

Online Comment by User: susanalb

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 3:32:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Environmental Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98105

Comment:

I-0907-001

I am opposed to all of your proposed plans for the replacement of SR520. I've read your materials and watched many of your City and County briefings on TV. I'm sickened to think of the negative environmental impacts that will be incurred should you proceed with any of these plans. It is unfortunate that this road was built in the first place, but your plan to widen it to between 2 and in some places almost 4 times the width of the current bridge, is shocking and must not be allowed to happen. As others have wisely said, this area is the equivalent of a GREEN LUNG for the Seattle area. I have fought for the preservation of places like Union Bay, recognizing its unique and critical habitat. Your plans will destroy all that is precious about the Arboretum, Foster Island, and Union Bay. Your roads are TOO WIDE, TOO HIGH, and TOO NOISY; they run across wetlands and through protected habitat -- a place where bald eagles nest, Chinook salmon run, and hundreds of bird species nest and migrate through. You have not done enough to study these and other environmental impacts. Me and my neighbors will fight this.

Comment Category: Comments on Construction Effects

Comment Location: Chapter-8, Page-2

Comment:

I-0907-002

TOO WIDE and TOO HIGH. The environmental impacts of constructing these will devastate the fragile ecosystems in the Arboretum and nearby bays. Also, the noise generated from construction and operation will ruin this area and destroy critical habitat. Not to mention, these behemoth monstrosities are an eyesore.

I-0907-003

Added to all that, I do not see how you have adequately addressed the traffic impacts on surrounding neighborhoods during construction itself. You plan to close off Lake Washington Blvd completely for the entire duration of construction?? 5 years or more? That is insane.

I-0907-004

You should be designing FOR light rail, but you have stated you are only designing for the "potential" for light rail. Sound Transit will use I-90 for light rail, but there is no current plan to use SR520 for light rail. This is crazy. With global warming looming and real, you have a responsibility to design to get cars off the road, get people onto public transportation, and reduce greenhouse gases. So far it looks like all you're doing is designing for MORE single occupancy vehicles. Nonsense.

I-0907-001

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0907-002

Comment Summary:

Arboretum (Concerns)

Response:

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

I-0907-003

Comment Summary:

Traffic Management (Construction)

Response:

See Section 4.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0907-004

Comment Summary:

Light Rail Transit

Response:

See Section 2.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.