

Online Comment by User: DAVEFOO

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 11:43:00 AM

Comment Category: Comment on all alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-2, Page-2

Address: , , 98052

Comment:

I-0127-001

It is my opinion that unless a 3rd cross-Lake Washington bridge is in the plans then there is no question that replacing the SR-520 bridge with anything less than a 6-lane bridge is foolish. Since we are struggling to pay for the 520 bridge, I doubt a 3rd bridge is feasible and therefore the state should be looking at a 6-lane or greater 520 replacement bridge.

I-0127-002

If the SR-520/I-5 interchange presents a bottleneck that would render a 6-lane bridge useless then that is a separate issue that also needs to be addressed. Build the 6-lane 520 bridge with plans to address I-5/520 in the future. Let's not find ourselves regretting a 4-lane 520 bridge 10 years down the road.

I-0127-001

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0127-002

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

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