

Online Comment by User: brenhi01

Submitted on: 10/26/2006 1:17:00 PM
Comment Category: 4-Lane Alternative
Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-9
Address: , Seattle, WA 98052

I-0065-001

Comment:

This 4 lane alternative looks like a waste of money to me. All you've done is kept the same amount of lanes we have now, widened two of them and widened the shoulders. And added a bike & pedestrian lane. Is a bike & pedestrian lane really a priority on a major freeway? And don't we already have many places they can walk & ride in our state?

Comment Category: 6-Lane Alternative

Comment Location: Chapter-3, Page-9

Comment:

I like this alternative and am sorry the 8 Lane was not feasible. If we're going to spend the money, let's plan ahead and get the most capacity we can on 520. I'd prefer to have 3 open lanes on each side, get rid of the bicycle/pedestrian lane and add it as an extra lane to either side.

Comment Category: General Comments

Comment Location: Chapter-6, Page-3

Comment:

-Go with the 6 lane

-Go with whatever reasonable option those communities nearby that are going to be effected favor the most

Please make 520 first priority over the viaduct and I90. It is the worst for traffic congestion across the water. I commute every day from Seattle to Redmond and the traffic reporters on the news stations might as well just record their broadcasts and play them over and over each day. People says we no longer have a reverse commute; however, from what I see every day, traffic always seems to be worse going to the Eastside in the morning and back to Seattle in the late afternoon. (Sonic games, Mariners games, Seahawks, opera/musical events, etc.) My commute, of course. :)

I-0065-002

-Has anyone thought of a tunnel vs. open lanes? Or too costly? It would reduce the noise even more and eliminate slow-downs when: that water-skier shows up every Winter skiing next to the bridge and people slow down to watch, when people take their foot off the gas while gawking at all of the boats on the water in Summer and when traffic gets congested because of the sun blinding the majority of drivers who forgot to bring their sunglasses with them.

I-0065-003

-And how about stacked lanes? They have them in PA. Eliminate the width of the bridge; just make it taller? Too costly? Ruin too many views?

I-0065-004

And most of all, start electronically tolling the 520 now! I am ready. As long as no one spends the money on something else, you would have a good head start on funds when this project finally gets started and it would eliminate any more delays.

Thanks for giving me the opportunity to comment.

I-0065-001

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

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

I-0065-002

Comment Summary:

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

Response:

See Section 1.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0065-003

Comment Summary:

Alternatives Development

Response:

See Section 1.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0065-004

Comment Summary:

Early Tolling

Response:

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

-Brenda