

520 Tolling Implementation Committee - Public Comments Received

Comment	
From:	Angela Hinckley
Source:	info@build520.org
Date:	09/25/2008
Zip Code:	98122
Comment:	<p>It would be far better to come up with a plan other than tolls. For example increase the tax just in King County.</p> <p>The whole state shouldn't have to pay for the 520 bridge. I use the bridge daily to get from Redmond to Seattle and the added congestion a toll would create would be awful. The cost is ok, not the extra time.</p>
From:	William R. Alves
Source:	Mail
Date:	09/25/2008
Zip Code:	98144
Comment:	<p>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.</p>
From:	Larry Corkins
Source:	info@build520.org
Date:	09/26/2008
Zip Code:	98101
Comment:	<p>I think the issue is clear, the state needs the money to rebuild 520 before it collapses and the people who use the corridor should pay the majority of the cost.</p> <p>Tolls seem to be the best way for those who 'want to play have to pay" I suggest the public be informed that a toll be implemented on 520 in 2010 sufficient to cover the cost of making up the short fall in funding over an extended period of time that starts before construction and extends until it is paid off.</p> <p>If the toll on 520 causes drivers to change their driving habits enough to create congestion on 190 and to create a short fall in the funding for 520 the state reserves the right to implement a toll on that brige as well.</p> <p>The bottom line is those if us who cross the lake need a new bridge before the old one fails and we should pay some portion of it.</p> <p>The electronic tolling on the Narrows bridge appears to be working well.</p> <p>Good luck and get something done.</p> <p>Larry</p>
From:	Chris Hoerner
Source:	Mail

Date: 09/26/2008
Zip Code: 98126
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: Jules Cohen
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 09/30/2008
Zip Code: 98112
Comment: Hi,

Touching base because I haven't seen any confirmation that folks traveling in HOV3 cars won't have the pay the new tolls on 520. Clearly this is the way to go since we should be doing everything that we possibly can to provide incentives for people to drive HOV3 across the bridge.

Thanks,

Jules Cohen

From: John E.Z. Caner, M.D.
Source: Mail
Date: 10/02/2008
Zip Code: 98112
Comment: I support early fixed 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.

Tolling should pay for any major road expansions.

From: George V. Reilly
Source: Mail
Date: 10/03/2008
Zip Code: 98108
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: Gary
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 10/10/2008
Zip Code: 98125
Comment: No Frills, its a short road not a la la look at that thing as you drive by slow just get on it and drive to or from. Pay for it with the gas / car tax we pay now , no more tax or tolls....buck up and be a man say no new tax its just a road. If we need \$\$\$ sell the name to starbucks as Starbucks Highway of Yahoo Highway let them pay some of the cost it worked for other things, think smart

From: Patricia Kloster
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 10/24/2008
Zip Code: 98116
Comment: Most of my trips over 520 would be on the week end, when there are very few express buses to the eastside.

Since I live in West Seattle, I mostly use I-90, but that will then be over-crowded unless tolls are on both bridges.

Is there any plan to increase bus service during construction or when tolls would be added?

I've been here long enough (born and raised) that I already paid tolls when the 520 bridge first opened - now again?!

Thank you ~

From: Deborah Jacober
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/04/2008
Zip Code: 98121
Comment: Maybe the funding should be a combination of Tolls (based on tolls) and taxes based on where primary users of the bridge reside. e.g. Maybe those living on the East side who benefit most from the bridges should pay for a higher portion of the costs through taxes. New developers (for east side projects) should also help contribute as well.

From: Vicki Tolbert
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/04/2008
Zip Code: 98117
Comment: PLEASE, please don't have tolls on the bridges. I don't mind tolls on optional routes that are true options, but these bridges are vital to everyone and not really options. Living in Seattle is increasingly getting too expensive for its citizens, and this is yet another taxation on the public. PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE NO TOLLS!

From: Rob Gifford
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/04/2008
Zip Code: 98144
Comment: I strongly support tolls being added to 520 between Seattle and Bellevue. I think this is a responsible solution to pay for the roadway by those who use it.

Sincerely,
Rob Gifford

From: Evan Nelson
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/04/2008
Zip Code: 98108
Comment: Toll both 520 and I-90, 520 needs to be replaced yesterday, get it done! I support the 6 lane configuration

with provisions for future mass transit as well.

