

**Online Comment by User: markjon**

**Submitted on:** 10/31/2006 11:09:00 AM

**Comment Category:** General Comments

**Comment Location:** Chapter-3, Page-2

**Address:** 2923 277th Ter SE, Fall City, WA 98024

**Comment:**

There is too much focus here on "better transit options to automobile commuting" which aren't actually better. I like my car and think it's the best option for commuting. The mass transit options that have been discussed around here are slow (even when running in dedicated roadways), inconvenient and waste valuable public resources that could be devoted to the more realistic and practical option that we have today...the automobile. I'm not aware of any other city that "grew up" on the car (e.g. not NY or Chicago or European cities) which has successfully adopted mass transit as the primary transportation method. I don't see why Seattle would be any different and so far the Sound Transit effort is proving me correct. The commuter trains are expensive and carry few passengers (relative to total commuter volume), the upcoming light rail line is a slow-moving waste of space and the silly "T" interchanges for carpool lanes are monuments to waste.

I favor alternatives that recognize the reality that I'm going to continue driving my car, as will nearly everyone else. I do not favor government attempts to "socially engineer" my habits to accept the inferior lifestyle required by mass transit. I'm particularly tired of the attitude that making life in the SOV lanes painful will motivate me toward mass transit.

The social contract I have with my government (see John Locke) does not allow it to intentionally reduce my daily quality of life while it conducts an ill-conceived "experiment".

**Comment Category:** General Comments

**Comment Location:** Chapter-3, Page-9

**Comment:**

But we know that traffic will probably continue to grow even past 2030 so why not take the opportunity now to build an 8-lane capable bridge? Isn't it more cost-effective to build room for 2 additional lanes now (even if we only use 6 lanes) than to come back later and start up a separate project to build 2 more lanes? I remember the huge project from the early '90s to add only one lane in each direction on I-405 (HOV of course...what a waste!). That was the one where the sides of bridges were torn up and retrofitted to add just enough room for a single lane. And what's happening right now on 405? Another huge project that involves tearing out edges of roadways that are only 15 years old to add, you guessed it, one additional lane. Did anyone in 1993 seriously believe that adding one HOV lane was really going to solve the problem long-term? It was obvious to people I talked to that it was too little and we'd be right back there again soon adding more lanes and now that's come true, although I doubt any of us thought that congestion on 405 would be allowed to get so bad before anything was done. So why would we place ourselves in the same position on the 520 bridge? Build the extra capacity while we're at it even though we can't use it fully until 5/405 are improved.

I-0710-001

I-0710-002

**I-0710-001**

**Comment Summary:**

Light Rail Transit

**Response:**

See Section 2.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0710-002**

**Comment Summary:**

8-Lane Alternative

**Response:**

See Section 1.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.