

**Online Comment by User: steve dubinsky**

---

Submitted on: 9/11/2006 9:46:00 AM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98115

**Comment:**

**I-0898-001** | i want to voice my support for continued analysis of the pacific interchange option. it seems to address several important points of concern, eg. links to rail, backups betw u village and the montlake bridge and the ramps and traffic that other alternatives will force into the arboretum and over portage bay.

**I-0898-002** | lidding 520 through part of montlake would also make sense.

**I-0898-003** | of course i'm also concerned as to where the funding for the project will come from -- this state can't simply continue on it's regressive course of sales and property taxes w/o implementing a progressive income tax to support the huge infrastructure projects which can no longer be deferred until later.

thanks for considering my pov.  
best,  
steve

**I-0898-001**

**Comment Summary:**

Pacific Street Interchange Option

**Response:**

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

**I-0898-002**

**Comment Summary:**

Bicycle/Pedestrian Path

**Response:**

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

**I-0898-003**

**Comment Summary:**

Funding

**Response:**

See Section 3.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.