

From: [JoAnn O'Connor](#)
To: [SR 520 DEIS Comments](#)
CC:
Subject: SR520
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2006 3:54:06 PM
Attachments:

To Whom It May concern:

- I-1065-001** | The Arboretum and Union Bay and their wetlands and fish and wildlife must not be damaged further by SR-520, especially by the Pacific Street Interchange, which more accurately should be called the Union Bay and Marsh Island Interchange (see photos, courtesy of Ted Lane and Louis Hoffer).
- The Pacific Street Interchange is not community-generated. It was proposed by WSDOT in the 1960s and emphatically rejected by Seattle voters and the City Council in the 1970s, but resurrected by a neighborhood that, in order to push SR520 traffic into other neighborhoods and natural areas, is willing to expand that traffic further.
- The ramps to and from SR520 that are in the Arboretum, which would be closed during the years of SR520 reconstruction, should never have been built to start with and should not be rebuilt or reopened. Not rebuilding them would save money, and reduce by about half the unacceptably high traffic on the Arboretum portions of Lake Washington Boulevard.
- I-1065-002** | So long as SR520 is kept to four lanes, tunnels should be studied, especially a short one north-south as a way to reduce the load on the Montlake drawbridge.
- I-1065-003** | Adding more lanes encourages more driving, energy use, pollution, and global warming.
- I-5, I-405, and local streets cannot accommodate the additional traffic caused by the six-lane alternatives.
- I-1065-004** | The six-lane alternatives will take up to a year longer to build, causing more truck noise, dust, and danger, local traffic tie-ups, and delaying fix of the existing bridge.

I-1065-001

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

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

I-1065-002

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-1065-003

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-1065-004

Comment Summary:

Schedule

Response:

See Section 4.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1065-005 | The current four-lane bridge's excellent transit share of total persons who cross would decline with the six lane alternatives. Transit share can best be maintained and improved not by more lanes, but by bus priority on the way to and from SR520 (such as upon ramps and local streets, and nearby parts of I-5 and I-405)--but the draft EIS failed to study this, and the final EIS should.

I-1065-006 | HOV and transit lanes should be converted from general purpose lanes; the draft EIS fails to study converting any of the existing four lanes to HOV or transit-only, whether at rush-hour or around the clock.

Building new HOV lanes takes cars and buses off the existing lanes, creating more space there for single occupancy vehicles, and encouraging more driving. Newly built HOV lanes are likely to be opened up to general purpose traffic, such as by the legislature or by voter initiative (two such initiatives were previously filed, and others are likely to be).

The four-lane alternative creates the least noise, but the EIS ignores noise under 66 decibels and above the first floor, both of which are worst with the six lane alternatives.

I-1065-007 | The EIS sees tolls as a "cash cow" to overbuild SR520, and fails to consider a rush-hour toll level that would keep the four-lane alternative free-flowing at rush hour by including a toll also on I-90.

I-1065-008 | The new, required cross-lake bike/ped lane must be connected south of SR520 to Madison Park, allowing nonmotorized travel between north and south Seattle and allowing much better connections across the lake. The 43rd and 37th Ave. routes for this bike-ped connection must both continue to be studied in the final EIS, and other routes should also be explored.

I-1065-009 | The six-lane alternatives, especially the Pacific Interchange (estimated cost \$4.38 billion!) are not affordable. The preferred alternative must be one whose financing can be confidently relied on.

The Governor's expert review panel finds that even the four-lane alternative is too big to be affordable. The four-lane must be scaled back by reducing width of lanes, shoulders, and ramps, cutting the proposed Portage Bay Viaduct from seven (!) lanes to the current four, and making the shoulders intermittent (pull-out) rather than continuous (and thus convertible to future traffic lanes, as is about to be done with I-90, despite promises that it would not happen).

I think that should cover it!

I-1065-005

Comment Summary:

Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning

Response:

See Section 2.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1065-006

Comment Summary:

4-Lane Alternative

Response:

See Section 2.0 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1065-007

Comment Summary:

Tolling Scenarios, Pricing, and Revenue

Response:

See Section 3.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1065-008

Comment Summary:

Madison Park Bicycle/Pedestrian Connection

Response:

See Section 24.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1065-009

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

JoAnn P. O'Connor

JoAnn P. O'Connor
100 East Edgar Street #2
Seattle, Washington 98102
206.324.2865 home
206.293.0272 cell
joannpoconnor@yahoo.com
joannonorcas@rockisland.com

Get your email and see which of your friends are online - Right on the [new Yahoo.com](#).

Response:

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