

Online Comment by User: MattRosoff

Submitted on: 8/22/2006 10:11:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-10

Address: 5549 31st Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98105

Comment:

I-0724-001

I strongly support the Pacific Street Interchange and 6-lane option. It is the Option that the EIS predicts will have the most positive effect on neighborhood traffic, particularly the intersection at NE 45th and Montlake Blvd. See Exhibit 5-6 for evidence. It will reduce time from 45th to 520 by 20 minutes during peak hours, according to the EIS; the other options will not. Reducing neighborhood traffic should be one of the goals of the 520 project--it's not fair to reduce freeway traffic at the expense of neighborhoods. It's also better for transit, restores the character of the Montlake neighborhood, and has a lesser visual effect and footprint on the marshland east of Montlake compared with the other 6-lane options (since the 520 roadway will be able to be narrower).

Comment Category: Second Montlake Bridge

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-10

Comment:

I-0724-002

I do not support the Second Montlake Bridge plan for the 6-lane alternative. It would not have a positive effect on neighborhood traffic, and in fact would increase traffic through the Montlake neighborhood. The Montlake Bridge opening causes major bottlenecks in the evenings--sometimes it can back traffic up for 30 minutes or longer back up to 24th St. Adding a Pacific St. Interchange is a much better option--it reduces neighborhood traffic, improves peak travel time from 25th Ave to 520 by 20 minutes, and eliminates the drawbridge bottleneck. Reducing neighborhood traffic should be a goal of the project--it's not fair to reduce highway traffic at the expense of local neighborhoods. Thank you.

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-10

Comment:

I-0724-003

We have a once-every-hundred-year opportunity to alleviate traffic on 520. Spending more than 2 billion dollars without increasing traffic capacity is insane. The 4-lane option would be a waste of taxpayer dollars. The only option that makes sense is the 6-lane option. Specifically, the option with the Pacific St Interchange, which would also help reduce neighborhood traffic.

I-0724-001

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

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

I-0724-002

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0724-003

Comment Summary:

4-Lane Alternative

Response:

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