



**Meeting Summary  
ESSB 6392 Workgroup Meeting #1  
Thursday, July 22, 2010  
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.  
Puget Sound Regional Council  
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500, Seattle**

**Workgroup members:**

- Angie Thomson, Facilitator
- Bob Powers, Seattle Department of Transportation
- David Hull, King County Metro
- Greg Walker, Sound Transit
- Julie Meredith, SR 520 Program
- Theresa Doherty, University of Washington
- Michael Fong, Seattle City Council (Not in attendance)

**Welcome and introductions (Angie Thomson)**

Angie Thomson, facilitator, welcomed everyone to the first ESSB 6392 Workgroup meeting and reviewed the agenda. Workgroup members introduced themselves.

**Engrossed Senate Substitute Bill (ESSB) 6392 Overview (Jennifer Ziegler and Heather Catron)**

Jennifer Ziegler, WSDOT Tolling Division, provided an overview of ESSB 6392. ESSB 6392 outlines the following:

- Reiterates that the project shall be designed to provide six total lanes, with two lanes that are for transit and high-occupancy vehicle travel, and four general purpose lanes.
- Designates that project design includes HOV lanes with 3+ occupancy requirements.
- Directs WSDOT to report to the Legislature when average transit speeds in HOV lanes fall below 45 miles per hour at least 10 percent of the time.
- Toll collection on the existing SR 520 bridge beginning in spring of 2011.
- Allows SR 520 toll revenue to be used on projects within the full SR 520 corridor.
- Provides \$200 million of bond proceeds to the west side project.
- Creates a special account for civil penalties from toll violators that may be used for the SR 520 project, including mitigation.

- Directs the Mayor and the city of Seattle to convene a workgroup consisting of Sound Transit, King County Metro, the Seattle Department of Transportation, and the University of Washington to study and make recommendations of connections for transit to the University Link light rail line. A report is due to the Governor and Legislature by October 1, 2010.
- Directs WSDOT to convene a workgroup with the city of Seattle and other organizations as designated by the city to study and make recommendations on potential design refinements to the preferred alternative that was announced in late April. This recommendations report is due by December 31, 2010.
- Directs WSDOT to convene a workgroup with Sound Transit and King County Metro to outline options for planning and financing for high capacity transit in the SR 520 corridor. The report is due to the Governor and Legislature by January 1, 2011.
- Requires WSDOT to consult with the governing board of the Washington Park Arboretum, the city of Seattle, and the University of Washington to identify all mitigation required by state and federal law resulting from the SR 520 program's impact on the Arboretum, and to develop a project mitigation plan to address these impacts. WSDOT shall submit the mitigation plan by December 31, 2010.

Heather Catron, SR 520 Operations Manager, outlined additional key milestones and stakeholders participating in the workgroup process. With many overlapping participants in the various workgroup efforts outlined in the bill, WSDOT and the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) have established technical coordination teams that will focus on topics outlined in ESSB 6392, as well convened one joint Workgroup to provide direction on technical recommendations.

One technical coordination team (TCT) will focus on transit connections and design refinements. By August 31 this technical team will identify all design updates resulting from this process so they can be incorporated into the SR 520 project final environmental impact statement. WSDOT will also lead a technical coordination team comprised of staff from WSDOT, King County Metro and Sound Transit focused on transit planning and financing that will begin meeting in the fall to develop recommendations for the Workgroup to review at a November meeting.

In November, the Workgroup will also hear from SDOT and WSDOT about topics related to the design and transit connections work that are included as part of coordination with the Arboretum Botanical Garden Committee on a mitigation plan.

A final set of recommendations on all four efforts included in the legislation will be submitted to the Washington State Legislature and Governor Gregoire by December 31, 2010.

