

1  
2  
3

STATEMENT OF ELIZA DAVIDSON

I-0324-001

My name is Eliza Davidson. There are several things that I'm concerned about.

I guess the first thing that comes to mind is the cultural-resources portion of the EIS completely neglects to mention the Olmstead Brothers Park and Boulevard System which goes right through the project area. The Arboretum and the boulevard as well as the University of Washington campus and Montlake and Interlaken Parks are all part of a system that is known all over the world and is one of the three best in the United States.

I-0324-002

In addition, the impacts on all of those resources will be significantly worse than they already are. And the Arboretum will receive, under all of the proposals that are shown, will receive a tremendous amount of traffic onto the boulevard. That is a park department boulevard originally intended to be a continuous pleasure drive through the city, and it would de facto become a main arterial and even more of an access route to 520 than it now is.

I have heard that WSDOT itself has said, with the Pacific Interchange option, there will be six times as many cars per day that will be traveling through the Arboretum. And these impacts need to be avoided, not mitigated.

**I-0324-001**

**Comment Summary:**  
Olmstead Resources

**Response:**

See Section 11.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0324-002**

**Comment Summary:**  
Arboretum Area (Local Streets)

**Response:**

See Section 5.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0324-002** There's federal regulation that requires that you take very  
2 careful consideration of these issues that I'm raising.

**I-0324-003** What I want to recommend out of that is that all  
4 alternatives that have ramps in and out of the Arboretum and  
5 Lake Washington Boulevard be eliminated from consideration.

6 Second, the impact on the Arboretum and actually the  
7 entire area is enormous under the Pacific Interchange  
8 option. Instead of concentrating and minimizing the  
9 footprint of the new bridge and associated links, it expands  
10 and spreads it visually and every which way into the  
11 university. And it's an enormous and incredibly intrusive  
12 approach.

**I-0324-004** I support adding lids. I object to the fact that the  
14 four-lane alternative presented in the EIS showed no lids  
15 and the six-lane alternative showed lids. It seems biased  
16 to me because I have been told the four-lane alternative can  
17 accommodate lids as easily as the six-lane alternative.

**I-0324-005** I do not understand why a tunnel option, at least  
19 through the Montlake to I-5 corridor, was not considered. I  
20 understand that the reject -- the tunnel was evaluated by a  
21 bridge contractor consultant briefly and that the outcome of  
22 that study was that it would be 10 times more expensive than  
23 any tunnel in the world to build a tunnel version of the 520  
24 project. I wonder why there was not a tunnel engineer who  
25 was consulted instead. I think that that question needs to

**I-0324-003**

**Comment Summary:**  
Arboretum (Concerns)

**Response:**

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

**I-0324-004**

**Comment Summary:**  
4-Lane Alternative

**Response:**

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

**I-0324-005**

**Comment Summary:**  
Tube/Tunnel Concepts

**Response:**

See Section 1.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0324-005** be revisited and that option needs to be brought back in to  
2 the EIS system.

**I-0324-006** I am concerned that there's an emphasis on moving  
4 single-occupancy cars rather than moving people. The  
5 four-lane option has no provision for high-occupancy  
6 vehicles and for transit getting priority. That means that  
7 high-occupancy vehicles and transit will be stuck in the  
8 two-hour commute from 405 to I-5 along with everyone else in  
9 the year 2030. This is completely unacceptable. The bridge  
10 should be built in a way that encourages and expedites  
11 people's movement back and forth by other modes than  
12 single-occupancy vehicles.

**I-0324-007** The placing of tolls on the 520 bridge is very unfair  
14 to poorer people who are increasingly forced to live further  
15 and further out from the city. It's an environmental  
16 justice issue which was not sufficiently addressed in the  
17 EIS.

**I-0324-008** The impacts on the wetlands and on the natural  
19 environment are extreme in the Pacific Interchange option  
20 and not good in the six-lane option. That's because the  
21 footprint is larger and larger and the damage and loss of  
22 wetlands is greater and greater. It's, it seems critical to  
23 me that more attention be given to preserving valuable  
24 wetlands which support endangered salmon and which already  
25 are a major resource to the people of the Puget Sound area,

**I-0324-006**

**Comment Summary:**  
4-Lane Alternative

**Response:**

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

**I-0324-007**

**Comment Summary:**  
Environmental Justice

**Response:**

Please see Section 8.1 of the Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0324-008**

**Comment Summary:**  
Wetland Mitigation

**Response:**

See Section 16.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

~~I-0324-008~~ 1 especially Seattle residents.

2 I support a package which is environmentally sensitive  
3 and avoids unnecessary expense, resulting in huge impacts of  
4 infrastructure on neighborhoods, on the environment, on  
5 precious historic resources that are not replaceable.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25