

I-1096-001
Comment Summary:
6-Lane Alternative

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

From: tmarseille@yahoo.com [mailto:tmarseille@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2006 11:55 AM
To: SR520Bridge@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: SR 520 Bridge Project Feedback

Sent from:
Address:
City:
State: WA
County: King County
Zip:
Email: tmarseille@yahoo.com
Phone:

Comments:

I-1096-001 Having reviewed the options presented on your website, I vigorously support the 6 lane alternative. For a relatively small increase in cost, it would go far in alleviating the traffic stoppages on 520 westbound occurring in Bellevue. The current number of onramps combined with the loss of the HOV lane, has been a recipe for congestion from the start. The 4 lane option addresses only the supposed safety concern which! is not, rightly or wrongly, on the drivers mind as he sits on 520. It does not solve the traffic flow problem, though the shoulder would perhaps help with stalled vehicles. The 4 lane alternative is not an option in this growing region. The HOV lane is an essential component that must be built into the replacement structure, not supposedly added "somewhere down the line". We all know that does not work in Seattle. I do question the need for a 10' shoulder on both sides of both directions in the 6 lane alternative. Surely, one shoulder lane on the outside of each direction would be sufficient and would dramatically reduce the width and the inherent problems that it creates in cutting through neighborhoods. It is a bridge after all and we haven't had any shoulder lanes til now. That reduction of 20' would not affect traffic flow or safety to any measurable degree. So, though I feel the 6 lane alternative is the only viable choice, I do feel further refinement is needed. I would not say the plan is complete as is. I do appreciate the considerable energy and creativity that has been spent thus far on this project and the opportunity for the public to offer their input.