

Online Comment by User: christiney

Submitted on: 10/27/2006 5:35:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98102

Comment:

Mr. Paul Krueger,

WSDOT

414 Olive Way, Suite 400

Seattle, WA 98101

Dear Mr. Krueger:

I am writing to urge you to oppose the proposed six lane expansion of the 520 bridge and Pacific Bridge interchange and to urge you to support the four lane alternative with tolling. The current WSDOT EIS fails to properly evaluate the more affordable four lane alternative and is a biased and factually incorrect document that promotes an unaffordable and unnecessary six lane expansion.

I recognize that a bridge replacement is necessary, however the only reasonable option for replacement of the bridge should be a four lane alternative with emergency pull-outs. A six lane proposal is fiscally reckless and would have devastating environmental impacts on the surrounding Seattle neighborhoods and the Arboretum. The current six lane Pacific Interchange proposed by the draft City Council Resolution is unacceptable and is opposed by nearly all the surrounding neighborhoods.

The EIS study that was done on the six lane alternative is seriously deficient, and both the Council resolution and the EIS fail to acknowledge that the six lane alternative has hazardous noise levels that cannot be mitigated. The higher noise from the six-lane alternative will affect all neighborhoods that now experience noise from SR520, including Montlake, Portage Bay/Roanoke Park, Capitol Hill, and Eastlake, as well as Madison Park, Laurelhurst, and the Eastside neighborhoods. There is no more certain way to degrade quality of life and home values in this broad area than to install a six lane bridge.

The City Council draft resolution and WSDOT's EIS are seriously flawed in failing to propose a tolling level that would reduce traffic flow at rush hour for the four-lane alternative to make it viable.

As a daily 520 transit rider, I can tell you that the limited schedules, inconvenient departure points, and lack of park and ride facilities make it a challenge for even a motivated person to use transit in this corridor. It should be no surprise that transit is underutilized and that the bridge is overloaded with single occupancy vehicles. Except at rush hours, the 520 has more than sufficient capacity. It is irresponsible for our government leaders not to determine the impact of tolling and transit improvement prior to making a decision to spend billions on additional capacity.

I-0103-001

I-0103-002

I-0103-001

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0103-002

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0103-002

Finally, as a property owner and tax payer, I strongly object to a bridge expansion that is unaffordable and unnecessary. The City and region have many critical needs, and a six lane 520 expansion is not one of them. I am a voter and I will work against any transportation proposal that allocates tax dollars to an unnecessary, ill-considered concrete monstrosity that would severely damage my own and surrounding neighborhoods and the Arboretum.

I urge WSDOT to revise the EIS to properly evaluate the four lane alternative, as it is a more responsible to the taxpayers and to future generations. Thank you for taking the time to consider my comment.

Sincerely,

Christine Yokan

1016 E. Shelby St.

Seattle, WA 98102

206-323-9155