



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program



I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

Supplemental Draft EIS Environmental Hearing Comment Form – Feb. 23, 2010

Welcome to the environmental hearing for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Please use this form to share your comments on the content provided in the Supplemental Draft EIS 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 through one of the following methods:

- **Complete this form** and place it in one of the comment boxes during the meeting. Please write clearly.
- **Mail** your comments to Jenifer Young, SR 520, I-5 to Medina 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.
- **Visit the Web page** at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge.

Name GENEVIEVE VAYDA **E-mail** GENEVIEVE@CIVICSUED.ORG
Address 3800 LINDEN AVE NORTH # 3
City SEATTLE **State** _____ **Zip** 98103

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 State Department of Transportation is a public agency and is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Therefore, meeting comments may be made available to anyone requesting them for non-commercial purposes.

STOP THIS UGLY NOISY BRIDGE - WIDEWAYS!

Do you have any comments on the Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

START PROCESS AGAIN!!

MAKE IT A PUBLIC PROCESS.

NO MORE DIVIDE AND CONQUER,

SALES PITCH OPEN HOUSES... WE MUST

HEAR FROM + LEARN FROM ONE

From: Elizabeth Adamitis [mailto:eadamitis@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 28, 2010 8:56 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Comments regarding 520 Bridge Replacement

I-071-001

Please consider any option retaining the 520 freeway stop. The new transit center is an extremely short distance away from the bus stop. People are capable of walking and re-routing all buses off the freeway and into traffic is both unnecessary and wasteful.

Elizabeth Adamitis
2427 E. Louisa St.
Seattle, WA 98112

Your E-mail and More On-the-Go. Get Windows Live Hotmail Free. [Sign up now.](#)

From: Richard Buckley [mailto:richard.r5398@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2010 2:37 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: SR 520 Bridge 6 Lanes

To Jenifer Young, SDEIS Environmental Mgr.

I-072-001

I much prefer six traffic lanes on the SR 520 bridge.
To be paying tolls on only 4 traffic lanes and 2 future transit lanes is
not desirable.

Richard Buckley

-----Original Message-----

From: jcooper@fhcrc.org [mailto:jcooper@fhcrc.org]

Sent: Sunday, February 28, 2010 10:01 AM

To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS

Subject:

I have two major concerns:

I-073-001 |
1. The bridge is much wider than the current bridge, and has considerable footprint in the form of interchanges etc at both ends. This removes current habitat for migratory birds. The mitigation plans are feeble and based on wishful thinking. The impacts on Foster Island area cannot be mitigated (white-washed) by tiny changes in Seward Park and other parks or by flooding the playfields at Montlake. Changes made in the Montlake Fill area need careful planning so they will not modify or destroy outstanding habitat. Meadow/grassland species also use the Union Bay Natural Area and just dredging to make more wetland is not a suitable answer. The footprints of the ends of the bridge need to be reduced.

I-073-002 |
2. There is no allowance for light rail. This is short-sighted and will have negative impacts on longterm traffic problems in Seattle and Eastside for decades to come.

Jonathan A. Cooper
643 Randolph Place
Seattle
WA 98122

From: richard daifuku [mailto:rdaifuku@hotmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, February 27, 2010 12:51 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: SR520 Bridge

To whom it may concern:

I-074-001 | I would like to suggest that roadway construction in general and the SR520 bridge specifically not add additional capacity for automobiles. Adding capacity even in the form of HOV lanes will decrease the impedance of automobile travel and result in more use by automobiles. Hence, I support the proposal to consider the two lanes currently being proposed as HOV lanes to be exclusively used for transit.

I-074-002 | It is also important that transportation projects be at a minimum carbon neutral. It is too common in political circles to give lip service to the environment or global warning, while promoting environmentally harmful infrastructure projects.

I-074-003 | Discouraging automobile use and encouraging use of transit, walking and cycling will have both environmental benefits and benefits to the public's health.

Sincerely,

Richard Daifuku MD

Hotmail: Trusted email with powerful SPAM protection. [Sign up now.](#)

From: Sandy G [mailto:sangran1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2010 7:38 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Comment on 520 Bridge- Concern through arboretum and lanes

I-075-001

My main concern is that the recreation area in the arboretum could be compromised. Everything should be done to maintain boating, canoeing, park activities in the arboretum, the 520 bridge should at least be raised to the height of the western high rise through this area. Bike and pedestrian paths along with expandibility to add light rail should be included in the plans.

Sandy

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

From: Hayman, Glenn [mailto:ghayman@eaest.com]
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2010 8:40 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: SR 520 Bridge

I-076-001

Build the new bridge using the current preferred option. There is no perfect solution. There is agreement that the existing 520 bridge is insufficient and needs to be replaced. Build the new bridge using the current preferred option.