Ms. Catron also outlined the public involvement opportunities. Methods for keeping the public involved include:

- Public comment at workgroup meetings
- Public information sessions
- City Council Special Committee meetings on SR 520
- Public comment period on draft recommendations
- SR 520 project open house
- SR 520 program e-mail updates
- ESSB 6392 Workgroup Web page
- Stakeholder briefings

([Slide 3](#) in the presentation includes additional information)

**QUESTION:** Can you please clarify the SR 520 tolling schedule? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *Tolling of the SR 520 corridor is still scheduled to begin in the spring of 2011 on the SR 520 bridge. (Jennifer Ziegler)*

**COMMENT:** I can tell that WSDOT has been working hard on this process. I am happy to be involved in a process that will dig into the technical issues we have been talking about for a long time. I look forward to seeing where this effort will lead. (Greg Walker)

### **SR 520, I-5 to Medina Preferred Alternative Description (Kerry Ruth)**

Kerry Ruth, I-5 to Medina Engineering Manager, provided an overview of the SR 520, I-5 to Medina preferred alternative (PA). The PA includes the following key elements:

- A new six-lane corridor from I-5 to Medina that includes two general-purpose and one transit/HOV lane in each direction.
- Reversible transit/HOV ramp to the I-5 express lanes; headed from the Eastside to downtown Seattle in the morning and from downtown Seattle to the Eastside in the evening.
- A six-lane Portage Bay Bridge with a westbound managed shoulder.
- An urban interchange at Montlake Boulevard with an expanded Montlake lid.
- A second bascule bridge across the Montlake Cut that provides additional capacity for transit/HOV, bicycles and pedestrians.
- A space between the west approach bridge structures that could accommodate potential future light rail and connect to the University Link light rail station.
- A 14-foot-wide bicycle/pedestrian path across Lake Washington.
- Improved bicycle and pedestrian connections at the future Montlake Multimodal Center from the University of Washington to the University Link.

- Environmental improvements, including noise reduction features, stormwater treatment, removal of unused R.H. Thomson ramps to restore park land and habitats, and improvements for fish and wetlands plants.

([Slides 4- 10](#) provide additional information)

**QUESTION:** How much width would be saved by removing the auxiliary lanes on the Portage Bay Bridge? Would this change cause any operational impacts? (Greg Walker)

**RESPONSE:** *The structure would be reduced by approximately five feet. Operationally, SR 520 would function the same way. By managing the westbound shoulder during peak travel times, traffic can use that area to merge, which will also help with congestion on southbound Montlake Boulevard. (Kerry Ruth)*

**QUESTION:** What are the limits of work for the new floating bridge? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *The limits of the floating bridge and landings stage of the I-5 to Medina Project – the part that is funded – are from approximately 1,000 feet west of the floating bridge to the eastern shore of Lake Washington at Evergreen Point Road. (Larry Kyle)*

**QUESTION:** Are the pontoons going to be tied into the new structure? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *The new floating bridge structure will be connected to the existing infrastructure west approach structure with an interim connection. Specifically, the transition span area will be 1,000 feet west of the current structure. (Kerry Ruth)*

**QUESTION:** What will the width of the new floating bridge be? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *The new floating bridge will be 115 feet wide. (Kerry Ruth)*

**QUESTION:** Will the floating bridge width be constant [across the water] for new construction? What is the width of each lane? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *Yes. Starting from the south, there is a 2-foot barrier, 10-foot shoulder, two 11-foot general-purpose lanes, 12-foot transit/HOV lane, 4-foot shoulder, 2-foot barrier, 4-foot shoulder, 12-foot transit/HOV lane, two 11-foot general-purpose lanes, 10-foot shoulder, 2-foot barrier and 14-foot bike/ped path. (Kerry Ruth)*

**QUESTION:** Can transit use the proposed 12-foot transit/HOV lane? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *Yes, that is the current plan for transit. (Kerry Ruth)*

**QUESTION:** What is the clearance for the west approach high rise? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *The clearance of the west approach high rise will not change from today's facility. It will remain at 41 feet. (Kerry Ruth)*

**QUESTION:** Is this clearance a requirement from the fire department? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *Yes, this is a requirement of the Seattle Fire Department, and it accommodates the Seattle fire boat. (Kerry Ruth)*

