

I-1273-001

Comment Summary:

Alternatives Development

Response:

See Section 1.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

From: [Eric Feigl, M.D.](#)
To: [SR 520 DEIS Comments](#)
CC:
Subject: Released from eSafe SPAM quarantine: 520 bridge plans
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2006 7:27:43 AM
Attachments:

I-1273-001

Dear DOT

- As a commuter over the Montlake Cut Bridge I am very familiar with the west end of the 520 bridge problems.
- What ever plan you come up with I think the common sense requirements are as follows:

- 1) There need to be 4 more bridge lanes over the Montlake Cut. -- Not just access lanes to 520. By definition bridges are bottle necks. The city has a problem with crossing the ship canal independent of access to the 520 bridge.
- 2) There should be a bicycle path through the arboretum to connect to the Burke - Gilman trail at the University. The narrow curving arboretum road is a hazard to both cyclists and motorists. (Please do not make a 4 lane road through the arboretum.)
- 3) There should be no 520 access ramps into or out of the arboretum. The arboretum road can not handle the traffic load, and much of the arboretum experience is spoiled by the heavy commuter traffic.

Thanks

Eric Feigl MD
Physiology Dept. 357290
G424 Health Science Building
University of Washington
Seattle WA 98195-7290 USA

Tel. 206 / 543-1496
FAX 206 / 685-0619
email: efeigl@u.washington.edu