

520 Tolling Implementation Committee - Public Comments Received

Comment	
From:	Janet & Conrad Vlaming
Source:	Mail
Date:	09/24/2008
Zip Code:	98042
Comment:	I support early "variable pricing" tolling of the 520 and I-90 bridges to bring quick and effective solutions to our region's transportation problems. We should set the tolls so they will pay to rebuild the 520 bridge and fund transportation choices. This will help relieve congestion and reduce climate change pollution.
From:	Connie Murry
Source:	info@build520.org
Date:	09/26/2008
Zip Code:	98290
Comment:	I believe tolls should be implemented for the SR 520 bridge only. Those individuals that use the bridge daily should be the ones to carry the majority of the load. Those that cross it occasionally, the toll should be a non-issue.
From:	Jerry Hautamaki
Source:	TIC Meeting #6 (Kirkland)
Date:	09/30/2008
Zip Code:	98290
Comment:	In Puerto rico over 45% of their patrons don't have credit cards. People can go into stores and scan cards to get money. Those programs are successful. A lot of research has been done into non-banked tolling methods.
From:	Pam Pritzl
Source:	Mail
Date:	10/15/2008
Zip Code:	98292
Comment:	Dear Committee Member: I support early "variable pricing" tolling of the 520 and I-90 bridges to bring quick and effective solutions to our region's transportation problems. We should set the tolls so they will pay to rebuild the 520 bridge and fund transportation choices. This will help relieve congestion and reduce climate change pollution.
From:	Janet Schafer
Source:	info@build520.org
Date:	10/21/2008

Zip Code: 98042

Comment: I vote for the following scenario: Start tolling 520 in 2010 at a toll rate that attempts to fill the project funding gap.

From: Ernest Tear

Source: info@build520.org

Date: 10/21/2008

Zip Code: 98002

Comment: What happened to the legislator promise, when the 520 was originally paid off (many times over), that we would never have another toll road/bridge in the state of Washington again?

From: Trevor Stanhope

Source: info@build520.org

Date: 10/22/2008

Zip Code: 98275

Comment: As a very infrequent (5-10 times per year) user of the 520 bridge, I feel that having a Good-to-Go Pass is not necessary and agree with the license plate detection and invoicing proposal. However, I also feel that having to pay a surcharge (for video processing) on top of the toll if I use the bridge without a Good-to-Go pass is unfair. The taxpayers of this state should not have to pay extra because they were not given a reasonable option to pay.

What about out of state plates and rental cars/trucks? How will these vehicles be accountable for tolls? Without a pass and using the plate, who will get charged the toll? With a Toll Booth, there is the option to collect. Without one.... it simply isn't fair.

From: Robert M. Moore

Source: info@build520.org

Date: 11/04/2008

Zip Code: 98371

Comment: Toll both bridges though a tunnel replacement of the 520 bridge would be preferable. If the proceeds exceed the financing and maintenance of the bridges, that surplus could certainly be well employed for transit build-out, either the line from Renton to Woodinville or Sound Transit extension southward beyond Lakewood toward Dupont.

From: Tom Byrne

Source: info@build520.org

Date: 11/06/2008

Zip Code: 98031

Comment: Hello,

I am a user of 520 and would not mind paying my share of the cost of improvements, but I am vehemently opposed to any tolls that are not structured to be removed once the expenses incurred are paid. There is no fair reason why there should be a permanent toll on our transportation surfaces.

Thank you,

Tom Byrne

From: Samuel North
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/06/2008
Zip Code: 98036

Comment: Tolling of the existing 520 bridge should commence as soon as possible. In addition to the state and federal funding being used to build a new bridge, it is reasonable that present day users of the 520 bridge be responsible for a larger share of funding than non-users. Taxes collected from all state residents have already been committed and this is reasonable since the 520 provides a collective benefit to residents by improving our economy. Those using today's bridge will directly benefit from the new bridge and owe a more substantial contribution than merely taxes. It would be unfair for taxes to be the sole funding source and it would also be unfair to expect a larger share of funding to come from future users and residents without current users sharing in the cost.

Additionally, both 520 and I-90 should be tolled. I-90 should be tolled for two reasons, first to balance demand between the two cross-lake corridors and second, because I-90 users benefit from the 520 bridge by reducing demand on I-90. It is therefore reasonable to expect users of both bridges to pay for improvements to either bridge.

Funding designated for bridge replacement and tolls collected should not be used to pay for transit service, but should pay for transit infrastructure and transit lane improvements. Transit services should be paid by regional transit agencies through their existing funding structure.

I am opposed to segment tolling. The purpose of the bridge corridor is to allow access to the bridge, if some drivers benefit from access to areas along the corridor, but do not cross the bridge, it is unreasonable to toll them for accessing this minor benefit of the bridge replacement. Tolling at a specific point at or after the bridge crossing is simpler and easier for drivers to understand.

I think that variable tolling is a smart idea when compared to a flat rate toll. Whether variable tolling actually affects behavior or not, I think it is reasonable for commuters to pay a larger portion of tolls because it is the demand that cross-lake commuters put on the system that requires us to have two bridges.

Tolls of \$1 to \$4 in today's dollars seems to be a reasonable amount. Higher amounts (over \$3) would force me to think twice about driving the bridge during peak periods and would force me to take transit were I commuting across the bridge daily.

