
From: Judy Jones [mailto:jazzyj66@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, September 11, 2006 5:56 PM
To: sr520bridge@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: 520 bridge

- I-0438-001** | I'm all for building a new bridge – it's overdue. I just wish the politicians and others would get off their duffs and make a decision – BEFORE the cost jumps once again! We Washingtonians tend to committee and discuss everything to death or vote against it - then complain LOUDLY when costs go up and/or traffic becomes even more of a problem. According to an article I read, Seattle area is suppose to grow by 25% (?) by 2010. If that's true, we'll all be stuck in our cars going nowhere, because we definitely have been very shortsighted on infrastructure (the Renton "S" curve project being a perfect example). Please have the forethought to make the bridge wider than two lanes each way! Think to the future for a change.
- I-0438-002** | I do think the transit tracks that have been approved for the I-90 bridge should be on 520! In the long run it makes more sense to put tracks in when you're building a new bridge and perhaps running the line to Redmond and Kirkland instead of just Bellevue. It might even cost less in the long run – heaven forbid!
- I-0438-003** | One concern I do have is the toll cost. I'm retired on a fixed income, so paying a \$5 to \$10 toll would definitely make me think twice about driving the 520 bridge. Which then, means I go I-90 or drive around; which increases traffic for either option. I understand the need to pay costs, but doesn't it make more sense to have a reasonable toll, so people wouldn't feel the need for other options.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment.

Judy Jones
14706 114th Ave. NE
Kirkland, WA 98034

I-0438-001

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0438-002

Comment Summary:

Light Rail Transit

Response:

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

I-0438-003

Comment Summary:

Tolling Scenarios, Pricing, and Revenue

Response:

See Section 3.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.