

**From:** [Ed Shively](#)  
**To:** [SR 520 DEIS Comments](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Strong support for the Pacific Street Interchange option  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 31, 2006 1:11:58 PM  
**Attachments:**

**I-1084-001** Good design can change everything. With the reconstruction of SR520 bridge, we have a rare opportunity to choose a plan that will solve many problems and create quality of life improvements at the same time.  
The Pacific Street Interchange option is that superior plan.

Why continue to force UW and Montlake Blvd traffic (3/4 of interchange traffic) to clog the already overburdened Montlake drawbridge? We don't have to. University traffic can now go directly to the University. Montlake traffic can now go directly to the widened Montlake Cut.  
Why force the public transit link to light rail to clog and be slowed by the Montlake Bridge bottleneck? We don't have to. It would go directly to light rail making transit times short and attractive, getting more commuters out of their cars.  
Why build a ridiculously wide freeway, eating up precious land, blighting the landscape, forcing many merges to get onto the bridge? We don't have to. By routing traffic directly where it wants to go we relieve the colossal log jam on Montlake Blvd., and create a continuous green belt reconnecting the playfield on Portage Bay to the Arboretum.

The Pacific Street Interchange option would also be lower in height which would create less noise, have less visual impact and be more attractive and easier for bike riders. Linking the Burke Gilman trail directly to the East Side - a huge win improving upon one of Seattle's greatest assets. A continuation of the bike path to Montlake blvd would further improve bike access to Capital Hill, reducing the car traffic burden on the bridge.

**I-1084-002** A bike connection directly to Madison Park would further reduce traffic by drawing commuters out of the Arboretum lineup. I used to commute this route through the Arboretum and it was grueling. This bike structure, if properly designed, could even become visually attractive landmark, making a clear statement about how Seattle and Washington strive for progressive alternative transportation options.

#### **I-1084-001**

##### **Comment Summary:**

Pacific Street Interchange Option

##### **Response:**

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

#### **I-1084-002**

##### **Comment Summary:**

Bicycle/Pedestrian Path

##### **Response:**

See Section 2.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-1084-003** | The Pacific Street Interchange would dramatically speed the public transit connection between light-rail and the East Side by avoiding the Montlake Bridge lineup. The better our public transit connections can be made, the more people will step out of their cars, reducing overall congestion. This plan makes that connection Very fast. Good planning for Bus/Rail transfers would further shorten transit times and improve throughput. This would be a win for students as well as everyone else using Light-Rail.

**I-1084-004** | I am a strong advocate for spending the additional dollars needed now ( \$4.38 billion, versus \$3.9 billion) to avoid future problems and expenses that would be more expensive to fix further down the road. Making the new SR520 bridge attractive is a very worthy goal. The beautiful backdrop of the lake and mountains is a key reason behind why many of us choose to live here. Taking the cheapest option to save a few dollars now would truly be an opportunity lost. Consider how the design of structures like the Space Needle or the Golden Gate Bridge has defined the image of entire regions in a very positive way. There were cheaper options on the table at the time.

**I-1084-005** | I am also in favor of implementing tolls now. This would help offset costs and help manage traffic during the inevitable congestion that will happen during construction.

**I-1084-006** | I strongly urge you to look closely at the advantages of the Pacific Street Interchange option listed at [www.betterbridge.org](http://www.betterbridge.org) , and to advocate for the best plan for our regions future.

Choosing the Pacific Street Interchange option now would be a huge win for everyone, improving traffic throughput, reducing the need for expenditures in the future, improving appearance and adding park land to improve quality of life for the entire city. Missing this opportunity will have dire consequences and result in increased traffic congestion for the rest of our lives.

Sincerely,

Ed Shively  
2433 Lorentz Pl. N.  
Seattle, Wa 98109

### **I-1084-003**

#### **Comment Summary:**

Pacific Street Interchange Option

#### **Response:**

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

### **I-1084-004**

#### **Comment Summary:**

Context Sensitive Solutions

#### **Response:**

See Section 10.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

### **I-1084-005**

#### **Comment Summary:**

Early Tolling

#### **Response:**

See Section 3.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

### **I-1084-006**

#### **Comment Summary:**

Pacific Street Interchange Option

#### **Response:**

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