

SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Supplemental Draft EIS Comment Form

Please use this form to share your comments on the content provided in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement document. WSDOT will consider all comments received between Jan. 22 and April 15, 2010 in making its final decision in the environmental review process. Thank you for your comments.

You can provide comments using one of the following methods:

- -- Complete this form.
- Mail your comments to Jenifer Young, SDEIS Environmental Manager, Washington State Department of Transportation, 600 Stewart Street, Suite 520, Seattle, WA 98101.
- -- E-mail your comments to SR520Bridge\_SDEIS@wsdot.wa.gov.
- -- Speak to a court reporter at an environmental hearing scheduled for 5 7 p.m., Feb. 23, at Lake Union Park Naval Reserve Building, 860 Terry Ave. N., Seattle.

 1. Name
 Richard Meyer and Susan Harmon
 CommentDate:
 4/14/2010 23:21

 2. E-mail
 meyerhar@aol.com
 Comment Source:
 Online Comment Form

3. Address: 1213 E. Shelby St. # 9

4. City: Seattle
5. State: WA
\* 6. Zip Code: 98102

7. Do you have any comments on the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

## I-331-001

We are opposed to the six lane plan A+ because it will do great harm to the Arboretum, Fischer's Island, Portage Bay and the wildlife who are thriving there.

## I-331-002

We support a four lane bridge and highway because the seven lane Portage Bay Vladuct will cause back ups to I-5. Even now there are back-ups to I-5. The second bridge proposed over the Montlake Cut will destroy historic homes and add to pollution in Portage Bay. The six lane bridge will be be an eyesore to views of Lake Washington from the shore. A four lane bridge can have one of the lanes converted to light rail in the future when many people will stop using cars and demand more mass transportation. Remember you are building a bridge and a highway for generations not the 1950s. Pease pay attention to the public hearing to the Seattle City Copuncil on April 8. There were over 30 citizens who were against the six lanes and only three for it.

Thank you.

These comments will become part of the public record for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Personal information is voluntary and will become part of the public record if provided. The Washington Sate Department of Transportation is a public agency and is subject to the Sate of Washington's Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Therefore, comments may be made available to anyone requesting them for non-commercial purposes.

## I-331-001

Comment noted. WSDOT received a number of comments in support of and in opposition to Options A, K, and L and the suboptions to these options. These opinions are summarized in the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Summary of Comments (WSDOT, April 2010), available at

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

## I-331-002

As described in Section 1.8 of the SDEIS and in Attachment 8 of the SDEIS, Range of Alternatives and Options Evaluated, the transportation analysis performed for the Draft EIS showed that while a 4-lane alternative would improve safety by replacing vulnerable structures and widening lanes and shoulders, it would not satisfy the project purpose of improving mobility in the SR 520 corridor. In 2010, based on SDEIS 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.

A 4-lane Portage Bay Bridge would not allow for HOV lanes, which provide express lane connectivity, or for a managed shoulder in the westbound direction, which is needed to address congestion.

The project can accommodate future high capacity transit in the SR 520 corridor, which may include bus rapid transit or light rail transit. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS provides further discussion. WSDOT undertook additional analysis after the SDEIS was published to help answer public questions about how rail in the SR 520 corridor might operate and the

ridership it might generate. The analysis assumed no tolls for carpools with 3 or more occupants. A single general-purpose lane in each direction would substantially restrict cross-lake mobility. With light rail service on SR 520 and I-90, the demand for general-purpose travel would still require two lanes in each direction on SR 520. WSDOT completed a visual analysis of the 6-lane alternative, and updated this analysis for the Preferred Alternative. See Section 5.5 of the SDEIS and Final EIS, and the Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report Addendum (Attachment 7 to the Final EIS).