

**Online Comment by User: mstaples**

---

Submitted on: 10/30/2006 9:49:00 PM

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-9, Page-1

Address: , , 98074

**Comment:**

Serious consideration of a 4-lane alternative is, given the current inadequacy and the obvious and apparent demographics of the region, ludicrous. Indeed, if light rail is at some point added to the 6-lane alternative, would the trains cut down the available lanes to two (or, worse yet, to one general purpose lane and one HOV lane)? That would be absolutely ridiculous. Traffic is the biggest issue in this region. It affects all of our lives, from requiring me to leave at 6:30 a.m. and to return at 7:30 p.m. to avoid traffic, to not allowing my friend's children to participate in after-school activities. It chases businesses away and prevents others from relocating here. Environmentalists and, in the absence of other terminology that might be more specific, "liberals," have their place in the debate, but they should not frame and control it. The mere fact that we have to fight for a 6-lane bridge, when the current 4-lane model is so absurdly inadequate \*without\* 1.3 million additional people in the region, boggles the mind.

I-0752-001

**I-0752-001**

**Comment Summary:**

4-Lane Alternative

**Response:**

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