From: Susan Bagley
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/07/2008
Zip Code: 98003

Comment: Every use of SR 520, even by local residents whose use is only part of the length of the bridge, should be tolled. A prorated amount should be collected at the onramp. This can be viewed similarly to the assessment for sanitary sewer improvements in communities. The length, or distance along the edge of your property is used to calculate your financial obligation to the sewer district. When it comes to tolling, the partial length of the SR 520 bridge travelled should be paid for at a slightly reduced rate. This may entail development of sensors at offramps to credit the drivers' accounts when exiting partway across the bridge. If the technology is not developed to that level yet, we need to get the technical experts working on a method of charging that partial amount.

From: Bill Okazaki
Source: Tolling web survey
Date: 11/11/2008
Zip Code: 98024

Comment: I do not believe that tolling the 520 and I-90 bridges is the most equitable way to fund the upgrading and new construction/replacement of these bridges.

From: Dave Thomas
Source: Tolling web survey

Date: 11/11/2008
Zip Code: 98043
Comment: This survey pretty much put words in my mouth. I don't think the outcome of it will be very valid, especially for the questions where I had to pick a statement I "agreed" with when I didn't agree with either. Also, the question where I had to rank three possible outcomes of tolling the bridge from most important to least important or what ever the three options were...

From: Randy Boss
Organization: Citizens Against Tolls
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/12/2008
Zip Code: 98335
Comment: Bob, Paula and Dick:

Just a couple of quick thoughts while you're deliberating over the tolls for the 520 Bridge.

First and foremost - when the project is all done it better relieve congestion! As proven at the Tacoma Narrows Bridge - all of the objections (well almost all) will go away if the project actually works and the users see that their tolls actually relate to congestion relief.

The I-90 and the 520 work together as a team. Exact tolls scenarios should be established on both bridges to avoid confusion and diversion and to insure a steady and predictable toll revenue.

You can't expect everyone that uses the I-90/520 to have a transponder. Emergency toll booth need to be a part of the equation even if paying a manual toll is charged at double or triple the transponder rate.

The public will accept tolls on the bridge to pay for the bridge (that direct connection principle) but not on other surface streets.

Congestion pricing now would help ease some of the current problems on the bridges by pushing some traffic out of the commute period thus making the tolling implementation a little easier to swallow.

As shown at the Tacoma Narrows Bridge - tolls work to solve congestion. With all due respect Bob, I believe there would be a line up to pay tolls if you would show (as with the Tacoma Narrows) that tolls solve congestion. The public will pay for that direct result.....

Please enter these comments in the public record.

Thank you

From: Will Atkinson
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/13/2008
Zip Code: 98024
Comment: Mass Transit is the way of the future - high speed electric trains are what the US Government will put full emphasis on in the future - that means 90% government funds for those bying into this approach. Why isn't the new bridge being built to take advantage of high speed transportation getting away from buses.

From: Will Atkinson
Source: Tolling web survey
Date: 11/13/2008
Zip Code: 98024
Comment: NO TOLLS save money by discontinuing tolling committee. Get federal funding for bridge, mass transit, and maintenance. Other cities like Portland, San Diego, Frisco, Phoenix, Boise, Spokane have gotten federal funding for mass transit, whats wrong with greater seattle area getting funds.

From: Paula Lucas
Source: Fall 2008 OH Comment Form
Date: 11/17/2008
Zip Code: 98014
Comment: I am firmly against the tolls on either bridge. I can already tell that this meeting is about placating the public. King County has already made up its mind and will enact the toll, when they choose, at the rate they choose. This meeting is being held so that King County can claim that they listened to us without actually considering anything we say.

Options like changing the time or destination of our commute is moronic - we have to work and we have to work at a certain time - we don't have the option of choice. With no bus options (Express 545 picks up where I need to be dropped off and drops off at the side of the freeway where you have to fend for yourself - including climbing a hill that is difficult with a cane.)

THIS PLAN SUCKS AND ISN'T FAIR.

From: Janet Schafer
Source: Tolling web survey
Date: 11/25/2008
Zip Code: 98042
Comment: Thank-you for finally repairing this survey!!! This is the 4th attempt at taking it, and I was FINALLY able to pull up the site!!!! I also support the tolling of the 520 in 2010, with further tolling of I-90 in 2016...option #4. Thank-you for accepting public comment on the options available. Now, it only they would ask us how we want the Viaduct replaced!!!! (no to a tunnel or a surface road.... the elevated road offers the best free view of the Puget Sound and should remain available to the entire public! It is a major part of the one-day tours I give to all who chose to "tourist in Seattle" and get my personal tour of the best of the city! It is a view I love to see and enjoy sharing with others!!

From: MJ Hillstrom
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/26/2008
Zip Code: 98020
Comment: Hello!

I am a counselor at Mercer Island High School. I live in Edmonds. I am one of those poor schleps who commutes every day. Yes, I have checked into mass transit, and would need to orchestrate four legs of transportation to get to work, leaving my home at 4:30AM and arriving home at 8:30PM. Therefore I drive and save myself a few hours each day. With the proposed toll for the I90 bridge, a good portion of my monthly pay check would be spent on more transportation, yet not benefitting my commute. I am opposed to this proposal and don't believe those who work for Mercer Island School District should have to pay the toll. Education professionals (35 years for me) choose our vocation because of what we can do for kids and the future of our society, obviously not for the meager salaries we are paid. Perhaps this is one way our society can give back to those in education- by granting us free passage on a bridge we can't avoid in our commute? Thank you for considering my opinion.

From: Paula Lucas
Source: Tolling web survey
Date: 11/30/2008
Zip Code: 98014
Comment: This whole idea sucks and makes lower income people forced to commute to work to pay for it - with no other options, routes or bus availability. Really forced us into a corner haven't you?

