

**Online Comment by User: mckaysteven**

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 5:26:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 55407

**Comment:**

**I-0727-001**

I have been watching this process unfold over the past several months with much dismay. A former 13 year resident of Seattle who has every intention of returning, I take great interest in this project.

I am disappointed at the lack of vision in these alternatives. These are basically just more road. I am not convinced that the parties involved in the initial screening of options have the expertise to eliminate some of the modern, yet expensive, options, namely a subsurface tunnel across Lake Washington.

**I-0727-002**

I am disappointed that the significance of the Washington Park Arboretum does not seem to be recognised. This is one of the more important arboreta on the North American continent, with a unique collection of living plants. The WPA has no serious competition within the regional climate zone of the Pacific Northwest and is the premier collection of living trees and shrubs in Washington. As an alum of the University of Washington College of Forest Resources (MS 1996), I am appalled that the Washington Park Arboretum and the other components of the University of Washington Botanic Gardens could be at such great risk from the Washington State Department of Transportation.

**I-0727-003**

I am also appalled that the Montlake neighborhood has such weight in this process. The Pacific Street Interchange alternative seems to be designed specifically with Montlake, and only Montlake, in mind. I have spent much time on Pacific Street over the years, and see no traffic alleviation for this already congested street in this alternative. Property values in the Montlake neighborhood, however, will only rise.

I also commuted over the 520 bridge for two years, by bus, by bicycle, and by car. Yes, changes are needed, but changes designed simply to increase the number of cars crossing the bridge are short-sighted, and uninspired. This is going to cost a fortune, regardless of the options. Do it right, not just building more highway lanes.

Very disappointing.

Steven McKay  
Department of Horticultural Science  
University of Minnesota  
1970 Folwell Ave  
St. Paul, MN 55108

**Comment Category: Comments on Construction Effects**

**Comment Location: Chapter-10, Page-9**

**Comment:**

**I-0727-004**

Great. A staging area will be located right at the north entrance to the arboretum along lake Washington Blvd, another could be in a park. Nice job. Actually not.

**I-0727-001**

**Comment Summary:**

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

**Response:**

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

**I-0727-002**

**Comment Summary:**

Arboretum (Concerns)

**Response:**

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

**I-0727-003**

**Comment Summary:**

Pacific Street Interchange Option

**Response:**

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

**I-0727-004**

**Comment Summary:**

Schedule

**Response:**

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

**I-0727-005** | **Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects**  
**Comment Location: Chapter-11, Page-12**  
**Comment:**  
 It's nice to know that a single neighborhood, namely Montlake, has enough pull to essentially veto the closure of the Lake Washington Blvd ramps. The current levels of traffic along Lake Washington Blvd are unacceptable, so much so that crossing the road on foot within the Arboretum is very dangerous.  
**Comment Category: General Comments**  
**Comment Location: Chapter-5, Page-6**

**I-0727-006** | **Comment:**  
 "A tube submerged below the lake surface ... could interfere with navigation or fish passage." "Could" is not adequate reason to eliminate this as an option. Do the parties that investigated this option have the expertise and supporting data to determine whether or not a submerged tunnel is indeed a feasible option or not? And what about the costs? Have they ever been estimated?  
**Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives**  
**Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-14**

**I-0727-007** | **Comment:**  
 The inclusion of a pedestrian/bicycle lane is absolutely essential.  
**Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives**  
**Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-13**

**I-0727-008** | **Comment:**  
 I find it hard to imagine that simply replacing the stop sign at the Lake Washington Blvd/SR520 interchange will "virtually eliminate severe congestion in both the morning and afternoon peak hours." This is especially unlikely in those scenarios that are likely to funnel even more traffic onto the already severely overloaded Lake Washington Blvd.  
**Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives**  
**Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-13**

**I-0727-009** | **Comment:**  
 Exhibit 5-6 clearly demonstrates that the biggest benefactors of the Pacific Interchange alternative is likely to be the Montlake neighborhood.  
**Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives**  
**Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-15**

**I-0727-010** | **Comment:**  
 Removing the freeway station would have a major impact on bus commuters beyond the University District residents. Already, many people don't take the bus because they have to transfer first at Montlake and then at Overlake. Changes that require people, particularly from north of the Ship Canal, to ride a bus further south to downtown Seattle, transfer there and then quite likely transfer again on the Eastside will only reduce ridership.  
**Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives**  
**Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-24**

**I-0727-011** | **Comment:**  
 None of the proposed alternatives are necessary if the reconnection of severed communities is an objective. The construction of lids should not be dependent upon which of the options are chosen, but rather on whether they merit construction in their own right.  
**Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives**  
**Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-27**  
**Comment:**

**I-0727-005**

**Comment Summary:**

Arboretum Area (Local Streets)

**Response:**

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

**I-0727-006**

**Comment Summary:**

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

**Response:**

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

**I-0727-007**

**Comment Summary:**

Bicycle/Pedestrian Path

**Response:**

See Section 2.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0727-008**

**Comment Summary:**

Arboretum Area (Local Streets)

**Response:**

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

**I-0727-009**

**Comment Summary:**

Pacific Street Interchange Option

**I-0727-012**

The spatial extent of construction effects upon the Arboretum, as presented in Exhibit 5-13, are bad enough in the 4-lane and 6-lane options, but are absolutely horrifying in the Pacific Street Interchange option. The designers should be ashamed of themselves.

**Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects**

**Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-9**

**Comment:**

**I-0727-013**

It is obvious to me that the only images illustrating the visual impacts on the Washington Park Arboretum are from locations at which the current bridge already dominates. What is noticeable absent is any indication of how the proposed alternatives will visually impact locations that are currently not significantly impacted, such as from the Visitor Center or across Duck Pond.

**Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects**

**Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-9**

**Comment:**

It is quite unlikely that the shadows cast by the alternatives in Exhibit 5-4 are at all realistic. In fact, the larger the bridge, the smaller the shadows as presented in these images. Also the rather lush undergrowth as presented is suspicious. It is an unusual bridge that casts no shadows and promotes plant growth underneath.

**Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects**

**Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-2**

**Comment:**

I cannot help but wonder what these images would look if they were aimed only slightly to the right. As displayed, they are aimed away from the areas of greatest change.

**Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects**

**Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-3**

**Comment:**

Where are the views from Broadmoor? The Montlake Bridge? The UW's Waterfront Activity Center?

**Response:**

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

**I-0727-010**

**Comment Summary:**

Montlake Freeway Transit Station

**Response:**

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

**I-0727-011**

**Comment Summary:**

Bicycle/Pedestrian Path

**Response:**

See Section 2.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0727-012**

**Comment Summary:**

Pacific Street Interchange Option

**Response:**

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

**I-0727-013**

**Comment Summary:**

Visual Quality Effects

**Response:**

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