forecasted by PSRC, in predicting future travel demand. PSRC periodically updates its travel demand models with current assumptions; the project travel demand models are based on PSRC's current models. Chapter 3 of the Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS) and the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) provides information on travel demand modeling.

The SR 520 project would complete the HOV lane system in the corridor and add a bicycle/pedestrian lane to the corridor. The project would not add general purpose lanes. The project would result in immediate benefits for transit speed and reliability in the corridor by providing high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes across the floating bridge and better HOV connections at the Montlake and I-5 interchanges (see Section 5.1 of both the SDEIS and Final EIS). Because the project would improve reliability and efficiency for transit and carpools, it would create incentives for people to choose an alternative to driving alone. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues, and I-311-007 and I-311-035 regarding compatibility with potential future light rail and high capacity transit on SR 520.

I-311-571

This section was describing past trends in the project area specifically related to the opening of bridges across Lake Washington.

I-311-572

NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report.TheHowever, the Affected Environment section of the Final Indirect and Cumulative Effects

Discipline Report has been updated to include additional discussion of the original SR 520 corridor on the Arboretum and Westside communities.

I-311-573

The project aims to increase mobility and includes completing the HOV lanes across the Evergreen Point Bridge. Section 5.1 of the Final EIS describes transportation effects of the project, which include an increased percentage of trips across the bridge occurring in non-SOVs. Additionally, see Chapter 7 of the Transportation Discipline Report regarding nonmotorized transportation.

I-311-574

Comment noted. The requested change was not made because it does not affect the findings or analysis of the EIS. Please see the response to comment C-311-005 for a list of design enhancements included with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-575

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. Regardless, the Recreation and Ecosystems Discipline Report Addenda (Attachment 7 of the Final EIS) discuss the effects of the Preferred Alternative to Montlake Playfield, and the adjacent aquatic environment.

Additionally, Exhibit 17a of the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report is entitled, "Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions - Land Development." A restoration project in the southern waters of Portage Bay would likely not include land development and therefore would not be shown on a land development exhibit.

I-311-576

WSDOT mitigates the direct and indirect effects of its actions. However, the fact that cumulative effects include contributions from many sources makes it difficult for any one agency to mitigate them effectively. By mitigating the direct and indirect effects of its actions, WSDOT minimizes the extent to which it contributes to cumulative effects.

I-311-577

See the response to comment I-311-324 regarding the intersection analysis. The Roanoke Street/Harvard Avenue intersection was evaluated for operational effects; however, the Delmar Drive/East Lynn Street and Fuhrman/Boyer Avenue E were not included in the analysis because the project would result in little to no change in traffic volumes (less than 5 percent) and operations at these locations.

I-311-578

See the response to comment I-311-450 regarding increases in traffic on local streets due to tolling.

I-311-579

The comment incorrectly equates the no-build alternative with existing conditions, by saying that "...currently, with the no-build, traffic is never backed up even on that off ramp to 405." The no-build represents conditions that are likely to be present 20 years in the future, if the SR 520, I-5 to Medina Project is not built. It includes planned and programmed transportation projects and accounts for the population and employment growth that is currently planned by all of the cities within the region. The differences between existing conditions and the no-build alternative were shown in Chapter 5 of the SDEIS Transportation Discipline Report, where no eastbound congestion currently exists in the PM peak period, there would be substantial congestion in 2030.

The differences between eastbound and westbound travel times for transit would be related to the configuration of HOV lanes in the no-build. In the westbound direction, congestion from I-405 would back-up onto SR 520, but the HOV lanes would be sufficiently long to allow transit vehicles to bypass the congestion. In the eastbound direction, the HOV lane would begin near Evergreen Point. I-405 congestion would back up beyond the start of the HOV lanes, preventing transit and carpools from accessing them and bypassing the congestion. Therefore, unlike the westbound direction, transit and carpools in the eastbound lanes would become part of the congestion in the two general purpose lanes in the no-build. Construction of the HOV lane along the Evergreen Point floating bridge would allow transit and carpools to bypass congestion in the general purpose lanes.