From: Denis Martynowych

Source: info@build520.org

Date: 11/05/2008

Zip Code: 98106

Comment: There are two high level principles that should guide the decision makers

1) The public should not fund independence - the public should fund what is good for the public. There is a difference between access and independence. Make the difference clear to everyone.

2) Use the best science that points to an approach that minimizes carbon footprint and eases congestion. Science is sometimes counter-intuitive. Read "Fewer Roads - Less Congestion" http://daily.sightline.org/daily_score/archive/2008/10/27/fewer-roads-less-congestion

Make sure someone does this kind of analysis on the options.

From: Cedric Dussud

Source: info@build520.org

Date: 11/06/2008

Zip Code: 98115

Comment: I strongly favor variable-rate tolling like that implemented on highway 167 (though for 520 I assume it will be on all lanes). I commute across 520 every day and would 1.) pay more to be guaranteed a quick commute across the bridge when I really needed it and 2.) start commuting at more off-hours to avoid paying the expensive toll on most days.

I'm also in favor of a toll on I90 if it's necessary, though an early toll on 520 may obviate the need.

I think the toll should be implemented sooner rather than later because it may help relieve congestion immediately.

From: Richard Brown

Source: info@build520.org

Date: 11/06/2008

Zip Code: 98112

Comment: Please do not implement segmentation tolls. Segmentation tolls will greatly increase traffic in adjacent residential neighborhoods. The only reasonable way to toll 520 and I90 is to have a single toll location on each bridge.

From: J.L. Byrne

Source: info@build520.org

Date: 11/10/2008

Zip Code: 98144

Comment: I live in Mt. Baker and rarely (maybe two or three times a year) use 520. I use 90 more often, but not for commuting. I am a big supporter of transit and I strongly believe that tolls should be used to fund transit as well as road improvements. Drivers benefit when they have choices, and even if they don't use transit, the road has less traffic because of those who do. I also support the use of variable tolling, as a congestion relief measure. I think tolling should start as soon as possible and tolling should be used on both 90 and 520 as a way to finance road improvements and transit. I am pleased that ST Prop 1 passed and that there will be light rail to the Eastside. That should help with congestion. Please implement tolling now and use it for transit!!

From: Rob Lane
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/10/2008
Zip Code: 98102
Comment: I remember stopping and tossing the dime in with the toll bridge on 520 a long time ago. I am very disappointed with our roads, along with everyone in Seattle/Bellevue who sits on our dangerous roads and exits and tries to drive through the 10 to 15 year old same construction paid for, maybe 10 times over in which is still not finished and/or paid for some how. Welcome to the next mess that is being proposed and postponed over and over. If you have a spot on the board for me, I would love to vote for change.

Thank you so much

From: Happie Byers
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/10/2008
Zip Code: 98112
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 bridge and fund transportation choices. This will help relieve congestion and reduce climate change pollution.

Where will drivers drive during rebuilding process?

From: Jules Cohen
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/11/2008
Zip Code: 98112
Comment: Here is my big concern. If you just toll 520 then traffic from 520 westbound is going to get backed getting onto 405 south (on the way to 90). This is going to cause huge problems for folks who commute from redmond to seattle since there is a big bottle next at 405. To make matters worse there is no HOV lane that will let transit bypass this problem. I love the idea just tolling 520 so that the communte gets faster but there needs to be a way to do so without bottlenecking at 405.

From: Larry Corkins
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/11/2008
Zip Code: 98101
Comment: Thank you for keeping me informed about the process.

I have spent some time reviewing the new information and I did find it difficult to understand if the toll would be charged in both directions or just one way as was done on the 520 bridge in the 70's.

That is a very important detail, as it could double the potential cost to the consumer, and should be clearly stated on each page that shows the toll rate being analyzed. Although I'm sure that detail is explained somewhere in the presentation most of us don't have the time to read each and every page in your presentation to find that detail.

I spent about 5 to 10 minutes looking at the presentation and did not see that explained.

Keep up the good work.

Larry D. Corkins

From: Anna Golden
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/11/2008
Zip Code: 98165
Comment: How did you get my e-mail address??? I never signed up for this. Please remove me from your e-mail list. Thank you.

From: Bob Fleming
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/11/2008
Zip Code: 98133
Comment: I am in favor of beginning tolling as soon as possible, and also in favor of tolling both SR520 and I-90 bridges.

However I am also in favor of beginning the tolls low, let's say \$.50 off-peak and \$.75 peak. This will reduce objections and permit people to more quickly adjust to tolling as such. It will probably also result in some people switching to transit and will give transit authorities time to make some adjustments.