Glenn A. Hayman, LHg
Cell 206.235.0589
ghayman@eaest.com



Before printing, think about ENVIRONMENTAL responsibility



SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program



I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project

Supplemental Draft EIS Environmental Hearing Comment Form – Feb. 23, 2010

Welcome to the environmental hearing for the SR 520, I-5 to Medina: Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Please use this form to share your comments on the content provided in the Supplemental Draft EIS 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 through one of the following methods:

- **Complete this form** and place it in one of the comment boxes during the meeting. Please write clearly.
- **Mail** your comments to Jenifer Young, SR 520, I-5 to Medina 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.
- **Visit the Web page** at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/SR520Bridge.

Name Penny Lewis E-mail plewis4040@msn.com
 Address 1213 E Shelby #7
 City Seattle State WA Zip 98102

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 State Department of Transportation is a public agency and is subject to the State of Washington's Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Therefore, meeting comments may be made available to anyone requesting them for non-commercial purposes.

Do you have any comments on the Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

I-077-001

Yes. I have the following concerns:
The lack of emphasis on decreasing auto
traffic over Lake Washington - To help solve
that issue, the third lane could be Transit ONLY,
and connection between transit traffic + light rail

Do you have any comments on the Bridge Replacement and HOV Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement? (continued from page 1)

I-077-001

would be direct NOT a 3-block walk;

I-077-002

I'm concerned that the enormous size of the replacement bridge is wasteful, unnecessary and too expensive, especially in the Montlake/Portage Bay Area. I'm concerned the size of this project will destroy irreplaceable parts of a community treasure - The Arboretum. I'm concerned

I-077-003

that construction will cause major disruption of surrounding neighborhoods. I'm concerned that the design will increase the number of cars traversing the lake rather than discourage it. I'm concerned that there is not enough funding to pay for this project and what will be done when half of it gets built and there is no money to finish it?!

I-077-004

This plan - any of them - does not help to meet the City of Seattle's goal of a zero carbon footprint city.

I-077-005

I'm concerned that the proposed plan can easily be turned into an 8 lane road easely. It does not need to be as wide as planned.

I-077-006

We need a 6 lane bridge only wide enough for that - with 2 lanes dedicated to rapid transit - Buses now/light rail ready. - No Arboretum Ramps / Yes on a Montlake transit stop.

I-077-007

I-077-008

From: George Myers [mailto:gjmyers@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, February 27, 2010 10:43 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: 520 Bridge Replacement

To Whom It May Concern;

My wife and I recently received a postcard notifying us about the comment period extension.

I have recently heard that Seattle Mayor McGinn is seeking to conduct yet another study and change the plan that has already been approved and is in process. So much time and taxpayer money has been spent and wasted on multiple studies over many years that this has become a farce. Those of us who commute everyday on this heavily overused and dangerously outdated bridge are more than tired of studies and delays. The time for building, not studies, has long past.

Respectfully,
George Myers

I-078-001

From: Marianne Wick [mailto:chip52@basecapital.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 28, 2010 11:19 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: FW: prpposed 520 changes
Importance: High

From: Marianne Wick [mailto:chip52@basecapital.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 28, 2010 11:18 AM
To: 'sr520bridge_SDEIS@wsdot.wa.gov'
Subject: prpposed 520 changes
Importance: High

I-079-001 | Ms. Jennifer Young SDEIS ENV. Manager and other interested parties,

I am a 58 year old native of the Seattle area. I was born and raised in South Seattle, graduated from Franklin High and later the University of Washington. My wife and I and our three children have been residents of Bellevue for 35 years. We live approximately one half mile north of 520 on 130th Avenue NE.

I am flabbergasted that the proposed 520 program has been extended again and that another study is being conducted for over \$250,000. *It is time for government to get with the program. I have watched for decades as our ineffective government officials accomplish very little in the way of actual results. The proposed plan with 3 lanes in each direction on the new 520 is a good start and has been studied and restudied.*

I-079-002 | *The new Seattle mayor's idea to stop this plan in favor of some rapid transit or Sound Transit plan is truly obstructionist. We do need a rail option but it should be added to the existing plan. Sound Transit is a joke for those of us who live on the Eastside. Billions were spend before the first shovel was put in the ground. As far as its benefit people in Seattle especially along Martin Luther King Way are very disappointed that they cannot be serviced as there are no parking options for those that may live more than a half mile from the rail line. Tell the new mayor he should fix the inadequacies of the existing Seattle lines before he proposes rail for the Eastside. Seattle's new mayor would have probably been opposed to the wheel thousands of years ago.*

I don't mean to denigrate Seattle's new mayor. He is probably a well meaning but misguided idealist.