I-311-580

This section of the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report discussed transportation effects overall, listing the "improved access ramps in the Montlake area" as one of the features that would improve congestion. As stated on page 6-38 of the Transportation Discipline Report, "because of roadway improvements associated with the project, Option K would not degrade operations at any intersections during the morning peak hour and one intersection (Montlake Boulevard/NE Pacific Street) during the afternoon peak hour."

I-311-581

Please see the response to Comment I-311-544 regarding parking effects of the Preferred Alternative and how affected parking would be addressed.

I-311-582

The language used in the SDEIS does not offer bias for or against any of

the options. The information presented is accurate and compares the options in a standard and measurable format.

I-311-583

See the response to comment I-311-324 regarding the intersection analysis. The Roanoke Street/Harvard Avenue intersection was evaluated for operational effects; however, the Delmar Drive/East Lynn Street and Fuhrman/Boyer Avenue E were not included in the analysis because the project would result in little to no change in traffic volumes (less than 5 percent) and operations at these locations.

I-311-584

Effects on parks and transportation are considered direct effects of the project and are discussed throughout the SDEIS. Indirect effects are effects that “are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. Indirect effects may include growth-inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density, or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems (40 CFR 1508.8).” The ideas mentioned in the comment regarding attitudes are subjective and cannot be predicted with certainty. The NEPA process avoids such speculation when supporting evidence is lacking. See the response to Comment I-311-093 regarding property values.

I-311-585

This list of items that add to the congestion problem on SR 520 is a discussion of existing conditions and does not include the “lack” of potential future design features.

I-311-586

The language used in the SDEIS does not offer bias for or against any of

the options. The information presented is accurate and compares the options in a standard and measurable format. Please see the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-587

The statement was included in the cumulative effects analysis to describe a trend. The cumulative effects analysis is intended to identify changes to regional transportation patterns and changes to resources on a regional level that would result from the project in combination with other planned projects.

The effects described in the comment would be considered direct effects. See the response to comment I-311-324 regarding why some intersections are not considered in the analysis of direct transportation operational effects. The Roanoke Street/Harvard Avenue intersection was evaluated for operational effects; however, the Delmar Drive/East Lynn Street and Fuhrman/Boyer Avenue E were not included in the analysis because the project would result in little to no change in traffic volumes (less than 5 percent) and operations at these locations.

I-311-588

Please see the responses to comments I-311-088 and I-311-395 regarding transportation effects of the existing and new bascule bridge.

I-311-589

Please see the responses to comments I-311-003 and I-311-004 regarding how the options meet the project's purpose and need.

I-311-590

See the response to comment I-311-324 regarding the intersection analysis. The Roanoke Street/Harvard Avenue intersection was

evaluated for operational effects; however, the Delmar Drive/East Lynn Street and Fuhrman/Boyer Avenue E were not included in the analysis because the project would result in little to no change in traffic volumes (less than 5 percent) and operations at these locations. Also, see the response to comment I-311-297 regarding tolling the No Build Alternative as well as I-311-003 and I-311-007 regarding the range of alternatives evaluated for the SR 520 project. A 4-lane alternative was analyzed in the Draft EIS and found not to meet the project purpose and need. Section 2.4 of the Final EIS provides further information on consideration of a tolled and transit-optimized 4-lane alternative, which were also found to not meet the project purpose and need.

I-311-591

The referenced statement described future conditions without the project. As discussed in the response to comment I-311-297, the No-Build Alternative would not include a toll. As shown in Exhibit 5-3 of the Transportation Discipline Report, the daily vehicle demand on alternative routes, including I-90, is expected to increase as well, making it likely that motorists would continue to select SR 520 as their route. See the response to Comment I-311-570 regarding factors that travel demand modeling accounts for; both the Build and No Build travel demand models account for behavior based on economic factors and land use patterns.

I-311-592

See the response to comment I-311-324 regarding the intersection analysis. The Roanoke Street/Harvard Avenue intersection was evaluated for operational effects; however, the Delmar Drive/East Lynn Street and Fuhrman/Boyer Avenue E were not included in the analysis because the project would result in little to no change in traffic volumes (less than 5 percent) and operations at these locations. Please see the response to comment I-311-446 regarding the analysis of Montlake Boulevard operations with Option K.