After a few months, increase the toll by twenty-five cents, this will result in more adjustments by drivers and consequent adjustments by transit authorities. Then continue to increase and adjust tolls every few months so that over time gradual adjustments are made by drivers, transit systems, and others. The smaller incremental adjustments should also result in less opposition than one single massive implementation of fairly high tolls.

From: Aaron Lowin
Source: Tolling web survey
Date: 11/11/2008
Zip Code: 98102
Comment: Tolling the Montlake segment between 520 bridge and I-5 is ABSURD !!

From: Doug Nelson
Source: Tolling web survey
Date: 11/11/2008
Zip Code: 98105
Comment: DO it now before the bridge sinks. Also make 520 eight lanes.

From: Richard Brown
Source: Tolling web survey
Date: 11/11/2008
Zip Code: 98112
Comment: Do not implement "segment" tolls. Segment tolls will divert too many cars to neighborhood streets, increasing congestion, pollution, and making our neighborhoods less safe for pedestrians and bicyclists. I have one toll point in each direction on each bridge.

From: Matt Barclay
Source: Tolling web survey

Date: 11/11/2008
Zip Code: 98103
Comment: Variable tolling will make it so only rich people can afford to travel efficiently during peak hours!

From: Milton Horst
Source: Tolling web survey
Date: 11/11/2008
Zip Code: 98146
Comment: Bridge construction and maintenance should be funded by fuel and/or motor vehicle taxes, not tolls.

From: Tim Martino
Source: Tolling web survey
Date: 11/11/2008
Zip Code: 98122
Comment: Light Rail, Light Rail, Light Rail. I have lived in a city (Washington DC) where I relied on light rail to get me to and from work. Currently I take the bus but it doesn't save me any money and adds lots of time to my commute, not to mention the bus (ST545) from Capitol Hill to Redmond is packed. More buses are good but they are only a band-aid. Light rail gets more cars off the road and more people can be moved faster. The fact that light rail is not being included in the 520 discussion is ludicrous, laughable and so shortsighted I am in shock. Think of what actions the transportation committee didn't take 30 years ago and make sure you don't make the same mistakes.

From: Virginia Gunby
Source: Tolling web survey
Date: 11/11/2008
Zip Code: 98115
Comment: Please consider incentives such as free transit passes for monthly toll users to get SOV out of their vehicles. Toll Bridge Authority info writes that it is done on San Francisco Bridge.

Do not approve HOT high occupancy toll lanes that encourage more SOV trips on the crosslake bridges.

Promote a system for "casual carpooling" on the bridges, to allow use of carpools to increase. Promote new performance monitoring Partnership Agreement on SR 520 between the local cities, the major employers, institutions, WSDOT/Transit to oversee and regularly report back to the users and the public the successful or unsuccessful corridor performance, due to tolling, transit, and other TDM measures implemented to reduce SOV trips, change eastside to transit friendly land-use and efforts of employers with CTR programs.

From: Chris Pesce
Source: Tolling web survey
Date: 11/11/2008
Zip Code: 98112
Comment: Toll both bridges to keep tolls lower and avoid a MESS on I-90. It's the right thing, so do it.

From: Roxann Malley
Source: Tolling web survey
Date: 11/12/2008

Zip Code: 98104
Comment: Should cost more to come into Seattle than to leave. If possible toll tickets should be round trip.

From: Melissa Brown
Source: Tolling web survey
Date: 11/12/2008
Zip Code: 98136
Comment: Toll I-90!!! And make sure there is no toll for carpoolers or motorcycles.

From: J. Bader
Organization: UDCC
Source: Fall 2008 OH Comment Form
Date: 11/12/2008
Zip Code: 98155
Comment: Toll strategies

No tolls shall be charged to for emergency vehicles and the state patrol on assignment.

No tolls shall be charged for METRO, Sound Transit Express Bus Rapid Transit and/or school buses.

Toll shall encourage use of high occupancy vehicles (3 persons or more) ("HOV").

Toll shall recognize and make an accomodation for those handicapped people with disability decals/permits who depend upon travel by motor vehicles, e.g. lower rates or rates commensurate with those charged for HOV.

Current toll rates shall be posted on the internet at the WSDOT website and, if a special site is kept for the SR 520 bridge, at that site; and current tolls shall be posted at on-ramps to alert motorists sufficiently in advance so that they may take an alternate route.

