

I-0085-001

Online Comment by User: caroleecolter

Submitted on: 10/29/2006 6:08:00 PM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98118

Comment:

I am opposed to the six-lane alternative, and would prefer any four-lane alternative. Here is why:

* Global warming: The six-lane alternatives worsen global warming in a way that the four-lane alternative does not. The City Council draft resolution, and WSDOT's EIS both fail to consider global warming, and thus miss this advantage of the four-lane alternative. The City of Seattle's recent "green ribbon" commission report warns that increased driving is our region's largest single contribution to global warming. Keeping SR520 at four lanes is the most important single step that our region can take to reduce its future impact on global warming.

* Greater adverse construction impacts: SR520 construction will cause huge impacts from truck noise, vibration, dust and pollution, and traffic safety and tie-ups--and building the six-lane alternatives will cause a year more of these impacts than the four-lane alternative, plus tens of thousands of additional trips by dump trucks.

* Six-lane alternative encourages car driving: Because of wider lanes and shoulders, and improved connecting ramps, a four-lane SR520 would accommodate somewhat more traffic than the current bridge, but not be as wide or destructive as the six lane proposals. Transit can work well on a four-lane alternative through a combination of congestion pricing and preferential access, including conversion of lanes to HOV-only at rush hours. By building new HOV lanes, the six-lane alternatives would move car-pools and buses off of the other lanes, creating more incentive to drive. We do not help transit by making it easier to drive alone.

* Benefits for four and six lanes are equal, while adverse impacts are worse for six lanes: All the features now being promoted as benefits of the six lane option would also be true of the four lane option--reducing noise by building lids and sound walls, improving water quality by diverting runoff from the bridge to water treatment facilities, easing congestion on the Montlake Bridge, and adding shoulders for emergency vehicles and breakdowns.

* Community opposition: UW, Arboretum Foundation, and most neighborhoods oppose the Pacific Street Interchange. Descriptions of the Pacific Street Interchange as being community-generated are inaccurate. On August 11, 2006, eight stakeholders provided to the City the following statement:

"The organizations that we represent are opposed to the so-called Pacific Street Interchange proposal because it is overly large and expensive, and has unacceptable impacts on the Arboretum and its wetlands, Union Bay, the University of Washington, and the surrounding neighborhoods. Please include this statement in the body of the SR520 Seattle Advisory Committee report."

I-0085-001

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0085-001

Jean Amick, Laurelhurst Community Council
Lisa Anderson, Madison Park Community Council
Matt Fox, University District Community Council President
Louis Hoffer, Broadmoor Homeowners' Association
Larry Sinnott, Ravenna-Bryant Community Association
Carsten Stinn, Eastlake Community Council President
Theresa Doherty, University of Washington Assistant Vice President
Fred Hoyt, University of Washington Botanical Gardens
Angela Belbeck, Seattle Board of Park Commissioners

Unaffordable: The 520 upgrade is going to be expensive but the six lane option is going to be even more expensive than four lanes. The Expert Review Panel finds the most likely cost of the Pacific Street Interchange six-lane alternative to be \$4.38 billion--\$1.59 billion more than the four-lane cost of \$2.79 billion.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.