I-079-003 | *Please get the proposed 520 plan back on track so my grandchildren will not have to waste their time stuck in traffic. By the way you should have an economist or accountant that can value the lost time by eastside employees of approximately 10,00+ to inefficient commuting time each day. The value of this waste would go a long way to paying for the cost of the proposed six lane bridge and related enhancements. Please, get it done.*

Sincerely,

*H. Thomas Wick
Bellevue*

I-080-001

MR. AFFLECK-ASCH: Hi. I mean, I come not to bury the 520 Bridge but to praise the fact that we are doing something, even if the current plans may not meet the goals of the voters. When you look at the funding, we see that, on the western approach and also the eastern approach, not the actual pontoon structure itself -- we have up to 80 percent lack of funding, especially of the western edge. And I think that we're, at some point, going to have to do something to provide that money, which will probably be a vote of the people.

I-080-002

Most of the people on the western side do support having light rail with an initial phase of a bus rapid transit in a separate lane for any additional lanes past the first four. Every time you talk to the voters, that's what they say. People who live far away may have very different viewpoints. However, the majority of the people who will be voting do, in fact, live near the bridge.

I-080-003

Nobody is against tolls. I mean, everyone wants it to be free. I mean, come on. But I think the tolling that's been presented is a reasonable option.

I-080-004

One of the major concerns is that, as I understand the current air-quality constraints, we're only looking -- we're only looking at the current standards as set up by the EPA; we're not looking at what will become the regulations in 2011. The construction of this will not even begin, on the western approach, until -- I believe the earliest was 2012. Some of the landing structures may be before that, but the actual exits, etcetera, will have to comply with that standard.

To do that -- because our county will be in violation of the EPA

I-080-004

global-warming emission standards and the pollution standards by that point, we're going to have to reduce the emissions from both construction and operation.

That comes back to looking at the energy cost for the construction and the operation. If we put a lot of cars on, we're basically outsourcing energy production for the vehicles, either through gasoline -- if they're hybrid or plug-in electric, any car that's on the eastern side of Lake Washington is using mostly Puget Energy, not Seattle City Light. Seattle City Light does about 99-percent renewable energy. But when you look at Puget Energy, they have about 30-percent coal-derived energy. So even if you're recharging your plug-in electric car over at Microsoft or downtown Bellevue, you're getting that energy, unless they specially paid for it, from coal. So all we're doing is pushing the pollution somewhere else, but it's still being created.

So I think we need to address those things, looking at where we're going forward. Other nations have done a lot more than we have, and I think we need to address them as best we can.

Thank you.

(End of comment.)

I-081-001

MR. BADER: I'm Jorgen Bader. I was on the mediation panel, representing the University District. I have just delivered to you comments that I have prepared on the supplemental draft Environmental Impact Statement. We are for A-Plus without the Arboretum ramps. We support the findings of the legislative work group except for the Arboretum ramps, the simple A proposal.

And under A, there will be less traffic going through the Arboretum than we have now. It is the only option that does that. All of the other options considered in mediation increase traffic volumes through the Arboretum; this one cuts them.

I-081-002

We also need a corridor-management agreement so that we have land-use planning to favor transit. We have recommended for further study that we prepare and really study whether you can, in fact, find replacement land for park land taken. I don't think it can be done, except for Option A without the Arboretum ramps.

I-081-003

I-081-004

I've also recommended that you study the effect on the biota, which is at the very bottom of the food chain. That hasn't been done.

I-081-005

I think the EIS should set forth what you have done on the research, explain why rail cannot be put into the transit at the moment and why it's not feasible to plan to put rail stops on there or to have the lanes the bus stop in be the travel lanes. Those are things that were recommended by the Mayor, and they deserve some discussion to move the debate along.

I-081-006

Finally, the SDEIS should be more effective. It tends to soften the horrendous flaws caused by A, and it tones down the many advantages

I-081-006

(sic) of A and the effects that A presents to the neighborhoods. I think that you've got to have a full discussion so that the decision-makers can make an honest and objective finding and decision.

Thank you.

(End of comment.)

-----Original Message-----

From: rosemaryboyd [mailto:rosemaryboyd@live.com]
Sent: Monday, March 01, 2010 1:11 PM
To: SR 520 Bridge SDEIS
Subject: Commentary

I-082-001

The new proposed changes to 520 will strongly impact the entire community. Too much money, too tall a structure, too noisy a traffic flow, a lure for even more crossings make this a bad idea. Why not keep it at a maximum of four lanes with two HOV lanes, which would become single use lanes in higher vehicular usage times through the day? Thanks for allowing the public to review and comment.