I-311-593

Potential haul routes for the SDEIS options are discussed in Chapter 10 of the Transportation Discipline Report (see Exhibit 10-6). Potential haul routes have been revised since publication of the SDEIS and are discussed in Section 6.1 of the Final EIS and Chapter 10 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report.

I-311-594

Cut-through traffic is the Roanoke Park/Portage area was identified as a potential effect during construction only, not during operation. See the response to comment I-311-397 regarding how cut-through traffic was incorporated in the traffic model.

I-311-595

During detailed design, WSDOT will prepare a Community Construction Management Plan in consultation with the affected communities. As this plan is developed, details regarding temporary street closures and detours will be determined with community input. The detour routes have been revised since publication of the SDEIS, and some of the closures are no longer necessary. Please see Chapter 10 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report as well as Section 6.1 of the Final EIS for updated information.

I-311-596

The text quoted in the comment is unclear. It should read “With the No Build Alternative, daily transit person trips would increase by approximately 8,150 people, or 51 percent, between now and the year 2030.The 6-Lane Alternative would increase transit person-trip demand by approximately 3,450 per day, or 14 percent, over the No Build Alternative.” This information was discussed on page 8-34 of the Transportation Discipline Report.

I-311-597

The addition of HOV lanes to the corridor, with no increase in the existing number of general-purpose lanes, is expressly intended to improve the speed and reliability of transit service, providing an incentive to use transit. Please see the response to comment I-311-007 and I-311-035 regarding compatibility with potential future light rail and high capacity transit on SR 520.

I-311-598

The text refers to a project construction traffic management plan that will be developed prior to construction of the project, when detailed design and construction plans are available. This is described as a method of addressing potential concurrent construction effects when the project is implemented. The effect of closing the Delmar Drive during construction would be traffic diversion through the neighborhoods, which was described in Chapter 10 of the Transportation Discipline Report. The Delmar Drive bridge closure is no longer planned. Traffic will be shifted onto a portion of the new 10th and Delmar lid while the existing Delmar Drive bridge is re-constructed. Please see Chapter 10 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report as well as Section 6.1 of the Final EIS for updated information.

I-311-599

Because the NEPA process precedes the detailed design of a proposed action, it is typically not feasible for an environmental impact statement to provide precise information on topics such as temporary street closures and detours, which are determined later during detailed engineering design and construction planning. WSDOT will prepare a Community Construction Management Plan for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project that will include appropriate best management practices, mitigation commitments, and ongoing consultation and coordination commitments to local communities.

I-311-600

WSDOT considered a wide range of alternatives before narrowing them down to those evaluated in the Draft EIS. Please see the response to comment I-311-007 regarding the range of alternatives evaluated for the SR 520 project.

The SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Draft EIS considered two No Build scenarios – a Catastrophic Failure Scenario and a Continued Operation Scenario. The Continued Operation Scenario was used as the baseline No Build Alternative to which the project team compared the Build alternatives. Please refer to the Draft EIS for more information regarding the effects of the Catastrophic Failure Scenario. The width of the 6-Lane Alternative is discussed throughout the SDEIS in the areas where it would have an effect, including in the Ecosystems Discipline Report and the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Report.

I-311-601

The acquisition of land for construction of the project; shadows; and changes in park usage and to the historical character of an area are all direct effects. These effects are discussed in Chapter 5 of the SDEIS and updated information can be found in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS. Please see the response to comment I-311-584 for the definition of indirect effects. Please see the response to comment I-311-093 regarding property values.

I-311-602

The planning documents used to support the cumulative effects analysis identify trends that have affected land use in the region and provide projections of how land use is likely to change in the reasonably foreseeable future. This is the standard methodology for analyzing indirect and cumulative effects. Input from the community has been collected throughout the design process. A detailed overview of the public involvement process is located in the Agency Coordination and

Public Involvement Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). Also, see the response to comment I-311-005 for information regarding design refinements that are included with the Preferred Alternative, based largely on community feedback.

I-311-603

The referenced usage is not inconsistent, but reflects different contexts. The Affected Environment discussion notes that during their historical development, Bellevue and Redmond began as separate communities and subsequently assumed a suburban character after bridges were built across Lake Washington, connecting them to Seattle. In recent decades, Bellevue and Redmond have become urban centers in their own right.

