

From: [Rebecca Engrav](#)
To: [SR 520 DEIS Comments](#)
CC: rengrav@yahoo.com
Subject: 520 plans/arboretum
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2006 11:44:26 AM
Attachments:

I-1268-001 I am very concerned about the proposal to add an off or on ramp to 520 over and through the Arboretum. The Arboretum is a cultural resource and environmental beauty for the region as a whole. I recall going there to see the leaves and trees when I was child living in Bellevue. Now I live just a few blocks away from it in Madison Valley, and we regularly go there with our child. We also have occasion to drive to Bellevue probaby 2-3 times a week and so drive through it on Lake Washington Blvd. to access 520.

I-1268-002 I understand that the bridge has reached the end of its lifespan and must be replaced. I do understand why that also means we must increase its capacity. It feels like the pro-traffic people are just sneaking in added capacity and everyone's going along with it. Why do we need to increase capacity on 520? It is a never-ending cycle; if you make getting across it a little easier, you'll just have more people trying to cross it. (Incidentally, I don't understand why proposals for increasing the capacity of 520 are being considered without also considering light rail/mass transit across the lake.) There will always be more cars and more people wanting to cross 520; just adding some lanes now will not solve that problem.

I-1268-003 I do not think it is in anyone's interests to destroy the arboretum. The Commons was voted down. We have so few large-scale green spaces in our city. It strikes me as senseless to destroy one of the few that we have. (And the pictures of the proposals to me demonstrate that the Arboretum as we know it would certainly be destroyed.)

I do not know all the ins and outs of the process, but from what I read in the papers it seems like there was a proposal to beef up the on and off ramps in Montlake

I-1268-001

Comment Summary:

Arboretum (Concerns)

Response:

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

I-1268-002

Comment Summary:

Light Rail Transit

Response:

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

I-1268-003

Comment Summary:

Arboretum (Concerns)

Response:

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

I-1268-003 and the residents there complained and came up with the new proposals. Undeniably increasing the ramp sizes where they are would affect Montlake. But the new proposal would harm a cultural resource for the whole region. It seems more important to me to protect something that benefits all rather than one neighborhood.

I-1268-004 Please (1) consider whether we really need more capacity (2) ensure all environmental reviews are done of the effect on the Arboretum's eco-systems and (3) ensure all public comment is solicited. At the end, I hope you will find some alternative other than putting a freeway over the Arboretum, a decision I'm sure time would show to be a colossal mistake.

Thank you.

Rebecca Engrav
133 32nd Ave E
Seattle, WA 98112

We have the perfect Group for you. Check out the handy changes to Yahoo! Groups (<http://groups.yahoo.com>)

I-1268-004

Comment Summary:

Arboretum (Concerns)

Response:

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