

Jenifer Young
SR520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project
Environmental Manager
SR 520 Project Office
600 Stewart St, Suite 520
Seattle, Wa 98101

Subject: Comments to SDEIS

- I-317-001** | Enclosed 5 pages calls for a clarification and mitigation of the expected noise levels during and post construction within the Montlake Community area.
- I-317-002** | WSDOT has designed a SR520 bridge replacement that:
- I-317-003** | 1) Does not improve traffic flow
a) from Medina to I-5
b) from SR520 to UW
- I-317-004** | 2) Does not improve transit mobility
a) from Medina to I-5 and into Seattle central
b) from 520 alignment to UW
- I-317-005** | 3) Does increase noise levels beyond FHWA criterion throughout the Montlake Community
a) particularly along Lake Wash Blvd
b) and along the Montlake Blvd E
- I-317-006** | 4) Destroys a nature base lifestyle in the Montlake Community and the Arboretum adjunct
- I-317-007** | 5) Increases the probability of cumulative health problems to residents near SR520
- I-317-008** | MITIGATION - ???? The SDEIS report is primarily speculative, theoretical and not pragmatic, qualitative rather than quantitative and emphatically not committal to any abatement of the harmful effects on the adjacent neighborhoods.
- I-317-009** | "DO NO HARM" -???? Harm is all (you all) have accomplished with your decade long design.
- "LEAVE NO FOOTPRINT" is the demand of the Montlake Community.-

Charles S. Budnik
1896 E. Hamlin St
Seattle, Wash 98112



I-317-001

The Preferred Alternative includes several noise reduction strategies, such as 4-foot concrete traffic barriers with noise-absorptive coating; reducing speed limits through the Portage Bay area to 45 mph; encapsulating expansion joints; and using noise-absorptive materials around the Montlake and 10th Avenue East/Delmar Drive East lid portals. Information on noise modeling results for the Preferred Alternative can be found in Section 5.7 of the Final EIS and the Noise Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).

Construction noise is addressed in Chapter 6 of the SDEIS, with the range of expected construction noise given for several types of activities. For example, non-impact construction noise would range from 82-94 dB, pile driving from 99-105 dB, and demolition from 82-92 dB at the closest receivers.

I-317-002

The Preferred Alternative would improve traffic operations and travel times for all vehicles using the SR 520 corridor between Medina and I-5. It would also improve local traffic operations in the Montlake interchange area, including trips between SR 520 and the University of Washington. Chapter 5 of the Final EIS and Chapters 5, 6 and 8 of the Final Transportation Discipline Report (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS) describe how the No Build and Preferred Alternatives would affect freeway operations, local traffic, and transit operations.

I-317-003

The completion of the SR 520 HOV lanes between Medina and I-5 as well as providing direct access ramps at I-5 and Montlake Boulevard will improve the transit reliability on the corridor. Additional information can be found in the Final Transportation Discipline Report in Chapters 5 and 8.

Report Comment Summary

Report:

Report	Page #	Line #'s	Reviewer	Comment	
I-317-017	EIS	5-66	32-34	C.. Budnik	Negative effects of sound walls on drivers views should not be a priority over negative effects of noise on nearby homes and wildlife. Affected nearby residents whose homes were built 40-60 yrs prior to existing 520 route must have mitigation priority.
					The statement made regarding in-filling more residences closer to the highway than when it was built (pg 7-28 line 21-24) is clearly not valid to the situation in the Montlake community. width expansion of the proposed highway to 7+ lanes places the traffic much closer to homes that were built in the 1910's and the 1920's.
					If sound walls and or lids are not financially feasible as noted in the EIS for specific zones in Montlake, then the triple pane windows mitigation is a must, to reduce the traffic noise.
I-317-018					
I-317-019		5-77	32-35		Negative visual effects should not take precedent over traffic noise. Both demand corrective action.
		5-79	25-29		Same comment applies as above pg 5-77
		5-81	1# -12		Same comment applies as noted for Pg 5-77 and 5-79

applicable federal, state, and local agencies through the permitting and approval process. After the Final EIS has been issued, FHWA will prepare a Record of Decision (ROD), which will document the course of action it has decided upon as the federal lead agency. The ROD will explain how the lead agencies plan to implement mitigation measures and conservation actions in compliance with NEPA and other laws. This will include input from the ESSB 6392 processes where appropriate for the level of design development.