I-311-604

This section of the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report is focused on the overall study area, not only the communities next to SR 520. Demographic information of these communities is included in the Social Element Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS).

I-311-605

Acquisition of parkland is a direct effect and is discussed in Section 5.4 of the SDEIS and updated in Section 5.4 of the Final EIS. The Preferred Alternative has benefited from extensive input from agencies and the public during NEPA/SEPA evaluation, and as a result has further minimized effects on parks compared to designs studied previously. Please see the response to comment I-311-584 for the definition of indirect effects.

I-311-606

The indirect and cumulative effects analysis is expressly intended to evaluate effects on a regional level. Acquisition of parkland is a direct effect and is discussed in Section 5.4 of the SDEIS and updated in

Section 5.4 of the Final EIS. The Preferred Alternative has benefited from extensive input from agencies and the public during NEPA evaluation, and as a result has further minimized effects on parks compared to designs studied previously. Please see the response to comment I-311-584 for the definition of indirect effects.

I-311-607

"Minimizing the transportation corridor footprint" is not part of the project's purpose and need, and WSDOT has provided reasonable alternatives that meet the project's purpose and need. Please see the response to comment I-311-294 regarding the project footprint. The analysis conducted for the SDEIS is consistent with industry standards, NEPA requirements, regional planning process, and FHWA traffic analysis guidelines for evaluating and comparing existing and future transportation project alternatives.

I-311-608

Energy and greenhouse gas emissions and community effects are all direct effects. These effects are discussed in Chapter 5 of the SDEIS and updated information can be found in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS. Please see the responses to comments I-311-093 regarding property values, I-311-584 for the definition of indirect effects, and I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-609

Comment noted. Please see the responses to comments I-311-003 and I-311-004 regarding how the options meet the project's purpose and need.

I-311-610

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project. As shown in Table 5.4-1 in the SDEIS, compared to Option A, Option K would result in more permanent parkland acquisitions than Options A and K.

I-311-611

The noise and visual quality effects described in the comment are considered direct effects. These effects are discussed in Chapter 5 of the SDEIS and updated information can be found in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS. Please see the response to comment I-311-584 for the definition of indirect effects. Also see the Social Elements Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS) for more information on these effects.

I-311-612

WSDOT considered a wide range of alternatives before narrowing them down to those evaluated in the Draft EIS. Removing and not replacing the bridge did not meet the purpose and need of the project and therefore was not considered. Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project. NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report. However, consistent with accepted methodology, WSDOT evaluated the cumulative effects of the project by comparing expected future conditions with the project to expected future conditions without the project, not to conditions prior to the construction of the original SR 520 Bridge.

I-311-613

NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report. However, consistent with accepted methodology, WSDOT evaluated the cumulative effects of the project by comparing expected future conditions with the project to expected future conditions without the project, not to conditions prior to the construction of the original SR 520 Bridge. Additionally, direct effects to parks are discussed in Chapter 5 of the SDEIS and the Recreation Discipline Report.

I-311-614

Please see the responses to comments I-311-003 and I-311-004 regarding how the options meet the project's purpose and need, and I-311-007 and I-311-037 regarding how the project can accommodate bus rapid transit in the near time and potential future light rail.

Since publication of the SDEIS, WSDOT reevaluated the effects of tolling, as described in Final EIS Section 5.3 and the Environmental Justice Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).. WSDOT and FHWA determined that the actions taken to provide more affordable alternatives to paying the toll, coupled with the benefits of the project, would offset the adverse effects of the toll on low-income populations. For additional discussion about the potential effects of tolling on environmental justice populations, please refer to the SR 520 Variable Tolling Project Environmental Assessment document.

