

**From:** [oudist](#)  
**To:** [SR 520 DEIS Comments:](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** input on SR 520 options  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 31, 2006 8:30:18 AM  
**Attachments:**

---

Greetings,

**I-1077-001** | I wanted to add my input on 520 options.

I support the six-lane alternative; the Pacific Interchange; and a dedicated transit lane down the middle of the bridge - preferably for regional monorail or light rail, but if BRT is chosen instead, so be it).

**I-1077-002** | I also strongly support "demand management" options to help keep post project-completion traffic volumes from outstripping the newly-expanded capacity. Primary among these should be tolls, with rates varying according to hour of the day or night, and perhaps also varying according to number of people in the vehicle. However, there should be options for solo drivers to use fast lanes; perhaps they should just have to pay more to do so at peak hours. It will be especially important to ensure actual project completion costs do not exceed final estimates made for public consumption. "Low-balling" costs a great deal of public trust. In a related vein, it will also be very important to ensure project funding is fully committed from the various sources before the project starts, as any delays caused by incomplete funding will inevitably drive up costs beyond the official estimate.

**I-1077-003** |

Thanks for considering my input.

Sincerely,

Matt Rosenberg  
Writer/Communications Consultant  
West Seattle Resident  
[oudist@comcast.net](mailto:oudist@comcast.net)  
<http://www.rosenblog.com>  
<http://www.soundpolitics.com>

### **I-1077-001**

#### **Comment Summary:**

Pacific Street Interchange Option

#### **Response:**

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

### **I-1077-002**

#### **Comment Summary:**

Tolling Scenarios, Pricing, and Revenue

#### **Response:**

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

### **I-1077-003**

#### **Comment Summary:**

Project Costs

#### **Response:**

See Section 3.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

<http://blogconsultingpro.com>