

---

**From:** Deborah Green [mailto:debgreen11@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 31, 2006 10:17 AM  
**To:** SR 520 Bridge Replacement & HOV Project  
**Subject:** comment due today on 520 project

Please read the attached comment from an resident of Montlake Blvd. 5 houses south of the Montlake Bridge. whose pleas to the DOV have long been dismissed (over 38 years).

Please pay attention now.

thank you  
deborah green

\*\*\* eSafe2 scanned this email and found no malicious content \*\*\*  
\*\*\* IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders \*\*\*  
\*\*\* eSafe1 scanned this email and found no malicious content \*\*\*  
\*\*\* IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders \*\*\*

31 October 2006

To DOT committee re 520 choice, and government officials including the state governor:

**I-1280-001** | Perforce, I will be brief. My property, a double lot, is at the NE corner of the intersection of Montlake Blvd and East Hamlin. Of the seven residents along the car exit from 520 heading north to the Montlake Bridge, I am the longest survivor, having lived here since 1968. Further comments about this may follow below. For now, I would ask you to supply a rational reason why cars heading north to the University, or to the expensive U. Village, or further north, should exit 520 onto Montlake to add to the bottleneck leading to and over and beyond the Montlake Bridge. No cars should exit 520 on the south side of the bridge in order to head north. Of course the Pacific Interchange makes more sense. (With no damage to the arboretum, please, visually, aesthetically, view-wise and otherwise.)

**I-1280-002** | The big issue for me is this. I attended a "debate" at the Queen City Yacht club in late September. I happened to sit next to a woman (Judith/Julia?) who said she was the director or deputy director of the DOT 520 project. I asked her by note how much of the 520 bridge traffic is commuters going directly to and from work on the east side (or perhaps the other way). She said, "I don't know. We did not look at that."

**This is astounding, shocking. With the time and money spent supposedly thinking through this project, there has been no vision. What about motivating the drivers to get to work and home another way? No one thought of that? Instead you want to build more road for more such traffic?**

Thought and vision were required and apparently lacking throughout this process. An elected city government official said at that September meeting, "Seattle people won't change their habits." **The problem is what makes the traffic**, the single drivers driving to and from work. Another way is needed. Probably light rail. The elected official said Seattle is not ready for that.

Thought and vision were required. They still are. Change the driving patterns, not build unwanted roads that damage one environment or another.

**I-1280-003** | **Four lanes maximum. The same or smaller footprint, but in a rational place, one end the Pacific Interchange.**

**But do not do a thing until someone somewhere starts thinking with actual vision that is rational and productive and good for all.**

Thank you for attention to this plea.

Deborah Green  
2810 Montlake Blvd East  
Seattle WA 98112  
debgreen11@comcast.net fax 206 322 6484 \*51

## **I-1280-001**

### **Comment Summary:**

Pacific Street Interchange Option

### **Response:**

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

## **I-1280-002**

### **Comment Summary:**

Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning

### **Response:**

See Section 6.4 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

## **I-1280-003**

### **Comment Summary:**

4-Lane Alternative

### **Response:**

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