I-311-615

Because the NEPA process precedes the detailed design of a proposed action, it is typically not feasible for an environmental impact statement to provide precise information on topics which are determined later during detailed engineering design and construction planning. The

SDEIS provided a comprehensive analysis of effects based on the project design information available at that time. The discussion of environmental justice effects on page 5-50 of the SDEIS acknowledged the reduced access to tribal fishing areas resulting from the larger bridge. An updated discussion of the effects of project operation on usual and accustomed fishing areas is provided in section 5.3 of the Final EIS and in the Environmental Justice Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7). The social elements and cumulative effects analyses were conducted consistent with FHWA and WSDOT policy and guidelines. The Social Elements Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS) discusses direct effects to the surrounding communities resulting from the project. Please also see the responses to the Muckleshoot Indian Tribes comments on the SDEIS in Item T-001.

I-311-616

The project would provide infrastructure that improves transit speed and reliability along the SR 520 corridor. A more detailed discussion can be found in the Final Environmental Justice Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

I-311-617

See the response to I-311-002 regarding design considerations in the development of the SDEIS options and Preferred Alternative, and as project design development continues. The project will provide measures to minimize, reduce, and mitigate for effects as required. Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-618

Please see the response to comment I-311-007 and I-311-035 regarding

compatibility with potential future light rail and high capacity transit on SR 520. A more detailed discussion can be found in the Environmental Justice Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

I-311-619

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-620

Acquisition of parkland is discussed in the Recreation Discipline Report as well as in the Social Elements Discipline Report. Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.

I-311-621

Please see the responses to comments I-311-016 and I-311-150 regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge.

I-311-622

The language used in the SDEIS does not offer bias for or against any of the options. The information presented is accurate and compares the options in a standard and measurable format. Please see the responses to comments I-311-012 and I-311-118 regarding effects on Foster Island.

I-311-623

A discussion of effects on recreational boating is included in the Recreation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS). The Recreation Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 of the Final EIS)

discusses the design refinements included as part of the Preferred Alternative, which would improve the experience for small boats around the Arboretum. WSDOT and FHWA have identified a Preferred Alternative with a smaller overall project footprint in the Washington Park Arboretum that also maintains full access to Arboretum waterways and shorelines.

I-311-624

Comment noted. A higher bridge would allow more light to penetrate underneath the bridge and would contribute to a more open feeling with better views.

I-311-625

The language used in the SDEIS does not offer bias for or against any of the options. The information presented is accurate and compares to options in a standard and measurable format. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding the design development of the SDEIS options. Additionally, WSDOT received a number of comments in support of and in opposition to all three options presented in the SDEIS (Options A, K, and L). The Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Summary of Comments is available at: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/SR520Bridge/SDEIS.htm.

I-311-626

Please see the responses to comments I-311-012 and I-311-118 regarding effects on Foster Island. The language used in the SDEIS does not offer bias for or against any of the options. The information presented is accurate and compares to options in a standard and measurable format. WSDOT will consult with neighborhood organizations and other stakeholders as the landscaping approach for SR 520 lids is developed during detailed design.

I-311-627

The positive effects are discussed on page 73 of the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report: “Replacement properties developed as part of the mitigation of direct effects on parklands would provide recreational land available to park users. The regional bicycle/pedestrian trail and lids would encourage pedestrian and bicycle use over the long-term. In the Arboretum, removal of the Lake Washington Boulevard ramps and R.H. Thomson ramps (“ramps to nowhere”) would remove visual clutter and improve views to and from the park over the long-term. Inclusion of sound walls (as approved by affected neighborhoods) would also achieve long-term benefits for park users.” See the response to Comment I-311-096 regarding consideration of effects on parks and compliance with Section 4(f).

I-311-628

FHWA and WSDOT developed conceptual project designs and conducted environmental analysis for a facility that would satisfy the intended purpose and need, could be constructed and operated in a legally compliant manner, and would minimize potential effects to the environment. See the response to Comment I-311-096 regarding consideration of effects on parks and compliance with Section 4(f).

I-311-629

The requested change was not made because it would not change the analysis or findings. NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report. However, consistent with accepted methodology, WSDOT evaluated the cumulative effects of the project by comparing expected future conditions with the project to expected future conditions without the project, not to conditions prior to the construction of the original SR 520 Bridge.

I-311-630

Comment noted. The requested change was not made because the original statement is accurate and changing the text would not change the analysis or findings.

