

**I-1270-001**

**Comment Summary:**

4-Lane Alternative

**Response:**

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

**From:** [Carol Eychaner](#)  
**To:** [SR 520 DEIS Comments](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** SR 520 DEIS Comments  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 31, 2006 12:08:06 PM  
**Attachments:**

---

Dear Mr. Krueger,

**I-1270-001** I understand that the technical Draft EIS commenting process is being (mis)used to gauge the political temperature of SR 520 replacement and expansion alternatives. I am thus compelled to comment on the alternatives, if for no other reason than to add to the growing number of residents who do not want to see the concrete corridor expanded, especially at the expense of an urban oasis.

I DO NOT support any increase in the number of lanes over the SR 520 bridge. I DO NOT support a new ramp over Marsh Island (the "Pacific Street Interchange).

I cross SR 520 once, sometimes twice a week to visit my aging parents. Because I have a home office, it is one of the few car trips I take each week. It is true that I have to time my visits to avoid the worst of the peak commute, and even then I sometimes get stuck in traffic that crawls at a snail's pace. My husband has to deal with the SR 520 traffic on a daily, commuting basis, and there is no doubt that over the years the "rush hour" has evolved into "rush hours". We also live 1/2 block from the SR 520/I-5 interchange. So SR 520 figures prominently in our daily lives.

Everyone would like there to be less traffic and congestion on SR 520. Six lane alternatives and new ramps are not going to accomplish this. Even if increasing lanes and adding ramps could reduce congestion, I would NEVER EVER support a solution to the congestion that adds substantially more concrete, cars and pollution to Seattle's Arboretum and surrounding neighborhoods.

Many who live and work in Seattle think of their city as being on the forefront of environmental stewardship and as providing local leadership

**I-1270-001** on the critical issue of global warming. I would like to think so, too. Given the city's pride in the Arboretum, its history with the R. H. Thompson freeway (did we not learn anything from this?), and Mayor Nickel's outspoken and well-publicized position on local global warming initiatives, it is incomprehensible that any government entity (and its EIS document) is seriously considering SR 520 alternatives that would force more lanes, new ramps (including especially the one over Marsh Island that is called "Pacific Street Interchange") and more cars into the heart of the Arboretum's water habitat. I wonder if "Sierra" and "Rolling Stone" and other magazines will continue to feature Seattle's environmental efforts after large parts of the Arboretum are destroyed by expanded lanes and ramps. How could we possibly explain and justify such action and still call ourselves citizens who care about the environment?

There are measures that could be taken to reduce traffic and congestion on a re-built SR 520 bridge that would not destroy urban aquatic habitat. Some of the 4 existing general purpose lanes could be converted to short- or long-term HOV/transit lanes. Existing ramps that should never have been constructed in the Arboretum could be removed. Tunnels under sensitive habitat could be built for essential short segments. These and other environmentally protective measures should be identified and fully studied in the EIS and adopted by decision-makers.

SR 520 is an invasive species in the Arboretum and elsewhere. We may not be able to get rid of it, but we should certainly prevent its growth.

Carol Eychaner  
2348 Franklin Avenue East  
Seattle, WA 98102  
(206-324-1716)

**I-1270-002**

**Comment Summary:**

Pacific Street Interchange Option

**Response:**

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

**From:** [Carol Eychaner](#)  
**To:** [SR 520 DEIS Comments](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Additional SR 520 DEIS Comment  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 31, 2006 4:39:08 PM  
**Attachments:**

Dear Mr. Krueger,

**I-1270-002** There are many reasons to reject alternatives that would increase the number of lanes and add ramps on SR 520, the most paramount being the destruction of and damage to Arboretum aquatic habitat, which was the focus of my initial comments.