**QUESTION:** What will the width be at the Portage Bay Bridge? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** Combined across all lanes, the bridge width will be 105 feet at its narrowest section. (Kerry Ruth)

**QUESTION:** What will be the width of the transit/HOV lane? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** The transit/HOV lanes will be 12 feet wide. It is the required width. (Kerry Ruth)

**QUESTION:** Can you please confirm that the new transit/HOV direct access ramp to I-5 will be one lane? (Greg Walker)

**RESPONSE:** That is correct. It will be a reversible single lane. (Kerry Ruth)

**QUESTION:** Can you please give me a timeline for when the floating bridge will be built, and how long construction will last? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** The floating bridge will be open to traffic at the end of 2014. Construction will begin in 2012. (Kerry Ruth)

**QUESTION:** Will construction include night work? How many shifts will take place each day? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** WSDOT is evaluating single and double shifts so far. WSDOT is working to finalize details like this for the preferred alternative. More information about construction plans should be available later this fall. (Kerry Ruth/Larry Kyle)

**QUESTION:** Can you elaborate on the timeline of the Eastside Transit and HOV Project? (Julie Meredith)

**RESPONSE:** This piece of the program is moving forward. Construction will begin in 2011. The Eastside corridor will be open by 2014 as well. (Kerry Ruth/Julie Meredith)

### **Montlake Triangle Charrette (Kerry Ruth)**

Kerry Ruth provided an overview of the Montlake Triangle Charrette process. The purpose of the Charrette was to look at the opportunities to enhance regional and local bicycle and pedestrian connections in the Montlake Triangle area. Representatives from WSDOT, SDOT, the Seattle Design Commission, the University of Washington, King County Metro, and Sound Transit developed conceptual designs, and evaluated ideas for an undercrossing, an overcrossing, and at-grade methods of crossing Montlake Boulevard at the U-LINK Station. This group was specifically tasked with looking at a solution for bicycles and pedestrians in this area in conjunction with the University Washington Rainier Vista project and Sound Transit U-LINK Station. Ms. Ruth briefly described each design concept, highlighting the key features. Ms. Ruth noted that the Montlake Triangle Charrette group recommended an overcrossing option for further evaluation. The Charrette group would like to continue working with and evaluating the overcrossing option, but needs the workgroup's input before they proceeded.

**QUESTION:** What is the difference for transit operations between an overcrossing and undercrossing option? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *The operations for transit would be the same with both options. (Kerry Ruth)*

**QUESTION:** Would there be an elevator as part of an undercrossing option? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *Yes, an elevator would be necessary with an undercrossing option. (Kerry Ruth)*

**QUESTION:** Would there be a change to the Sound Transit's head house with either of these options? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *No, there would not be a significant change to the head house with the overcrossing option. A tunnel option may have impacts to the head house of the station. (Greg Walker)*

**QUESTION:** Has the team looked at the height of the overcrossing? (Greg Walker)

**RESPONSE:** *Yes. The overcrossing would remain at 21 feet high to meet trolley requirements. (Kerry Ruth)*

**QUESTION:** Would the overcrossing option require a lowering of NE Pacific Place? (Greg Walker)

**RESPONSE:** *Pacific Place will already be lowered as part of the University of Washington's Rainier Vista Plan, not part of the SR 520 Program. Also, Montlake Boulevard will not be lowered. (Kerry Ruth)*

**QUESTION:** How will an overcrossing or undercrossing option differ for bicycle and pedestrian users? (Theresa Doherty)

**RESPONSE:** *A tunnel undercrossing option only provides a direct pedestrian connection from the University of Washington to the U-LINK Station. An overcrossing provides both cyclists and pedestrians with a direct connection. The overcrossing also provides a better connection from the SR 520 regional trail to the Burke Gilman Trail. (Kerry Ruth)*

**QUESTION:** Is the Montlake Triangle Charrette group still looking at at-grade improvements to Pacific Place and Montlake Boulevard? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *Yes, opportunities for improvement in that area still exist. The team has completed initial analysis, but more discussion needs to happen around this topic. (Kerry Ruth)*

**COMMENT:** I feel that there were many positive benefits to an overcrossing, but I think we need to conduct further analysis to make sure there are no fatal flaws in the design. (Theresa Doherty)

**RESPONSE:** *The rest of the workgroup agreed with this statement.*

([Slides 11-12](#) provide additional information)

**Workgroup recommendation:** The workgroup recommended that WSDOT continue to work with SDOT, the University of Washington, King County Metro, and Sound Transit on further analysis of the overcrossing option.

