

I-0093-001

Online Comment by User: cathy1

Submitted on: 9/10/2006 6:40:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-1, Page-1

Address: , , 98112

Comment:

REASONS I FAVOR THE PACIFIC INTERCHANGE CHOICE FOR REDESIGNING HIGHWAY 520:

It makes no sense to me to funnel an increased number of cars and people from 520 north across the Montlake Bridge! Or even more troublesome, to not provide a better way for all the cars north of canal to get onto 520 (yes, lots of these people are UW-related). Let's help those cars and people move smoothly through to where they want to go, and let lanes on Montlake Bridge do what they do so beautifully: provide gorgeous city street driving from one neighborhood to the neighborhood next to it (IE a person who works at Children's Hospital and lives on Capitol Hill could drive or ride bus without traffic backups smoothly southward to get home from work.)

So many people want to get off of 520 to the north side of the Montlake Canal, whether they are connected to the UW or headed to other points north. Say they want to shop at University Village, or they live or work in neighborhoods that are north of canal and don't want to use I5 North. It makes sense to choose a well-thought out design that gets these cars where they want to go without continuing to force them all to sit backed up at the Montlake bridge bottleneck.

ALSO, mass transit is our region's only hope for the future. Mass transit needs to be viewed from an overall viewpoint, meaning one form of mass transit should connect to another--buses bringing riders off of 520's wonderful new HOV lanes should bring those riders to the light rail station that will be built at Husky stadium--not drop them off down on the 520 freeway from where they would have to walk north across the Montlake Bridge to get to the light rail station.

Thank you for listening--please choose the Pacific Interchange Option!
Cathy Loeffler

I-0093-001

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

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