

I-0059-001

**Online Comment by User: bmcullen**

Submitted on: 9/16/2006 8:10:00 AM

Comment Category: Pacific Street Interchange

Comment Location: Chapter-7, Page-9

Address: , , 98105

**Comment:**

Comment on the Pacific Street Interchange-

I oppose the Pacific Street Interchange and believe it has fatal flaws that will worsen traffic on Surface streets and make bus trips longer.

1. We are reducing the through put to get cars onto the 520 bridge for those People who head Eastbound: Currently, going East bound we have 1 General Purpose lane entering 520 at the arboretum and 1 GP + 1 HOV lane at Montlake that merges together into 1 lane prior to entering 520.

In the Pacific Interchange at the top where the 4 lane stop is, we have 1 HOV lane and will be jamming the 2 GP lanes into 1 lane on the on-ramp to east bound greatly restricting the throughput via the one GP onramp.

This would be essentially as if you took the current Montlake GP lane and could magically attach it over at the Arboretum stop sign where all the traffic comes together so they would merge together and then get onto the bridge using the one lane. This is more of a bottle neck then the current situation and therefore will backup traffic onto surface streets.

Montlake would be a dedicated HOV lane but all the GP traffic coming into one place in the arboretum illustrates the reduced capacity to get cars onto the bridge. This seems like we are making it worse for eastbound traffic then what we have today. The result would be larger backups onto the surface streets then we have now. How does reducing the amount of onramp capacity allow more cars to get through? This doesn't make sense.

A simple model might illustrate this.... If you assume that each GP lane provides 100 riders per hour and then you assume the current volume of HOV traffic carries 300 riders per hour then the current throughput would look alike...

= 1gpx100 riders for the arboretum + ((.75gpx100) +(300 for HOV)) for Montlake assuming that you only get 3/4 use of the GP in Montlake due to some HOV traffic also using that space this = 475 throughput for the current scenario.....

Alternatively with the Pacific Interchange using the same analysis

.5x100 + .5x100 for the GP Lanes that come together + 300 for the HOV lane = 400

**I-0059-001**

**Comment Summary:**

Pacific Street Interchange Option

**Response:**

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

I-0059-001

2. Two left hand turns do not seem to make traffic better. The Pacific Interchange Main intersection will allow only two lanes to turn left that will need to support both eastbound and westbound traffic and HOV traffic.

An additional left hand turn at the top of the interchange prior to getting onto the bridge will only add to the problems. If most of the traffic is coming from the north then why would you want to make them make two left hand turns to get onto 520?. This will however greatly improve the travel for the people from the north who before had less volume but did have to make the left hand turn which caused some backup.

3. Will we create a longer bus ride for those wishing to get off at the UW during Rush Hour: We will have backups on the Pacific Interchange arms between the 4-way lights and the main intersection going both inbound and outbound. Because of that, buses will be stuck in that traffic between the 4 lane lights at the top of the interchange and the Main intersection adding 10 to 15 minutes as they try to navigate from the offramp to the bus stop and then back out whereas today they easily exit and enter the freeway at the Montlake / 520 bus stops.

4. Do the analytical models reflect reality: I suggest you drive the Montlake blvd north to south several times on one day between 7am and 8am. You will see how the initial backup on Montlake starts when 520 volumes rise and backups start out on 520 at the "S" curve of the high rise and then the Arboretum exit and then the backup flows back onto the on ramp and finally back onto Montlake blvd. If 520 is flowing there is never a backup of consequence on Montlake during rush hour.ever.. This may be different in the afternoon but I have not seen any acknowledgement of this nor have I seen any discussion on the actual entry points onto 520 and how they are improved (See point 1.) If the models show that there is some kind of critical backup in Montlake in the morning that is due to a constriction on Montlake then it is not supported by my 7 years of driving that route at various time in various directions. The backup on Montlake 99% of the time starts with the backup on 520 at the Arboretum exit and moves West to the Montlake onramp and onto Montlake. Models can be wrong or blatantly misconstrued to generate the outcome desired..