Toll collection shall not delay traffic, but shall allow for tourists and infrequent users to make payment while travelling.

From: George Gunby
Source: Fall 2008 OH Comment Form
Date: 11/12/2008
Zip Code: 98115
Comment: My tolling preference -

Toll both I-90 and SR 520 starting in 2010

Use variable time-of-day rate

Toll users of Arboretum ramps an extra amount (to discourage Arboretum ramp usage) and give some (or all) of the difference to the Arboretum.

Keep the amount of the toll low by staying within the budgeted project cost of \$3.9B.

From: Jonathan Dubman
Organization: SR 520 Mediation
Source: Fall 2008 OH VC - UW (Seattl
Date: 11/13/2008

Zip Code: 98112
Comment: Has there been an attempt to quantify the economic and environmental benefits of the reduction in traffic congestion. Also has the volatile price of oil been taken into account?

From: Eric Fisk
Source: Tolling web survey
Date: 11/13/2008
Zip Code: 98103
Comment: Please make HOV-2 free, not just HOV-3: 1. If everyone drove HOV-2, there would no traffic on a 4 lane bridge (much less 6 lane) 2. HOV places no burden on transit- each car is like a little bus 3. HOV-2 is important over HOV-3 as it is easier to coordinate and provides incentive to drive smaller 2-seater cars when commuting Beyond that, please implement congestion pricing at whatever level is required to eliminate the backup for I-90 and 520.

From: Richard Maas
Source: Fall 2008 OH VC - UW (Seattl
Date: 11/13/2008
Zip Code: 98108
Comment: Once we build the new bridge, how will we pay for the maintenance and how long will the new bridge last?

From: Anonymous
Source: Fall 2008 OH VC - UW (Seattl
Date: 11/13/2008
Zip Code: unknown
Comment: We talk a lot about cap and trade systems and I've read a lot of literature about 520 and I don't hear it talked about at all. President Obama says he will have the cap and trade program in place by 2010, the same time tolling starts. If we have that as a disincentive to drive, as well as a possible gas tax increase, it could cause people to take transit. It seems like we're kind of being short sighted in how we will pay for that.

From: Anonymous
Source: Fall 2008 OH VC - UW (Seattl
Date: 11/13/2008
Zip Code: unknown
Comment: I'm excited to see the focus on HOV lanes and rapid transit. How much focus has been put on high speed rapid transit for 520?

From: Anonymous
Source: Fall 2008 OH VC - UW (Seattl
Date: 11/13/2008
Zip Code: unknown
Comment: 1. In terms of vehicles as their crossing and toll collection -- this is a per vehicle toll, not a per passenger toll? 2. For those who are driving things like plug in hybrids that cause less pollution impact, would they be able to have a lower toll fare since they aren't causing some of the side impacts?

From: Anonymous
Source: Fall 2008 OH VC - UW (Seattl
Date: 11/13/2008
Zip Code: unknown
Comment: I would encourage you not to toll buses because you want people to use buses and Metro is having funding problems anyway. Also, don't toll HOV's, vanpools, etc. because we want to encourage that type of travel.

From: Anonymous
Source: Fall 2008 OH VC - UW (Seattl
Date: 11/13/2008
Zip Code: unknown
Comment: One of your three main goals is safety, one is to get people moving faster and one is to mitigate for environmental impacts. So with that stated, why aren't we tolling right now if it has so many benefits?

From: Anonymous
Source: Fall 2008 OH VC - UW (Seattl
Date: 11/13/2008
Zip Code: unknown
Comment: How is the success of the Narrows Bridge in Tacoma?

From: Anonymous
Source: Fall 2008 OH VC - UW (Seattl
Date: 11/13/2008
Zip Code: unknown
Comment: Although we don't have the policy in place, do we have info in the EIS that leaders could use to establish a good cap and trade system? Do we have info about the carbon contributions of each element of the project? – My question really is: do we have the information on how much carbon emissions result from the various aspects of the project?

From: Anonymous
Source: Fall 2008 OH VC - UW (Seattl
Date: 11/13/2008
Zip Code: unknown
Comment: What are the legal and political complexities of collecting tolls on one freeway to use them on another?

From: Anonymous
Source: Fall 2008 OH VC - UW (Seattl
Date: 11/13/2008
Zip Code: unknown
Comment: There are ways to monitor how much carbon vehicles are emitting, it can be done.

