

I-0534-001

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

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

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

From: justin goodman [<mailto:justingoodman@hotmail.com>]

Sent: Saturday, October 07, 2006 11:31 AM

To: SR 520 DEIS Comments

Subject:

October 7, 2006

To Whom It May Concern:

I-0534-001

I am writing to express my strong support for the Pacific Street Interchange option for SR 520, and my equally strong opposition to the other options proposed to date. After carefully reviewing the options, it is readily apparent to me that the Pacific Street Interchange option is the only that will correct multiple transit problems in the Montlake area that affect me as a resident on a daily basis.

I have lived in Montlake for a year now, and have found it to be a wonderful place to live, with practically the only major drawback being traffic issues. The Montlake bottleneck can easily turn a good day into a very frustrating one, as can traffic on 520. Traffic noise from 520 is another aspect of life in Montlake that is considerably less than ideal.

The Pacific Street Interchange is the only SR520 option that has the potential to address these and several other pressing transit issues. With the arrival of light rail at UW, there clearly needs to be an interface between the light rail network and bus service; the Pacific Street Interchange provides this. The traffic bottleneck on Montlake, which can frequently add 20-30 minutes of travel time for a car trip of only a few miles must be improved; again, the Interchange option addresses this. The Pacific Interchange also helps make bicycling a more viable transit option, as it would provide connections between the SR520 bike trail, the Burke-Gilman trail, Madison Park and Montlake.

I am very concerned that other options, such as the "Base-6" proposal, would dramatically increase noise pollution in the area above its already troubling levels. A 9 lane highway extending from the University to Interstate 5 can only serve to dramatically increase traffic noise in our neighborhood. The Pacific Interchange option, on the other hand, would not. If noise mitigation design elements were employed, such as noise walls and quiet pavement, noise could be further reduced at a very reasonable cost.

I-0534-001 | As a densely populated urban city, Seattle needs more park space. Creating new park space that will connect the Montlake Playfield with the Arboretum, as the Interchange option would do, will provide significant advantages to the Montlake and University communities, as well as to the whole city.

In summary, I enthusiastically support the Pacific Street Interchange option for SR520. I also applaud the remarkable efforts of the members of our community who have lead the efforts to design and advocate for this far more desirable solution to several of our regions pressing transit problems.

Sincerely,

Justin Goodman
2002 E Calhoun St
Seattle, WA 98112

justingoodman@hotmail.com