Rosellini Sees ‘58 Start On 2nd Lake Span

Governor Rosellini predicted today that a start on construction of a second Lake Washington bridge would be made this year.

The governor told a luncheon of the Women’s City Club in Seattle that the state intended “to progress as quickly as possible on a bridge at Evergreen Point.”

The state proposed a plan to build a bridge at Evergreen Point as quickly as possible and later to construct a third bridge parallel to the Floating Bridge, putting tolls on all lake traffic.

The City of Seattle has opposed the plan and recently proposed that the second bridge be built between Sand Point and Kirkland.

Rosellini said that advances in highways and institutions would highlight his administration’s program in 1958. He said work on the Tacoma-Seattle-Everett freeway would be extended and that work will begin on a Hood Canal bridge.

Rosellini Sees ‘58 Start On 2nd Lake Span,” *The Seattle Times*, January 7, 1958, p. 34
Group's Rebuff to Metro Will Do Nothing to Speed Lake Span

—By ROSS CUNNINGHAM,
Associate Editor, The Times

It seems very doubtful if the second Lake Washington bridge project soon up will be helped any by the Lake Bridge Users' Association taking a position in opposition to the Metro proposition which will be on the March 3 ballot.

The action by the association, of course, was voluntary—in retaliation for the opposition by Seattle municipal officials to the construction of a bridge on the Evergreen Point-Montlake route.

This perhaps should be pointed out in connection with the long bridge controversy. If Seattle officials have been stubborn in their insistence upon a Sand Point or parallel-route bridge, the Bridge Users' Association has been equally stubborn in its fight for an Evergreen Point bridge.

No Concessions by Either Side

There has been no "give" or compromise on the part of either side. Both groups have hung tough in their insistence that they have their own ways that it has been impossible over the years to get started on a bridge, although there seems to be a growing consensus on both sides of the lake that the next for a new crossing is so great that a bridge should be built wherever one can be built.

The problem right now appears to be more one of HOW to finance a bridge rather than WHERE it is to be located.

The state's two-bridge package plan is not moving ahead and appears to be dead. Seattle officials are pushing a proposal for improvement of the present bridge, to be followed in a number of years by another toll-free bridge on the parallel route—but no one yet has suggested where the money for the present bridge improvements is to come from.

Long, Doubtful Shot in Dark

The Lake Bridge Users' Association's thinking that the bond market has improved enough to permit the financing of a toll bridge on the Evergreen Point route, without refunding tolls to the present bridge, seems to be a long and doubtful shot in the dark.

In this writer's view, it may be necessary to work up an entirely new approach to the financing of a second lake bridge. This might involve a combination of toll revenues and tax funds. The tax funds might come from either county or state or from a combination of both.

However, this much appears to be very clear: The cooperation of the state, city and county, either in a financing or a political operation, will be required to get the bridge project started.

Vindictive attitudes on the part of any of the groups concerned will not bring about the cooperative atmosphere needed to further the bridge project. Such attitudes would be to make the atmosphere even less favorable to a settlement of the long-simmering and the problem of financing more difficult.

Another Controversy Threatens

What appears to be happening is that the Metro proposal, the principal immediate aim of which is to clear up Lake Washington pollution, is getting into the same sort of hassle that has prevented construction of a lake bridge.

If this controversy gets cut off hand, as the lake bridge controversy has, we may be arguing the same thing now about what is to blame for the loss of Lake Washington as a recreational asset.
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Since 1953 a controversy has been raging over the site and design of a bridge to span Lake Washington Narrows. Numerous plans for a bridge have been proposed and rejected over the years. The latest plan, the Lake Bridge project, was chosen by the city council in 1954.

TIMES READERS HAVE THEIR SAY:

Money Troubles Real Cause of Evergreen Delay

Editor, The Times:

YOUR editorial, "And Still No Bridge in Sight" in The Times of September 29, gives undeserved credit to this and other organizations opposing a second Lake Washington bridge on the Evergreen Point-Montlake route for having delayed its construction.

The fact is that no protests against building this span, instead of where the State Highway Commission’s own engineers found the need to be the greatest, the parallel route, have had any effect whatever on state officialdom.

The reason the Evergreen Point bridge has not been built is that they have not yet found a way to finance it.

The DeLue-Cather report, for which the state paid some $30,000, was swept under the carpet because it recommended the parallel route.

The opposition to the Evergreen Point route of Mayor Clinton, the City Planning Commission, the Municipal League, the Arboretum Foundation and numerous improvement and community clubs has been brushed aside.

Your editorial would indicate that The Times thinks it makes no difference where a new bridge is located as long as we get one.

But the site of the bridge could make a big difference to the home-owners of Montlake and North Broadway residential districts, and to the comprehensive, long-range city plan of the City Planning Commission.

These city officials, who are working for Seattle’s best interest, are deserving of better support.

They understand, as state officialdom at Olympia stubbornly refuses to acknowledge, that U. S. Highway 10 is Seattle’s main highway link with the rest of the state and the nation, and that only a free parallel bridge will serve this growing traffic, which is not going to make a detour to pay a toll for crossing the lake at another point.

—CARL M. BALLARD
President
Citizens Parallel Bridge Association.

METRO COUNCIL
Editor, The Times:
It is most fitting as our Metro Council begins its work, that public notice be taken of the part Seattle’s two newspapers played in presenting the proposal to the voters.

You not only carried in your columns the routine news about the Council, and urged its adoption in your editorial pages. Your writers studied the plan and carried many educational articles on it so that our citizens could vote intelligently on this complicated question.

The new Metro plan will need careful study and intelligent and patient leadership from the members of the Metro Council to put the concept into operation.

We know our newspapers will continue their responsibility in keeping our citizens informed of its progress.

—GORDON S. CLINTON, Mayor.

NOTES ON THE NEWS

"Wait'll Capa Canaveral gets a load of this!"

Second Lake Span No Nearer Realization Than Year Ago
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