
From: jrgorg@u.washington.edu [mailto:jrgorg@u.washington.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, October 24, 2006 5:52 PM
To: SR520Bridge@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: SR 520 Bridge Project Feedback

Sent from: teljensen
Address:
City:
State: WA
County: King County
Zip:
Email: jrgorg@u.washington.edu
Phone:

Comments:

I-1133-001

so, I've no formal training in this sort of thing, but I've probably done more reading about it than the average citizen. I've got some objections. the idea that we should be relieving congestion suggests that we should continue accomodating the automobile. cars are nasty. they kill people in several ways: accidents, pollution, stress, facilitation of sedentary lifestyles, etc. perhaps building HOV 1a lanes will encourage carpooling and reduce some of these problems, but wouldn't converting an existing lane do the same for less cost with the addition of discouraging single occupancy? as long as we make it easy to drive, folks will continue to drive. from a public health standpoint, that doesn't make sense. from a fiscal standpoint, that doesn't make sense because it encourages sprawl and wastes taxes on roads and income on driving. from an aesthetic standpoint, that doesn't make sense because roads and autos are ugly and polluting. anyhow, I'm sure you've heard this general line of reasoning before, I just wanted to do my bit of civic engagement for the day. by the way, I live on the Eastside and commute to UW. thanks.

I-1133-001

Comment Summary:

Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning

Response:

See Section 2.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.