

**From:** [Drew Finch](#)  
**To:** [SR 520 DEIS Comments:](#)  
**CC:** [jennifer.ziegler@wa.gov](mailto:jennifer.ziegler@wa.gov); [tim.ceis@seattle.gov](mailto:tim.ceis@seattle.gov); [nick.licata@seattle.gov](mailto:nick.licata@seattle.gov);  
**Subject:** DEIS comments on SR520  
**Date:** Monday, October 30, 2006 1:33:38 PM  
**Attachments:** [DEIS Comments 520.doc](#)

---

Thanks for the chance to comment on the SR 520 plans. My comments are attached.

Best regards,

Dwight Gee  
[geewright@msn.com](mailto:geewright@msn.com)

\*\*\* eSafe2 scanned this email and found no malicious content \*\*\*  
\*\*\* IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders \*\*\*

Paul Krueger, Environmental Manager  
SR 520 Project Office  
414 Olive Way, Suite 400  
Seattle, WA 98101

Re: SR 520 DEIS RESPONSE FROM TRANSPORTATION CHOICES COALITION

Dear Mr. Krueger;

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 520 Bridge Replacement Project. In general, I am disappointed about the content of this DEIS because it does not adequately address the environmental impacts to the Washington Park Arboretum nor does it really address that we should be relying more on transit to solve the present and future capacity problems. The 520 corridor is an amazing natural environment and one we should be protecting since it impacts population health, plant material and Lake Washington

In particular, I would like to highlight the challenge we face with climate change. Climate change is no longer a topic of debate; rather, it is our most urgent environmental and social challenge. In Washington transportation is the single largest source of global warming emissions and we therefore cannot afford to build a 520 replacement with a business-as-usual mentality.

The effort to replace the SR 520 Bridge is a singular opportunity to move beyond the status quo – indeed, we must if we want to design a bridge that takes into account climate change, neighborhood disruption, environmental stewardship, and mobility in the face of major population growth.

**I-1198-001** Please take the following comments into consideration:

**Protection of the Arboretum and open space**

1. **Any alternative should protect the Arboretum and open space.** We are incredibly fortunate to have the Washington Park Arboretum. Not only is it a historic Olmsted Park and part of the City's revered Olmsted Legacy, it is a resource that should be valued. To increase the traffic through this jewel is a disservice to human health and the health of the Arboretum plant material. More specifically, I recommend the following:
  - no net loss of publicly held parkland or currently accessible open space in the Arboretum
  - no net loss or impairment to the plant collection and wildlife or their future health
  - a limited increase of traffic traveling east/west through the Arboretum's wetlands
  - no net loss of physical meeting and office facilities for the Arboretum Foundation and the other Arboretum partners' management and maintenance functions
  - no net increase to negative intangible conditions (e.g. visual, audio, air quality, light, green space, educational opportunities, or international reputation or significance).

**I-1198-002** **Mobility**

1. **Any alternative should aggressively maximize the use of transit, active traffic management, congestion pricing and Transportation Demand Management to move people through the 520 corridor.**

**I-1198-003** 2. **A four-lane option with congestion-pricing should be studied.**

**I-1198-001**

**Comment Summary:**

Arboretum (Concerns)

**Response:**

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

**I-1198-002**

**Comment Summary:**

Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning

**Response:**

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

**I-1198-003**

**Comment Summary:**

4-Lane Alternative

**Response:**

See Section 2.0 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-1198-004** | 3. The selected alternative should provide great regional and local bicycle and pedestrian connectivity

**I-1198-005** | Protection of human health

1. Provide appropriate mitigation for impacts on human health. Specifically, the chosen alternative should ensure we don't increase noise levels, adversely impact air quality, and adversely impact water quality.

**I-1198-006** | 2. Lid options should be studied and presented to the community for all alternatives.

With this project we have the opportunity to dramatically reshape the direction of transportation and make investments that improve our mobility, health, and quality of life and we appreciate opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Dwight Gee  
2025 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue East  
Seattle WA 98112  
geewright@msn.com

**I-1198-004**

**Comment Summary:**

Bicycle/Pedestrian Path

**Response:**

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

**I-1198-005**

**Comment Summary:**

Health Impact Assessment

**Response:**

See Section 7.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-1198-006**

**Comment Summary:**

4-Lane Alternative

**Response:**

See Section 2.0 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.