I-311-631

The requested change was not made because the original statement is accurate and changing the text would not change the analysis or findings. The Preferred Alternative, described in Chapter 2 of the Final EIS, would reduce effects on the Arboretum by eliminating the eastbound Lake Washington Boulevard on-ramp and providing an off-ramp that connects to 24th Avenue instead of to Lake Washington Boulevard. The addition of the proposed Lake Washington Boulevard lid would enhance the livability of the neighborhood by providing landscaped open space and improved connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists.

I-311-632

NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report. However, consistent with accepted methodology, WSDOT evaluated the cumulative effects of the project by comparing expected future conditions with the project to expected future conditions without the project, not to conditions prior to the construction of the original SR 520 Bridge.

I-311-633

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not

reasonable alternatives for the project, and I-311-096 regarding compliance with Section 4(f) requirements.

I-311-634

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project, and I-311-096 regarding compliance with Section 4(f) requirements. WSDOT has continued to work with local agencies, including the City of Seattle, and the project will comply with all applicable regulations.

I-311-635

The Draft Section 4(f)/6(f) Evaluation (Attachment 6 of the SDEIS) discussed effects of Options A, K, and L on park and recreational lands regulated under Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act and Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservations Fund Act, and how WSDOT would mitigate those effects.

The Final Section 4(f) Evaluation (Chapter 9 of the Final EIS) provides a detailed description of Section 4(f) lands that would be affected by the Preferred Alternative and measures WSDOT would take to mitigate those effects. The Section 6(f) Evaluation (Chapter 10 of the Final EIS) describes proposed compensatory mitigation through the conversion of existing non-recreational lands in the project vicinity to new parklands. The Section 6(f) Evaluation incorporates assessments of the environmental effects of the proposed conversions, which would compensate for right-of-way acquisitions of recreational land needed to build the Preferred Alternative.

Please see the response to comment I-311-096 for more information regarding compliance with Section 4(f) requirements.

I-311-636

The paragraph referenced in the comment is about the Montlake interchange area. The paragraph below it discusses the visual quality effect of Options K and L, and also the effect of the bascule bridge under Options A and L. The suggested edit is not accurate.

I-311-637

The quoted text is referring to the structure passing over Foster Island, which would be similar to the existing bridge. Please see the response to comment I-311-012 regarding effects on Foster Island. The Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report discusses direct effects on visual quality in greater detail.

I-311-638

The term land bridge and lid are interchangeable in this context. The structure over Foster Island is generally called a land bridge because the roadway beneath it would be depressed; however, once completed, it would serve a similar function as a lid.

I-311-639

The SDEIS assesses and discloses the expected direct effects of the project on visual quality in Section 5.5 and in the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report. The Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report assesses the cumulative effect of the project and other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions on visual quality and discusses how urban development, including transportation improvement projects, has altered the visual environment of the study area. The cumulative effects assessment discusses how the project would contribute to the long-term trend in visual quality during project construction and operation. WSDOT follows State of Washington and FHWA guidance in conducting visual quality assessments and avoids

speculation on how visitors might react to the project. Please see the response to comment I-311-584 for the definition of indirect effects.

I-311-640

See the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-641

The requested change was not made because it does not affect the findings or analysis of the EIS.

I-311-642

The purpose of the visual quality assessment is to disclose how the existing visual quality conditions will change due to the location, size, and character of the new facility. See the responses to comments I-311-010 and I-311-178 regarding the visual quality assessment included in the SDEIS. Also see the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues.

I-311-643

The project is a replacement of an existing highway. It is a transportation project, with a purpose and need of improving safety and mobility for people and goods, as stated on page 1-3 of the SDEIS. See the response to comment I-311-002 regarding how the project addresses urban design, visual quality and aesthetic issues. NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report. However, consistent with accepted methodology, WSDOT evaluated the cumulative effects of the project by

comparing expected future conditions with the project to expected future conditions without the project, not to conditions prior to the construction of the original SR 520 Bridge.

I-311-644
Comment noted. The requested change was not made because it does not affect the findings or analysis of the EIS.

I-311-645
The cultural resources analysis and visual quality analysis use two different types of methodology and therefore the conclusions would not necessarily be the same. A change in visual quality may not affect cultural resources and vice versa. Please see the responses to comments I-311-016 and I-311-150 regarding visual effects of the new bascule bridge.

