

-----Original Message-----
From: dick [mailto:darnold@aaaahawk.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 03, 2006 10:00 PM
To: SR520Bridge@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: SR520 Bridge Replacement

- I-0479-001** | I tried to access your comment online address, but was refused.
- Though I'm sure that the DOT and others are trying to sell the 6 lane options for a replacement bridge, I do not agree, for the following reasons.
1. More bridge will inevitably lead to an increase in traffic until the new bridge is at capacity, whatever size bridge is built. We should be willing to discourage increased cross-lake traffic, not encourage it.
 2. More vehicles, probably twice as many using a six lane bridge as do the present span, will drastically increase pollution, to the detriment of the Seattle and east side communities.
 3. I-5 will be unable to handle the greatly increased traffic, which will spill over onto local streets, further polluting and congesting residential and local business neighborhoods.
 4. The four lane option, which I support, with break-down provision, would significantly increase ease of use, and would increase the numbers of vehicles using the bridge by about half, an increase which could be more reasonably managed by I-5, 520, 405, and local streets.
- I-0479-002** | 5. Instituting tolls for use of the new span during commute hours, would effectively reduce use by non-commuters during such times.
- I-0479-003** | 6. We in the metropolitan area need to search out ways to discourage single-driver commutes, and encourage shorter distance commutes, particularly those which are feasible by public transit and by bicycle. We can find ways to do so, such as subsidizing any form of commute which does not rely on single occupant vehicles, such as financial incentives for those who purchase residences near to their work places, such as requiring employers to provide employee parking free for car-pool vehicles and at significant cost for single occupant vehicles, such as a user tax to be assessed to those who live in one municipality and work in another, thereby using the second city's infrastructure without paying for the facilities and services.
- Sincerely, Richard E. Arnold

I-0479-001
Comment Summary:
4-Lane Alternative

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

I-0479-002
Comment Summary:
Tolling Scenarios, Pricing, and Revenue

Response:
See Section 3.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0479-003
Comment Summary:
Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning

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