From: Sergio Steele
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/13/2008
Zip Code: 98106
Comment: Toll booths should be implemented on 520 bridge. The traffic demands it. It will automatically put some commuters onto buses which is necessary to alleviate traffic congestion. We will also be able to pick up valuable tourist dollars in the Summer because of it.

From: Anonymous
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/13/2008
Zip Code: 98122
Comment: I just finished the survey, then read one of the PDFs. I have any additional comment: to encourage mass transit, you should not add the toll to the bus fare.

From: Jim Chevigny
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/13/2008
Zip Code: 98101
Comment: Enough already! While you have ben bickering and being undecided, Tacoma has designed and built and opened the new Narrows Bridge, and yes, with tolls.

Please hire some decision-makers who will get 520 built!

Charge everyone \$5 one way and be DONE WITH IT, including I-90.

Hire the person who implemented the electronic system in Tacoma and start the tolls NOW in order to build up the fund to pay the bonds earlier.

PLEASE DO SOMETHING!!!

From: Marilyn Dunstan
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/13/2008
Zip Code: 98146
Comment: I commuted across Lake Washington from West Seattle to Redmond for 14 years but now sporadically use mostly I-90 for miscellaneous trips. My experience has been I-90 has been the most efficient choice although I've frequently taken 520 from Redmond to North Seattle. Based on my habit of switching bridges based on traffic flows as well as experience living in New York State's Hudson River Valley, I'd say the only appropriate choice is to toll BOTH THE I-90 AND THE 520 BRIDGES. Why shove cars from 520 onto I-90 because the folks want to avoid paying the 520 toll? Sure there will be some people stuck paying the 520 toll no matter what because of where they are going but there are a lot who have the choice to use either bridge and they will migrate to I-90 making it worse if only 520 is tolled. It is best for the overall efficiency of the system to toll both bridges. With electronic tolls you could toll in both directions but if some folks need to pay in a booth then it could make sense to toll one way only, same way on both bridges. The tolls could be varied by time of day to flatten out the traffic pattern.

Actually some type of congestion pricing on the other major routes could make sense but only if it paid for improvements in the transportation system (as a whole). Transportation is time-elastic much more than price elastic and so pricing off the peak to generate funds for transit makes some sense.

From: Kil Yong Park

Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/14/2008
Zip Code: 98104
Comment: Please send me an E-mail when do you have hearing or meeting for transportation committee, I have attended former time as a representative of Korean commiitee. Thanks

From: Kaaren Kirkpatrick
Source: Tolling web survey
Date: 11/15/2008
Zip Code: 98102
Comment: Tolling is the only equitable way to fund. I am more than willing to pay to use the bridges (and freeways, for that matter). Washington is so far behind other states in this regard, it is laughable.

From: Lee Hooks
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/17/2008
Zip Code: 98121
Comment: Extending the rationale that you are using to justify tolls on both I-90 and 520, you should actually be tolling all ways around Lake Washington. You should have tolls on the south end of 405 and on Lake City Way/Bothell. That way you could prevent any leakage and maximize the revenue.

I am amazed that people would consider it acceptable that Mercer Island residents would be asked to pay an inordinate share of the 520 bridge cost (if I-90 has tolls) because we are captive on the Island. This is while we seldom use 520 while Seattle and Clyde Hill residents support tolls on both roads while they use 520 extensively.

I support, only as a last resort, tolls on 520 (the bridge should be built with general tax revenues as it is a public good) only as that then costs those who use the facilities.

Thank you

From: Karen Sherwood
Source: info@build520.org
Date: 11/17/2008
Zip Code: 98101
Comment: Dear committee on toll plans,

I am a teacher in the Mercer Island school district. I live in Seattle, along with 53% of the teachers and staff in the Mercer Island school district. Although we teach in a wealthy district, our salaries are -- as you know -- quite low. Most of us have salaries below the median income of King County. If you put a toll on I-90, our already challenging struggle to make ends meet will become even more challenging. For some of us, it may mean we need to look for other jobs. You may say that putting a toll only on 520 will impact those teachers commuting over that bridge. But if only the 520 bridge has a toll, at least people have a CHOICE about which bridge to take. Tolling them both makes it impossible for many teachers to get to work without paying a significant part of our already low state salaries back to the state. This will take an incredible toll on the teachers and other low-salary commuters who have no choice but to use the bridges daily. While tolling only one bridge may cause an increase in traffic on the other as people make that choice, at least it gives a choice to those of us who need it.

