
From: danieljevans@comcast.net [mailto:danieljevans@comcast.net]
Sent: Wed 11/1/2006 12:25 AM
To: Swenson, Michael/BOI
Cc: Daniel J(h) Evans
Subject:

Comments on the draft EIS for the 520 bridge.

- I-1121-001** | I served in the state legislature during the 1957 session, when the Evergreen Point Bridge was first authorized. I fought hard against the R. H. Thomson freeway which was a proposed element of that bridge project. That would have devastated the Washington Park Arboretum, and finally that freeway element was abandoned.
Traffic engineers of that era were concerned only with automobile movement and paid little attention to environmental concerns.
- Now we are engaged in proposals to expand the 520 bridge and today's traffic engineers are about to duplicate the errors of their predecessors. I have had an opportunity to meet with traffic engineers representing WASHDOT and was briefed on their plans for a six lane bridge coupled with a Pacific Avenue interchange.
- I grew up in the Laurelhurst community and live there currently. During the past 12 years I have served as a Regent of the University of Washington and many years ago, was trained as a structural engineer. My comments on the draft EIS follow.
1. It was apparent that the state has already chosen its preferred alternative, a six lane bridge with the Pacific Avenue interchange. A concentrated political effort by some representatives of the Montlake community is aimed at eliminating traffic congestion in that community. It is a laudable effort, but a clever case of NIMBY(not in my backyard.)
 - 2: the EIS specifically mentions the potential of a transit interconnect with the Sound Transit station at the Pacific Avenue interchange, but shows no plans and no specifics on how that is to be accomplished. There is simply no room for a comprehensive transit interchange, considering the future plans for the UW medical school and Husky Stadium.
 - 3: Montlake Blvd., is proposed to be expanded to six lanes to the intersection of Montlake Blvd. and 25th Ave NE and continuing east on 45th to Mary Gates Way. There is virtually no land available on the West side of Montlake Blvd., without constructing a 12 foot high wall to retain the Burke Gilman Trail. If the expansion is on the east side of Montlake Blvd.,it will have a devastating effect on the entire array of intramural and intercollegiate athletic facilities.
- I-1121-002** | 4: While traffic engineers blithely believe that there will be no added congestion on these arterials to the north, common sense leads one to believe that the traffic chokepoints will merely be moved from the Montlake bridge to intersections further to the north.

I-1121-001

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

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

I-1121-002

Comment Summary:

Local Street Network

Response:

See Section 5.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-1121-003 | 5: Interruptions during construction and limited access after construction cause significant problems in the operation of the UW medical school and Husky Stadium and other athletic facilities. Mitigation costs will be huge and drive the expense of the Pacific Interchange alternative beyond any rational consideration.

I-1121-004 | 6: A 110 foot high bridge across the Montlake cut wreaks havoc on environmentally sensitive areas and on the Washington Park Arboretum to the south. No mitigation available will replace these environmentally sensitive lands once they are destroyed.

These are only a few of what I believe to be fatal errors in the alternative the state apparently is determined to impose. I believe it is time for the state to quit thinking only of automobiles and recognize that over the next 20 years we are going to have to reduce dependence on automobiles and consider how we can quickly and efficiently move people, not just cars across this important traffic artery.

Daniel J. Evans

I-1121-003

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

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

I-1121-004

Comment Summary:

Arboretum (Concerns)

Response:

See Section 9.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.