

I-1093-001

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

From: [Keith Szot](#)
To: [SR 520 DEIS Comments](#)
CC:
Subject: Support for the biggest bridge option possible
Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2006 8:46:17 AM
Attachments:

I-1093-001

I live in King County just outside of Redmond. I support the 6 lane option with bike lane combined with the pacific interchange. For better or worse our metro area has rapidly grown, and a strong 520 bridge link is a critical component to ensuring we have effective access between downtown Seattle and the northern part of the Eastside.

As a consultant I find myself often needing to meet with clients in Seattle. And no matter what time of day the meeting is, I deal with the risk factor of the 520 bridge which requires me to pad time on both sides of any meeting. As time is literally money in my business, it curtails my economic opportunity.

The four lane option to me is not a real option and would be a waste of taxpayer's money. If the 6 lane doesn't fly, we'd be better off punishing ourselves with the current bridge than spend a penny on a bridge that dooms us to the same situation for many years.

Regarding the 6 lane, I'm not a big fan of HOV lanes so seeing 2 of the lanes devoted to that is not what I'd like to see, but if it means getting 6 instead of 4, so be it.

Please register my support for this option.

Thanks,

Keith Szot
Redmond area