

**From:** [Greg Nelson](#)  
**To:** [SR 520 DEIS Comments:](#)  
**CC:** [Richard.Conlin@seattle.gov](mailto:Richard.Conlin@seattle.gov)  
**Subject:** FW: MADISON PARK BIKE TRAFFIC-(B.APTS)  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 17, 2006 1:46:24 PM  
**Attachments:**

---

October 17, 2006

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: Bike Lane Madison Park

**I-0991-001** My family has had ownership of various properties in Madison Park since the mid- 1930's and at the present time we are, and have been since 1947, the owners of the apartment building at 2032 – 43<sup>rd</sup> Ave E.

I feel strongly that I am uniquely qualified to comment on what I understand is an idea to increase traffic on 43<sup>rd</sup> Ave E. albeit bicycle traffic – which my family members and I strongly oppose.

The 520 DEIS scopes and studies the inclusion of a 14-foot bike lane connecting the University of Washington and Lake Washington Blvd. No mention of a bike lane connection to Madison Park is made, however the City of Seattle has considered a request for this connection and it is to this proposed request that this letter is addressed.

I would urge that the State not consider this proposal for the following

**I-0991-001**

**Comment Summary:**

Madison Park Bicycle/Pedestrian Connection

**Response:**

See Section 24.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0991-001 reasons:

1. This was not in the scope or project limits of the 520 EIS to study.
2. The Neighborhood of Madison Park now struggles with narrow streets, lack of parking, and congestion. To add additional through traffic, even if it is bike related could not be adequately mitigated with the 520 bridge project.
3. According to the City's current Bike routes any such connection would serve primarily as a connection to Lake Washington Blvd. To the south. The 520 project is already doing this in the University District without the added cost of a bridge connection to Madison Park.

I was only recently made aware of this proposed idea and have not had adequate time to formalize my strong opposition to it. It certainly appears to be a diverse tangent to the goal of replacing the 520 bridge.

I hope you can quickly dispense with this idea and finish the monumental task of completing the environmental studies and begin construction on this much needed roadway improvement to SR 520 and its approaches.

Sincerely,

Bill Buchan