**Design Refinements and Transit Connections Technical Coordination Team (Kerry Ruth and Stephanie Brown)**

Stephanie Brown, SDOT, reviewed the work that has been done to date by the Technical Coordination Team (TCT). Ms. Brown noted that between June 25 and July 8 WSDOT and SDOT asked for public feedback on their draft work plan. The TCT received a total of four comments – three from stakeholder groups and one from an individual.

A few key comments related to design refinements included:

- Consider noise effects of any design refinements.
- Consider bicycle enhancements with traffic calming and pedestrian enhancement design refinements.
- Consider design refinements at the Montlake Interchange that prioritize transit and HOV.

A few key comments we heard related to transit connections included:

- Consider transit connectivity from the Montlake interchange to the Arboretum, not just the University of Washington.
- Focus on fast and easy transfers from local buses to the bus rapid transit routes and the light rail station.

**Transit Connectivity update**

Kerry Ruth, provided an update on the TCT's work on transit connections. The TCT recommends that the transit/HOV lane on northbound Montlake Boulevard, between SR 520 and NE Pacific Street, be placed on the inside or left side of the roadway. The benefits of placing the lane in the inside include:

- Ease of movement of transit/HOV's from the SR 520 westbound off-ramp on to northbound Montlake Boulevard.
- All buses (except one route that operates three times per day (RT 243)) turn left off of Montlake Boulevard on to NE Pacific Street. Therefore, placing the transit/HOV lane on the inside allows this movement to occur for regional buses without switching lanes on Montlake Boulevard.

The TCT recommends that the transit/HOV lane on southbound Montlake Boulevard, between SR 520 and NE Pacific Street, be placed on the outside or right side of the roadway. The benefits of placing the lane on the outside include:

- The lane is recognized as an extension of the current transit/HOV lane that exists on NE Pacific Street. We assumed that the signal priority function would continue

to operate for transit and HOV at the Montlake Boulevard NE and NE Pacific Street intersection.

- Further south the majority of traffic on Montlake Boulevard in the right or outside lanes is accessing the SR 520 on-ramps. Therefore, the lane is proposed to end at Shelby prior to the westbound SR 520 on-ramp in order to allow time for regional buses to merge to the left turn lane on to the SR 520 eastbound direct access ramp.
- The majority of transit riders who cross the Montlake Bridge in the southbound direction are on the local bus service. The outside lane placement allows local buses to move to the through lane on Montlake Boulevard to proceed further south of the 520/Montlake intersection.
- Regional buses still benefit from this transit/HOV lane by bypassing traffic up to E. Shelby Street. This is particularly an advantage when the drawbridge opens and buses can move to the front of the line. We will continue to coordinate regarding the potential of implementing signal transit priority that could clear the buses when the bridge closes.

Workgroup recommendation: The workgroup recommended that WSDOT continue to analyze the transit/HOV lanes on northbound and southbound Montlake Boulevard in the configurations recommended by the TCT.

Kerry also provided an overview the TCT's work on relocating bus stops in the Montlake vicinity. In the northbound direction, the TCT is evaluating the feasibility of placing a new bus stop on Montlake Boulevard at the Montlake lid or at E. North Street. In the southbound direction, the TCT is evaluating the feasibility of placing a bus stop near the Hop-In Market. The TCT will provide more information on bus stop relocations at the next Workgroup meeting.