I-083-001

MR. BRONER: So thank you for hearing us. I appreciate you public officials listening to citizens on this important issue. But I would like to say that, given how much this bridge will make global warming worse -- well, it's fortunate that it's a floating bridge.

So a few things. First of all, what we should be doing is planning this bridge for the next 50 years, not for the last 13. Those 13 years, we're never getting back. Let's move on.

I-083-002

What we should ultimately be doing is replacing the pontoons. We know that they're damaged, that they need to be replaced. What we should not be doing is using this as an excuse to push through a design that doesn't meet our needs.

I-083-003

What we should be doing is treating bus rapid transit as the minimum of what we should be doing. Bus rapid transit would be the Montlake stop. We know that bus rapid transit is a very effective way of getting high-capacity transit with the minimum of capital investment.

What we also should be doing is -- since we're treating this as the minimum we should be doing, we should think about what is the most we should be doing, which is taking the 6.1 miles between east link and north link and realizing that it's penny-wise and pound-foolish to tear them up and reconfigure them now without putting in light rail.

If you assume that we're not going to do light rail for the next 50 years, well, yes, let's just do that now. But I think that's a false assumption, given all the challenges that previous speakers have outlined. But maybe Washington engineers have a plan they can pull

I-083-003 |

off when the pontoons -- when they become the only thing that's still
afloat.

(End of comment.)

I-084-001

MR. BURKHART: I'm Dick Burkhardt, the transit advocate for south of Seattle that works with Sierra Club and many other groups. And I come at this from -- not as a neighbor, but to look from a bigger picture. And I agree with Seattle Mayor Mike McGinn. We need to take climate change seriously now. We can't just have goals for the future, say "We'll do something then." When we have the opportunity right now, we need to do it.

It's not just climate change. I've also been studying the oil situation, and we're in the period of peak oil. In 10 years, we're probably going to have gas \$10 a gallon, and then it's going to go up from there. The result of that is that all of these growth projections that we've been hearing are not going to be operative. If we're serious about climate change, we cannot have the projected growth. And in any case, peak oil won't allow it.

I-084-002

So the consequence of that is: We oppose the A-Plus with the Arboretum ramps; support the modified A where, instead of starting with HOV lanes, we start with very separated transit-only lanes and don't plan to add more lanes later on for LRT. Right now, plan for LRT in the future.

In what's called the HOV lane, make that transit BRT lane, not bus-only transit in the future; maybe both; and then retain the transit Flyer stops at Montlake. But the transit Flyer stop should be in-lane stops, not -- no bypass lane, and that would actually make them work with a much smaller footprint.

In addition, to make the transit work on the Montlake Boulevard

I-084-002

and 23rd, we need transit preference on those for buses: Single preference, maybe transit-only lanes, things like that.

And so I think this is one way we can actually get serious and do things now. Thank you.

(End of comment.)

I-085-001

MS. CARLSON: I'm Jan Carlson, and I'm a citizen. I live in Eastlake. I live on a houseboat, so I'm concerned about the environment. The -- whenever a new roadway is built, the primary, first concern should be not automobiles, but alternative transportation.

I know that -- I've been through the -- we looked on the Internet the other day, and I've been through the designs over here, and I know that there are transit -- rapid bus transit and bicycle lanes and pedestrian lanes are part of the planning. However, access to the bus transit is very poor.

One of the problems is the 1200 feet that you have to go, over in the U District or the Montlake area, in order to get to the rapid transit. To change, you have to change modes of transportation there. And there's no way for people -- people are expected to ride their bike or walk and walk in between those transportation -- or in between those points.

And when I asked some of the staff people about the problem of getting to and -- you know, and where are the Park & Ride lots? And they said, "Well, that's not our issue. That's not what we're doing. That is either King County or the City of Seattle." Another person said, "Well, the City of Seattle doesn't want to encourage parking. They want people to walk or ride their bike."

And what's going to happen is, number one, for handicapped people who can't walk and don't qualify for Access or -- Access would not be feasible because, to get off the bus and sit and wait for an Access

I-085-001

van to come and take you 1200 feet is not reasonable.

But it would not -- it would -- what it's going to do is throw all kinds of people into their cars and have them drive, because the access to the alternative transportation doesn't work for them.

So I just want to say that somebody needs to take responsibility for that problem. And I would say somebody in all three areas -- in King County -- in King County, in WSDOT, and in the City of Seattle. You need to get together.

Thank you.

(End of comment.)