I-311-646
The assessment of indirect noise effects presented in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 of the Final EIS) has been updated for the Preferred Alternative. This assessment addresses changes in noise levels that would result from project-related changes in surface street traffic volumes within residential neighborhoods along the SR 520 corridor.

I-311-647
Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project, and I-311-057 regarding noise.

I-311-648
Please see the response to comment I-311-584 for the definition of

indirect effects. Direct noise effects are discussed in Section 5.7 of the SDEIS and the Noise Discipline Report. Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project, and I-311-057 regarding noise.

I-311-649

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project, and I-311-057 regarding noise.

I-311-650

See Section 5.9 for a discussion of how the project relates to regional goals reduce GHG emissions. See the response to Comment I-311-022 for more information on the reduction of VMT and GHG with the project.

I-311-651

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project. See the response to Comment I-311-022 for more information on the reduction of VMT and GHG with the project. WSDOT performed air quality modeling of carbon monoxide (CO) for conformity analysis for both the SDEIS and the Final EIS, as required under the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The results of the conformity analysis for the SDEIS were described on page 5-112 under the heading “Local Air Quality.” A more detailed discussion with reference to conformity standards is found on pages 17 through 22 and 23 through 25 of the Air Quality Discipline Report. The Air Quality Discipline Report Addendum and the Final EIS updated these analyses.

The modeling demonstrated that the project will be in conformity with the SIP. The air quality analysis was conducted using accepted methodology consistent with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington Department of Ecology, FHWA, and WSDOT policy. Air quality standards and guidance from these agencies has been formulated to protect human health and the environment.

I-311-652
Comment noted. The Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report has been updated and is included in Attachment 7 to the Final EIS.

I-311-653
See the response to Comment I-311-022.

I-311-654
Mitigation measures are included in each discipline report for each specific element of the environment (discipline reports are included in Attachment 7 of the Final EIS). Mitigation Plans are also included in Attachment 9 to the Final EIS.

I-311-655
Please see the responses to comments I-311-003 and I-311-004 regarding how the options meet the project's purpose and need. Noise reduction strategies included with 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. Please see the response to comment C-311-057 regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative.

I-311-656

Section 5.9 of the SDEIS and the Energy and Greenhouse Gases Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the SDEIS) discussed these effects in greater detail. The Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report assesses the cumulative effect of the project and other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions and discusses how urban development, including transportation improvement projects, has affected energy consumption and greenhouse gases in the study area. The cumulative effects assessment discusses how the project would contribute to long-term trends during project construction and operation. Please see the response to comment I-311-584 regarding the definition of indirect effects.

Section 5.9 of the Final EIS includes a discussion of how the project relates to regional goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Energy Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) includes additional discussion of emission reduction for both operational and construction energy use and greenhouse gas emissions.

I-311-657

Comment noted. The visual quality effects of the new stormwater facilities are discussed in the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report.

I-311-658

The text quoted in the comment is a summary of direct effects. Tables 5.11-1 and 5.11-2 of the SDEIS showed the fill and shading effects on wetlands and wetland buffers. The information in the quoted text regarding wetland fill is correct, but there was a typo regarding the shade effects. The text should have read: “Option K would have the greatest shade effects from project construction. Option K would have the most fill effects from project operation on buffers, followed by Option L, then Option A. Option L, however, would have the most effects from shading,

followed by Option K, then Option A." However, the Final Indirect and Cumulative Effects report presents the analysis differently and does not include this statement.

I-311-659

NEPA does not require analysis of the effects of prior projects as part of environmental review of direct effects for a proposal; however, effects of the existing SR 520 corridor are considered and discussed in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Discipline Report. However, consistent with accepted methodology, WSDOT evaluated the cumulative effects of the project by comparing expected future conditions with the project to expected future conditions without the project, not to conditions prior to the construction of the original SR 520 Bridge.

I-311-660

Please see the responses to comments I-311-004 and I-311-007 regarding why a cross-lake tube/tunnel and a tunnel for the I-5 to Lake Washington portion of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina project are not reasonable alternatives for the project.