Although the ROD is the conclusion of the NEPA process, it signals the beginning of project implementation, during which WSDOT will further develop the engineering design for the project, including additional detail on project phasing, construction staging, and construction techniques. At this point, WSDOT will develop more specific designs for mitigation measures, which will be documented in project permit approvals. These designs will be prepared by WSDOT and FHWA, in cooperation with the affected jurisdictions and resource agencies. In addition, WSDOT will abide by local jurisdiction regulations for construction and will continue to work with communities to define construction mitigation measures through the permit and approval process. This may include seeking a noise variance when appropriate for construction activities. WSDOT's commitments to mitigation determined through community coordination and the permit and approval conditions of federal, state, and local laws and regulations will be disclosed in the ROD (see the Fact Sheet in the Final EIS for a list of required permits and approvals).

I-317-008

Comment noted.

I-317-009

Comment noted.

Report Comment Summary

Report:

Report	Page #	Line #'s	Reviewer	Comment	
I-317-020	EIS	6-72	1-22	C.S. Budnik	Listed potential noise mitigation measures should be individually quantified to determine achievable sound level reductions relative to maximum allowable levels noted for operational scenarios in Table 6.7.5 Page 6-68.
I-317-021		7-28	27-30		Erroneous/contradictory statement--- The A+ option has a reasonably foreseeable future project scheduled to be built close enough to SR 520 that will contribute to a cumulative noise increase effect. That project is the Montlake second bascule bridge which will have major noise impact on the Shelby/Hamlin homes during the construction phase (obviously) as well as a continuing noise generator with traffic idling along Montlake Blvd E. More lanes and more traffic on those lanes will obviously increase noise by idling automobiles when the bascule bridge is up. NO SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES ARE QUANTIFIABLY DEFINED TO ALLEVIATE THIS DIRECT AND CUMULATIVE NOISE EFFECT.

I-317-010

The requested change was not made because this list is only an example of some of the possible mitigation measures that were evaluated. See the Noise Discipline Report and its Addendum in Attachment 7 to the Final EIS for information on how the analysis and findings were updated based on the Preferred Alternative and in response to public comments on the SDEIS.

I-317-011

The requested change was not made because the original statement is accurate.

I-317-012

Please see the response to comment I-317-001 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.

I-317-013

The requested change was not made because the original statement is accurate.

I-317-014

See response to comment I-317-012.

I-317-015

A large number of noise locations were selected for noise modeling and from this information it was possible to determine future project-related noise levels considering the proposed mitigation at 862 properties.

by code or regulation, and therefore mitigation options are typically developed with community and jurisdictional stakeholders.

I-317-020

See response to comment I-317-015.

I-317-021

Please see the response to comment I-317-001 regarding noise reduction strategies included with the Preferred Alternative. In the Shelby Hamlin area specifically, the higher profile of the Preferred Alternative provides further noise reduction. The project would reduce noise from traffic in many parts of the Shelby Hamlin neighborhood compared to the No Build Alternative. However, some properties close to Montlake Boulevard would experience a slight increase in noise levels. Information on noise modeling results for the Preferred Alternative can be found in the Noise Discipline Report Addendum and in Section 5.7 of the Final EIS.

I-317-022

Comment noted.

I-317-023

Comment noted. WSDOT does mitigate direct adverse effects of transportation improvement projects. It cannot mitigate cumulative effects such as those relating to regional population growth, except by easing such effects where feasible through transportation improvement projects.

I-317-024

A number of design refinements were included in the Preferred Alternative to reduce negative impacts to the Montlake Historic District. The Preferred Alternative would create some beneficial changes to the

district, including removal of the Lake Washington and R.H. Thomson Express way ramps, addition of a planted median on Lake Washington Boulevard, enhancement of the boulevard to a true park boulevard, reduction of noise levels in some areas from the Montlake lid, and from additional public green space and connectivity from the lid. The Montlake lid would also visually shield many of the historic properties from the effects of the wider SR 520 roadway.

These beneficial changes would resolve some of the cumulative effects from transportation facilities and traffic through the historic district.

WSDOT has also engaged the Montlake Community Council in further discussions, through the Section 106 consultation process, to address potential effects from the project. The consultation culminated with the development and signature of a Programmatic Agreement (Attachment 9 to the Final EIS), which outlines the terms and conditions agreed upon to resolve the potential adverse effect from construction and operation of this project. Please see the Final Cultural Resources Assessment and Discipline Report for more detailed information pertaining to the process (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).