

I-0096-001

Online Comment by User: Celia Kennedy

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 9:42:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: 6055-52nd Ave. NE, Seattle, WA 98115

Comment:

While we need to improve the transportation in and around the greater Seattle area, we need to do it in a manner that does not degrade one of the most precious natural areas that is housed in the city. This precious natural area is the Washington Park Arboretum. It is loved and appreciated for its amazing plant diversity, the variety of birds that call it home and the peace and quiet that so many visitors can find there. In these days that we spend millions and millions of dollars on repairing habitat that has been degraded, we need to make certain we are being good stewards of the natural areas we have now that are still in good condition and still are peaceful, quiet places for generations to come to visit and enjoy. I am not necessarily opposed to the 6-lane option (with HOV lanes as 2 of those) if mitigations can and are put in place to limit the sound impacts to the northern part of the arboretum. The current plans appear insufficient in that regard. I am strongly opposed to any option, current or future, that would add any increase in traffic through the road that currently runs north to south through the body of the arboretum. Any increase in traffic in that road, or any road into the body of the arboretum, beyond the bridge replacement itself, will substantially degrade the experience of the arboretum because of the increase in noise levels. Let's identify a bridge replacement project that allows us to protect the amazing natural resource that so many enjoy and cherish. I think more analysis is needed on what the negative impacts (especially increased noise levels) will actually be on those visiting the arboretum given the possible options and have more public discussions on whether these impacts are acceptable to the public. Thank you.

I-0096-001

Comment Summary:

Arboretum (Concerns)

Response:

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