

I-1118-001

Comment Summary:

4-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

From: [HANS ASCHENBACH](#)
To: [SR 520 DEIS Comments](#)
CC:
Subject: SR-520 Comments from Kosovo
Date: Wednesday, November 01, 2006 3:36:40 PM
Attachments:

Dear Sir or Madam,

I-1118-001 | I am writing to advocate for the 4 lane alternative for SR 520.

My points are as follows:

1) It seems to me that if a six-lane alternative is built, it will undo much of the good work that hundreds even thousands of citizens have been doing for decades to advocate for transportation alternatives and improved mass transit in the Greater Puget Sound Region. People will always take the seemingly easiest transportation alternative, but that may not be the best or most cost effective alternative in terms of social good. If you build it they will come. If you don't build it, they will use mass transit.

2) How will 6-lanes of SR 520 squeezing into I-5 be an improvement, if 4-lanes of SR 520 already cannot be accommodated by I-5? A few design changes at the junction of the two highways will not solve the problem. You either need to expand the entire system (which can't be done on I-5 in Seattle) or you need to transport individuals on the existing net more efficiently.

Thank you for your attention,

Hans Aschenbach M.B.A., Member Citizen Advisory Board to SR 520 from Seattle, 2002 - DEC 2003

I have been working in the Balkans since 2004 as a member of the WA Army National Guard and as a civilian political analyst for the US Army

2220- 132 Ave SE #A202

Bellevue, WA 98005