

I-0702-001

Online Comment by User: Margaret Kitchell

Submitted on: 10/31/2006 4:33:00 PM

Comment Category: Comments on Alternatives

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-7

Address: , , 98122

Comment:

I am against all six lane alternatives and in favor of the 4 lane alternatives for a number of reasons. I am very concerned about global warming, and in the news today are reports that Great Britain considers it a serious emergency, which I believe it is. We have a mayor in Seattle who is a leader to combat this, and also county executive, but we have only made relatively small steps so far. On the other hand we are responsible, in the US, for 25% of the world's global warming emissions, so I believe we need to take much more serious steps, and looking to options that don't add more lanes is part of that.

I believe we have not invested enough in public transportation and in transportation demand management, using a variety of methods to encourage people to travel in more efficient modes. A fairly small amount of money invested in demand management would go very far to decrease single occupancy vehicles. There are many people on 520 who take transit, but more could if TDM was used.

I believe we need to have excellent pedestrian and bicycle access between areas north and south of the canal, and that the cross-lake bike/ped lane should be connected south of SR 520 to Madison Park. We need to invest more in efficient, safe, attractive walking routes and bicycle routes, both to lessen global warming, and also improve our health.

I-0702-001

Comment Summary:

4-Lane Alternative

Response:

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