PLEASE do NOT put a toll on the I-90 bridge. I am confident that my email speaks the sentiment if nearly all of my colleagues. Please feel free to contact me for further comment.

From: Shelly Bolser

Source: info@build520.org

Date: 11/17/2008

Zip Code: 98122

Comment: Our household does not have the option of avoiding these tolls, and we believe that the tolls should be imposed fairly on the region that uses both bridges to cross Lake Washington.

My husband works in Kirkland and I work in Seattle. My husband works early in the morning and so hasn't been able to find a vanpool option that arrives early enough for his schedule. His workplace does not offer flexible schedules and so he is forced to travel during peak times. It would take him 3 buses and approximately 90 minutes to get to work if he used transit, and we live in an area with high transit service. We bought our house in Seattle to minimize the commute for both of us, since I work in downtown Seattle.

If tolling is imposed, it should be imposed equally on both 520 and I-90. Some people will choose to travel I-90 if there is no toll, which will lead to increased traffic on that bridge and the need for additional maintenance. It is unfair to the people who have no other feasible option than 520 that some people can avoid paying a 'fair share' by diverting trips to another location, making fewer people shoulder more of the burden.

The peak hours of travel should also be extended, or a flat rate imposed, since travel volumes on 520 are high for many hours of the day, beyond typical peak travel times.

Whatever the tolls, they should be low enough that it will not unduly impact families that are already struggling with the current economy. The tolls should be evenly distributed and manageable, or it could severely impact the local economy. The tolls should be combined with increased bus service and connections to suburban work hubs.

From: Gail Eisenberg

Source: info@build520.org

Date: 11/19/2008

Zip Code: 98101

Comment: NO TOLLS ON I-90!!!

I-90 is used as a local thoroughfare for people like me who live right by the bridge in Seattle. I do a lot of my shopping on Mercer Island and the Factoria section of Bellevue. My doctors are on Mercer Island and Bellevue. I am Jewish, and the only place that I can buy kosher meats and other foods is at the Albertsons on Mercer Island. I belong to the Jewish Community Center on Mercer Island, and go there to use their sports facilities and attend events. Members of my family can be back and forth between our home and Mercer Island several times during the day!! Do you want me to end up spending \$20 or \$30 every time I walk out of my house to go somewhere.

If you want to toll, toll the 520 bridge. Toll the people who use it!!!! I-90 is completed and working just fine.

My daughter goes to Bellevue Community College in Bellevue, and works at the Jewish Community Center on Mercer Island. I carpool with her to school in the morning. Sometimes she has time to come home and do schoolwork before going to work. Do you mean to tell me every time she crosses that bridge you're going to charge her a toll!!!! She works hard to pay for school, carpools as much as possible, and she is going to get a raw deal for trying hard to do the right thing!!! We all use the buses as much as possible. But, unfortunately, sometimes the buses just won't get you from school to work to school.

Realize that people who go back and forth to Mercer Island do so, using it as a "local street." This is total nonsense to toll I-90. Why don't you just toll every street in the city. I thought that Seattle did things well. After living here for almost 30 years, I'm almost ready to leave. You are making what was once a most wonderful city, the kind of place that only the "rich" can afford!!!! I, along with the rest of the middle class, will eventually leave. Go tax the rich!!!

From: Phillip McCune

Source: info@build520.org

Date: 11/20/2008

Zip Code: 98102

Comment: I support tolling both bridges in 2010, so long as the funds are directed to the improvement costs related to the bridges themselves.

From: Grahm Satterwhite

Source: Tolling web survey

Date: 11/24/2008

Zip Code: 98105

Comment: I strongly encourage tolling both the I-90 and sr 520 bridges in the year 2010. From a project financial perspective this makes the most sense. From a transportation perspective this makes the most sense. From an environmental perspective this makes the most sense. From a regional economic perspective this makes the most sense. From what perspective does waiting to toll sr 520 and possibly not tolling I-90 make sense?

From: Jennifer Allen

Source: info@build520.org

Date: 11/25/2008

Zip Code: 98119

Comment: First, I must admit that I hate tolls (really, who likes them? :)). However, I am willing to pay higher tolls if the 520 project addresses all of the 520 problems and not just the bridge. Driving on 520 can be emotionally and physically exhausting, especially during peak commuting times. Perfectly nice people are turned into Mad Max raging avengers due to the various problems with the design today.

