

I-1224-001

Comment Summary:

Section 106 Process

Response:

See Section 11.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

From: shethars@aol.com
To: [SR 520 DEIS Comments:](#)
CC: Ziegler, Jennifer. tim.ceis@seattle.gov; nick.licata@seattle.gov;
[gov](#);
Subject: SR 520 Project
Date: Monday, October 30, 2006 3:43:36 PM
Attachments:

Dear Mr. Krueger,

I-1224-001

I request that a thorough Section 106 review be made to examine the full effect of the SR 520 Project on Washington Park Arboretum, Lake Washington Boulevard, and the University of Washington Campus. All are significant Olmsted cultural landscapes, all are eligible for National Register of Historic Places, and all are adversely impacted the proposed 520 alternatives.

We all know that as our urban areas become denser, the need for open space increases. This is why projects receiving federal funds require Section 106 compliance; compliance prevents us from paving our parks. However, the 520 draft EIS strategically limits its scope so as to not trigger a compliance review. One example: the draft EIS looks at street traffic impacts north of Montlake, but does not analyze south-bound traffic along Lake Washington Boulevard through the Arboretum to Madison. It is our responsibility to fully evaluate the impact of this large project and not limit the scope of the EIS in any way.

I love the Arboretum and treasure it as a natural classroom, a living museum and a special community place. I will not vote for any SR 520 Project that does not protect this regional treasure and I urge you not to make irreversible short-cuts in evaluating our options.

Thank you,
Megan Shethar

Check out the new AOL. Most comprehensive set of free safety and security tools, free access to millions of high-quality videos from across the web, free AOL Mail and more.