

**I-1061-001**

**Comment Summary:**

Light Rail Transit

**Response:**

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

**From:** [Carl Mueller](#)  
**To:** [SR 520 DEIS Comments](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Comments on the SR 520 Bridge Replacement project  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 31, 2006 11:55:32 PM  
**Attachments:**

---

To Whom It Concerns:

**I-1061-001**

I'm upset that the major focus of the SR 520 Bridge Replacement project is on increasing the car-carrying capacity of the bridge. Usually it seems that adding more car capacity to a roadway just puts more cars on the road without relieving the congestion problem; instead it just grows the problem into a bigger problem later down the road.

I believe the focus on the SR 520 Bridge Replacement project should be on increasing the people-moving capacity of the bridge, and that such a focus should include high-capacity transit as a main solution. Indeed, right now it seems that such a transit solution is merely a footnote to the project.

I understand that it is hard for an agency whose main focus is roads to develop solutions that don't focus on road-building, especially since the job of planning high-capacity transit appears to be relegated to other organizations. Nevertheless, I firmly believe that attempts to relieve congestion by building bigger roads are mostly doomed to fail in the long run - they will eventually just be filled by more cars.

It will require some new ways of thinking and new types of developments (as well as a change in culture) to solve the "too many cars" problem.

It will require that we as a people consider an alternative to the car as the solution to all transportation needs. We must not remain stuck in this same rut of thinking, or else we will remain stuck with the same problems, only on an ever-growing scale.

There are many alternatives for implementing high-capacity transit, from light rail to monorail to dedicated bus corridors. The exact implementation is probably not too important. What is important is that we start planning a solution already. I really can't say it enough times: solutions that revolve around more cars are not real solutions.

**I-1061-001** | I may even go so far as to suggest looking at solutions that restrict the number of cars on the road, in favor of dedicated transit lanes. Perhaps once traveling by car becomes the less desirable alternative, people may start taking transit much more seriously. (This is true for me: I always used to drive myself to work across the bridge, but these days it seems that traffic on Tuesday - Thursdays on 520 remains bad till 8 pm or so, and now I ride the bus on those days.)

**I-1061-002** | In any case, I much favor the so-called 4-lane Alternative for the project vs. the 6-lane Alternative. (Perhaps to be more accurate, these alternatives should be designated by their width in feet. I don't think most people really understand how big each alternative is, given their current names.) But as I say above, transit should be designed and built in now, not added later.

It looks like I'm out of time. I hope something good comes out of this.

## **I-1061-002**

### **Comment Summary:**

4-Lane Alternative

### **Response:**

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