

Online Comment by User: smithme

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 10:53:00 AM

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98102

Comment:

I-0883-001

I live in the Montlake area of Seattle and work in downtown Seattle.

I have asked both at the public comment meetings and as a comment on this website to see the study that was done on the Tunnel alternative. You have yet to provide that to me. We keep being told that the tunnel alternative is off the table and not an option because of the expense and because of the fill it would sit on, yet you fail to provide any documentation of an actual study that documents that. Why?

You may disagree with the tunnel alternative and that's fine. Let me have access to the data that led you to your conclusion. Better yet, put it on your website.

That said, I don't believe that any of the alternatives that you have put forth are acceptable, and here's why.

I-0883-002

The six lane alternative would have an extremely negative impact on the arboretum, wetlands, the environment, as well as neighborhoods and surface roads. These are cherished resources. Also, it is being touted as a quieter alternative to the four lane because it has noise mitigation that the four lane does not have. This is a transparent and manipulative argument. Also, I thought the point was to move traffic in an environmentally sound way, and to reduce greenhouse gasses and fossil fuel use. We should be looking at ways to get people out of their cars rather than trying to accommodate more of them.

I-0883-003

The Pacific Street Interchange is a misnomer and totally unacceptable. It should be called the "Arboretum" Interchange or the "Union Bay" interchange because that is what it really is. It will increase traffic on surface streets north of the Montlake area. No wonder the Montlake and Capital Hill area residents and Better Bridge support it. It's the most obvious case of NIMBYism. Defer the cars away from my neighborhood, and push them on to someone else's.

I-0883-004

Please rebuild the 4 lane bridge, and charge tolls for any single or double occupancy vehicle. I don't understand why this hasn't been implemented already. Get the people out of their cars and into public transportation or carpools. Pay for our new bridge with those revenues. Make a bridge that is seismically sound and will last longer than 40 years. Design one we can all be proud of, that is functional as well as aesthetically pleasing and blends in better with the natural environment and beauty we are so fortunate to live in. It's why we're all here, in the Seattle area. Don't let the "decision must be made soon", make the decision. Sometimes cheap is more expensive. The cost of a bad decision far outweighs the added expense of one well thought out, and perhaps by some new sets of eyes and engineers and designers. Don't let the "experts" become so invested in their position that they fail to see the merit in other alternatives. I fear that these folks have studied this for so long that they

I-0883-001

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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

I-0883-002

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0883-003

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

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

I-0883-004

Comment Summary:

4-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0883-004

are tired of studying it, and that is no reason to build anything that will impact all of us for generations to come. Please don't let that be your legacy. That Seattle and its millionaires can spend so much money on their sports stadiums and pet projects without taking responsibility for their impacts on our environment is mind-boggling to me. Can we just take the high road for once?

Megan Smith

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-1

Comment:

I-0883-005

I have asked to see the data from the DEIS as it relates to the Tube Tunnel option on SR520 over Lake Washington and have yet to receive it. Please send it to me. Thank you.

I-0883-005

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

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