

Online Comment by User: Lisa McCabe

Submitted on: 10/26/2006 8:12:00 PM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-3

Address: , , 98105

Comment:

I-0683-001

I am concerned that a tube tunnel (a partial tunnel extending beneath Portage Bay & Montlake and extending out past Madison Park and Webster Point) was not seriously considered/studied as a viable alternative. It seems to have been eliminated from the menu of alternatives before evaluated by a professional team of consultants/engineers.

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-1

Comment:

Again, an appropriate place for my comment asking why tunneling was never considered or explored as a reasonable alternative? Just because we have a highway today running through one of the most beautiful and pristine natural areas doesn't mean we have the right to expand it further! I can't imagine that under today's environmental restrictions 520 would be built if there weren't already a structure in place. We should be better stewards of our environment and seriously explore cutting edge and environmentally sensitive ways of achieving better traffic flow without irrevocably damaging a unique and beautiful resource like the Arboretum.

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-5

Comment:

Aha! The tunnel idea! WSDOT studying the tunnel alternative is not the same as an independent engineering firm studying the tunnel alternative. Yes, it's costly. Yes, it initially might create more disruption in areas. Yes, it might take longer for vegetation to re-establish itself. BUT--- 50 years from now, what is going to look best? Are we focused on the cheapest and easiest alternative or the best?

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-11

Comment:

I-0683-002

The Pacific Interchange option does very little to nothing to alleviate rush hour traffic north point #4 as shown on the map and outlined on the attached statistics. As a commuter to downtown Seattle from Laurelhurst who travels this route at least twice per day, this seems insane. The back up north of the Montlake Bridge all the way up 45th to Mary Gates Drive is also critical and sees little to no improvement.

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-7

Comment:

I-0683-003

Why aren't renderings provided on the view impact from Webster Point looking south and east? Laurelhurst is one of the affected neighborhoods and I don't see this addressed anywhere.

I-0683-004

Additionally, this document is not clear (at least not to me) about how far east the sound walls will extend. It's my understanding that any sound walls will NOT extend fully past Webster Point on the north side of the bridge thereby exponentially increasing the noise level in this area.

Comment Category: General Comments

I-0683-001

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

See Section 1.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0683-002

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0683-003

Comment Summary:

Visual Quality Effects

Response:

See Section 10.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0683-004

Comment Summary:

Noise Walls

Response:

See Section 12.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0683-005

Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-2

Comment:

Consideration should be given (and realistic renderings provided to the public) regarding the view impact from Webster Point looking south and east as it will significantly change vs. what is in place today.

I-0683-005

Comment Summary:

Visual Quality Effects

Response:

See Section 10.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.