I think that 520 is currently a mess for several reasons:

Problem 1.

Many people who commute to the eastside, leave for work later in the morning to avoid congestion. At the same time, these people often leave work early to avoid congestion as well. This leads to double-peak traffic, causing people to wait up to 2 hours in stop and go traffic.

Problem 2.

520 has the only 3 person carpool lane in the entire state. The carpool lane starts on Westbound 520 near the 40th street exit as a 2 person lane and then changes into a 3 person lane about 2 miles later. This causes any 2 person carpools to abruptly merge into the slower-moving main traffic, causing the 3 person carpools and buses to frequently have to abruptly stop.

Problem 3.

520's carpool lane is on the right. The multitude of merges and exits on the right (405 N and S) wreak havoc on the carpool lane. Carpoolers and buses are often forced to break rapidly in order to avoid hitting cars that are abruptly merging. Although fixing the bridge is paramount, if the overall congestion issues are not addressed for the highway, people will be furious. Simply replacing the bridge is not enough.

I am obviously in no way a transportation planner, but I have been commuting on 520 for over 5 years now. Here are some ways that I think the problems above could be resolved:

Solution 1. a) Improve transit. The recent Sound Transit plan that was passed will help by adding more bus service. More and more people are using the bus now. b) Expand 520 to make it at least three lanes (2+ plus carpool) at all times. There are places where the carpool lane is also the exit/entrance lane, reducing the road to essentially 2 lanes. The three existing lanes are also merged into two lanes across the bridge. c) When designing the new bridge, ensure that it is of even elevation. When going westbound, the bridge rises at the west edge, causing drivers to slow down out of fear of stopped traffic that is out of view. A bridge of even elevation and no blind spots would help reduce abrupt stops and accidents.

Solution 2. Change the carpool lane to 2 people at all times.

Solution 3. One way to resolve the merging problem would be to move the carpool lane to the left and then build pedestrian overpasses with stairs and accessible ramps for bus stops.

Thank you for your time

From: Jennifer Allen

Source: Tolling web survey

Date: 11/25/2008

Zip Code: 98119

Comment: First, I must admit that I hate tolls (really, who likes them? :)). However, I am willing to pay higher tolls if the 520 project addresses all of the 520 problems and not just the bridge. Driving on 520 can be emotionally and physically exhausting, especially during peak commuting times. Perfectly nice people are turned into Mad Max raging avengers due to the various problems with the design today. I think that 520 is currently a mess for several reasons: Problem 1. Many people who commute to the eastside, leave for work later in the morning to avoid congestion. At the same time, these people often leave work early to avoid congestion as well. This leads to double-peak traffic, causing people to wait up to 2 hours in stop and go traffic. Problem 2. 520 has the only 3 person carpool lane in the entire state. The carpool lane starts on Westbound 520 near the 40th street exit as a 2 person lane and then changes into a 3 person lane about 2 miles later. This causes any 2 person carpools to abruptly merge into the slower-moving main traffic, causing the 3 person carpools and buses to frequently have to abruptly stop. Problem 3. 520's carpool lane is on the right. The multitude of merges and exits on the right (405 N and S) wreak havok on the carpool lane. Carpoolers and buses are often forced to break rapidly in order to avoid hitting cars that are abruptly merging. Although fixing the bridge is paramount, if the overall congestion issues are not addressed for the highway, people will be furious. Simply replacing the bridge is not enough. I am obviously in no way a transportation planner, but I have been commuting on 520 for over 5 years now. Here are some ways that I think the problems above could be resolved: Solution 1. a) Improve transit. The recent Sound Transit plan that was passed will help by adding more bus service. More and more people are using the bus now. b) Expand 520 to make it at least three lanes (2+ plus carpool) at all times. There are places where the carpool lane is also the exit/entrance lane, reducing the road to essentially 2 lanes. The three existing lanes are also merged into two lanes across the bridge. c) When designing the new bridge, ensure that it is of even elevation. When going westbound, the bridge rises at the west edge, causing drivers to slow down out of fear of stopped traffic that is out of view. An bridge of even elevation and no blind spots would help reduce abrupt stops and accidents. Solution 2. Change the carpool lane to 2 people at all times. Solution 3. One way to resolve the merging problem would be to move the carpool lane to the left and then build pedestrian overpasses with stairs and accessible ramps for bus stops.

From: Nedra Rivera Huntington

Source: Mail

Date: 11/26/2008

Zip Code: 98136

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.