

From: Sullivan, Joseph M [mailto:joseph.m.sullivan@boeing.com]
Sent: Friday, April 16, 2010 1:47 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Opposition to WSDOT SR 520 DEIS and Construction Option A

I-298-001

TO: WSDOT - SR 520 DEIS

Council Members,

I have made a list of my concerns and request they be acknowledged and included in our building of a new bridge:

I am requesting construction processes for noise mitigation during construction. And bridge deck evaluation of 'quiet pavement' on the bridge (vs. I-405 test) and use of sound walls or Lid. on the sides of the Portage Bay viaduct.

I am requesting a video of our current structure and mitigation for damage for dust/air quality of from bridge removal as well as vibration on our Condominiums and moorage slips and our house down the street.

I-298-002

I request mitigation of Boyer Ave. traffic impacts from heavy equipment. And any loss of renters/rent do to congestion on Boyer Ave..

I-298-003

I am requesting you save our parks and nature walk in South Portage Bay.

Original SR 520 construction affected the bay in many ways: silt build up, water quality, shoreline, native species, native plants, and fish/salmon habitat.

Reclaiming South Portage Bay with removal of silt, invasive plant life, restoration of shoreline (see www.fabnia.org) and better recreational access will provide an important dimension to Seattle's urban quality of life.

I-298-004

I believe WSDOT is biased, and that local officials and agencies of government are under pressure from business interests anxious for mass cross-lake transit at any cost.

Option A & A+ ignores our concerns to mitigate highway noise. Although WSDOT convened an expert panel on noise, there is no provision in Option A/A+ for any noise-abatement systems.

I-298-005

Option A/A+ adds a second drawbridge across the Montlake cut, destroying homes (some of which may be historic). And it fails to improve transit speed or reliability and overloads the intersections on either side. WSDOT's own analysis predicts the volume of traffic able to cross the cut will not increase beyond what can cross it even if we do nothing at all.

I strongly urge 'building SR 520 right' this time.

Thanks,
Joe

I-298-001

The proposed noise reduction strategies for the Portage Bay area include: 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. The noise modeling indicated that these strategies would reduce the level of future noise from the completed project over existing noise levels.

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.

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).

I-298-002

Limited construction using heavy equipment would occur on Boyer Avenue East. The construction traffic management plan will establish requirements to minimize traffic effects during those times. Boyer Avenue East is expected to operate similar to existing conditions throughout most of construction. Increased congestion is not anticipated.

I-298-003

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. WSDOT is unable to undertake a reclamation of Portage Bay in association with this project,

but will mitigate for effects generated by construction activities or operation of the project where needed. WSDOT will continue to work with affected communities and develop mitigation measures for the preferred alternative where needed. Refer to the aquatic and wetland mitigation plans in Attachment 9 to the Final EIS and the Ecosystems Discipline Report Addendum in Attachment 7 to the Final EIS for updated information on the scope of the project.

I-298-004

Comment noted.

I-298-005

Comment noted.