I-086-001

MR. CURREN: Hi. I'm Ryan Curren. I'm an organizer from Seattle. I'm a Seattle resident; I am a Seattleite. And you guys are reasonable. I think you'll understand this metaphor. Building more roads to increase the capacity for cars to cure congestion is like loosening your belt to cure obesity. Right? It's not going to get you where you want.

And the numbers I heard earlier, about population growth, we need to cure congestion -- to meet that population growth does not take in the fact that you're not providing that population growth alternatives, alternative transit.

I-086-002

So I would just like to advocate for bus rapid transit now, no HOV lanes, and light rail in the near future. And I think -- as a taxpayer, I think that the appetite is there to fund that if it's put to a vote sooner than later, so your political time line or your funding time line can be much shorter than what you're currently anticipating.

The City Council came out Monday with a, you know, bold statement for carbon neutral, a carbon-neutral city. I'd say that six lanes is not carbon-neutral. Microsoft came out with their ad today, and, you know, two days ago, their founder came out saying that climate change is the number-one priority for their funding. So there's some great hypocrisy amongst our Council, there's some great hypocrisy amongst our business community, and, fortunately, the communities of Seattle are coming together to call them out on that. So I hope you -- hope you also acknowledge that.

Thank you.

(End of comment.)

From: GatorGregg@aol.com [mailto:GatorGregg@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 07, 2010 11:20 AM
To: SR 520 Bridge Replacement & HOV Project
Subject: SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program Feedback

Sent from: Gregg DuPont
Address: 2514 Boyer Ave E
City: Seattle
State: WA
County: King County
Zip: 98102
Email: GatorGregg@aol.com
Phone: 206 329-8207

Comments:

Whatever option is decided, it is critically important that a noise barrier be included on the south side of the Portage Bay viaduct. The current traffic noise is in violation of city noise ordinance for residential neighborhoods. Although it was fine when built, this is no longer acceptable. More importantly, with current proof that these noise levels increase stress and blood pressure and can even cause early death, any option that does not include noise barrier walls on the south of the viaduct in the face of proof that you were aware of this during this planning stage would be grounds for huge class action lawsuits due to severe health impacts and early death. Foresight and vision is hugely financially valuable to the city and state as well as ethically mandated.

I-087-001

I-088-001

MS. FOWBERT: I've been working on this for about eight years on behalf of the Sierra Club and the Seattle Community Council Federation and the Olmsted Parks. My strong support for -- the full environmental review now provides more helpful findings than when we began the process. There's more information on the building materials and how the project would produce mitigating effects to preserve the Olmsted Parks and the University of Washington campus.

I-088-002

The design options for your consideration must protect the Foster Island and the Portage Bay wetlands from the previous proposal. We are glad for getting rid of the underground tunnel. The final EIS review rejects the tunnel solution and focuses WSDOT's responsibility for updated information and evaluating workable alternatives to any kind of Arboretum on- and off-ramps. We're are opposed to all and any Arboretum on- and off-ramps.

I-088-003

I-088-004

The ongoing process generated more analysis and, hopefully, the electronic tolling and funding support for possible Metro HOV lanes and for, eventually, possible commuter fast rail seem to be closer to a workable solution now.

Now, the A-Plus option has actually developed a higher capacity transit plan for less cost to the public and to better accommodate University of Washington traffic impacts. Thank you.

(End of comment.)

I-089-001

MR. GOULD: Good evening. My name is Tim Gould. I appreciate the chance to speak here this evening. I'd just like to start off by saying that the bridge that you've designed thus far, when you consider the budget is really only enough to put in a floating bridge and nothing that approaches it, I think it's really a good -- that should be a good wake-up call to really think about how we build this structure corridor to serve a long-term need.

There's all this talk of needing to get started right away, and we don't really have the money to complete the entire project. And as far as the project is concerned, I just echo the comments that others have made this evening, that we really need to design this in a way that functions for the long term, especially for transit.

I-089-002

And that's why I favor the bridge design that's supposed to be adding two lanes, two transit: bus rapid transit initially, light rail when you can get that funded to put on there.

I-089-003

It's also very critical to include a Flyer stop at Montlake Boulevard instead of eliminating that, which all the various options call for. That is a big mistake if that goes away and we don't have that to add to transit connectivity.

I-089-004

In addition, the Arboretum ramps ought to be taken out of any design that goes forward. That was a mistake from 45, 50 years ago. We have an opportunity now to correct that mistake. It will be a travesty if we don't do that.

I-089-005

Also, I would just like to finally thank WSDOT for having extended the comment period on the EIS. This is a very important project, and

I-089-005 | we should study it carefully and get it right before we go forward.

Thank you.

(End of comment.)