In addition to destroying the natural environment, alternatives that include the Pacific Street Interchange would also permanently destroy public views of a designated historic landmark -- the Montlake Bridge and Montlake Cut. The Bridge/Cut features prominently in Seattle's engineering, maritime and University history, and is the visual focal point of special events (Opening Day, crew races) as well as any stroll through Marsh Island, Foster Island and the trails along the Cut. Unobstructed views of and from the historic Bridge/Cut can be now be enjoyed from many public places, including Foster and Marsh Islands, without any visual clue that SR 520 is only a stone's throw away. These unimpeded views of the Bridge and Cut would be drastically changed by the intrusion of the Pacific Street Interchange.

There are very few, if any, legitimate reasons to destroy aquatic habitat/parkland and views of an historic icon. Providing for more cars is not one of them.

Carol Eychaner  
2348 Franklin Avenue East  
Seattle, WA 98102  
(206-324-1716)

----- Original Message -----

**Subject:** SR 520 DEIS Comments  
**Date:** Tue, 31 Oct 2006 12:07:51 -0800  
**From:** Carol Eychaner <[blucmoon2@qwest.net](mailto:blucmoon2@qwest.net)>  
**To:** [SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov](mailto:SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov)

Dear Mr. Krueger,

I understand that the technical Draft EIS commenting process is being (mis)used to gauge the political temperature of SR 520 replacement and expansion alternatives. I am thus compelled to comment on the alternatives, if for no other reason than to add to the growing number of residents who do not want to see the concrete corridor expanded, especially at the expense of an urban oasis.

I DO NOT support any increase in the number of lanes over the SR 520 bridge.  
I DO NOT support a new ramp over Marsh Island (the "Pacific Street Interchange").

I cross SR 520 once, sometimes twice a week to visit my aging parents.

**I-1270-002** Because I have a home office, it is one of the few car trips I take each week. It is true that I have to time my visits to avoid the worst of the peak commute, and even then I sometimes get stuck in traffic that crawls at a snail's pace. My husband has to deal with the SR 520 traffic on a daily, commuting basis, and there is no doubt that over the years the "rush hour" has evolved into "rush hours". We also live 1/2 block from the SR 520/I-5 interchange. So SR 520 figures prominently in our daily lives.

Everyone would like there to be less traffic and congestion on SR 520. Six lane alternatives and new ramps are not going to accomplish this. Even if increasing lanes and adding ramps could reduce congestion, I would NEVER EVER support a solution to the congestion that adds substantially more concrete, cars and pollution to Seattle's Arboretum and surrounding neighborhoods.

Many who live and work in Seattle think of their city as being on the forefront of environmental stewardship and as providing local leadership on the critical issue of global warming. I would like to think so, too. Given the city's pride in the Arboretum, its history with the R. H. Thompson freeway (did we not learn anything from this?), and Mayor Nickel's outspoken and well-publicized position on local global warming initiatives, it is incomprehensible that any government entity (and its EIS document) is seriously considering SR 520 alternatives that would force more lanes, new ramps (including especially the one over Marsh Island that is called "Pacific Street Interchange") and more cars into the heart of the Arboretum's water habitat. I wonder if "Sierra" and "Rolling Stone" and other magazines will continue to feature Seattle's environmental efforts after large parts of the Arboretum are destroyed by expanded lanes and ramps. How could we possibly explain and justify such action and still call ourselves citizens who care about the environment?

There are measures that could be taken to reduce traffic and congestion on a re-built SR 520 bridge that would not destroy urban aquatic habitat. Some of the 4 existing general purpose lanes could be converted to short- or long-term HOV/transit lanes. Existing ramps that should never have been constructed in the Arboretum could be removed. Tunnels under sensitive habitat could be built for essential short segments. These and other environmentally protective measures should be identified and fully studied in the EIS and adopted by decision-makers.

SR 520 is an invasive species in the Arboretum and elsewhere. We may not be able to get rid of it, but we should certainly prevent its growth.

Carol Eychaner  
2348 Franklin Avenue East  
Seattle, WA 98102  
(206-324-1716)