#### Bicycle and pedestrian connectivity update

The technical coordination team convened a smaller subgroup made up of representatives from WSDOT, SDOT, and the Seattle Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Boards. This group will be working to identify key routes for bicyclists and pedestrians throughout the corridor and will have more to report back on this topic at the August meeting.

#### Arboretum traffic calming and traffic management update

Stephanie outlined an approach for how the TCT and Workgroup will coordinate Arboretum Botanical Garden Committee (ABGC). She highlighted key milestones specific to the traffic management plan. In early July the technical coordination team identified several goals to discuss with the ABGC and utilize as a framework for this effort moving forward. These included:

- Increased bicycle and pedestrian use and safety through the Arboretum.
- Reduced queue lengths in the Arboretum (compared to a No Build scenario).

- Reduced noise in the Arboretum area.
- Increased use of the Arboretum Park.
- Reduced total number of automobile trips through the Arboretum.
- Maintain transit reliability on Montlake
- Boulevard and 23rd Avenue.

([Slides 18-19](#) provide additional information)

**QUESTION:** What will the traffic management plan include? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *We plan to look at how we can improve a number of city arterials. There will be improvements to Montlake Boulevard. For example, signal timing changes. The traffic management plan is included as a future topic for the TCT to address. (Stephanie Brown)*

**QUESTION:** There will be tolling in the spring. Does that have any early impacts to the grid system that we need to think about with WSDOT now? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *We will be working through this topic in the technical coordination team meetings. (Stephanie Brown)*

**QUESTION:** Is there data for before and after volumes on SR 520 during tolling? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *We can cover this issue when the TCT looks at traffic volumes on SR 520. (Stephanie Brown)*

**QUESTION:** Regarding northbound transit/HOV lane configurations on Montlake, will there be phasing at a later date? What does cross-section B [SR 520 preferred alternative at the Montlake Cut] look like? *On the existing bridge, can transit/HOV be accommodated?* (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *In the southbound direction, the TCT evaluated inside versus outside transit/HOV lanes. The recommendation was for outside transit/HOV lanes ending at E Shelby St. There are not modifications to the existing bascule bridge, except restriping, as it is a historic structure. We can accommodate two general purpose lanes and a transit/HOV lane. There will be an additional 5.5 feet of width remaining that could be utilized as a bicycle lane. The TCT is currently discussing this, but there are no recommendations yet. In regard to phasing, the TCT will analyze if the second bascule bridge could be phased into the project at a later date. (Kerry Ruth)*

**QUESTION:** For Montlake Boulevard, I thought the standard was 11 feet for a general-purpose lane? It shows 12. The communities are interested in narrowing this corridor as much as possible. (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *We will discuss that when we bring up the topic of channelization in the TCT. (Kerry Ruth)*

**QUESTION:** Related to movements in the interchange area, what about access to SR 520 heading southbound on Montlake? General traffic is only allowed to turn right. What about people wanting to go south off of SR 520? (Greg Walker)

**RESPONSE:** *The direct-access lanes are only for transit and HOV. All of these will go to and from the University area. From eastbound SR 520, vehicles would use the 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue intersection to access southbound Montlake Boulevard. (Kerry Ruth)*

**QUESTION:** How many movements will be accommodated at this intersection? (Greg Walker)

**RESPONSE:** *For vehicles coming off of SR 520, the signal only allows right turn movements onto Montlake Boulevard. At this intersection, we are accommodating northbound and southbound through traffic on Montlake Boulevard, westbound off and transit/HOV on and off. (Kerry Ruth)*

**COMMENT:** What about a queue jump from the right hand lane at E. Shelby Street? (David Hull)

**RESPONSE:** *We understand the importance of queue jumps, and will continue to look into these at various intersections. (Kerry Ruth)*

**QUESTION:** Buses that cross SR 520 are on the outside in a 12 foot lane, moving over into an 11 foot lane. Could the 11 foot lane be wider? (David Hull)

**RESPONSE:** *We made a decision not to widen Montlake Boulevard. There are currently no impacts to the planted median strip in that area. (Stephanie Brown)*

**QUESTION:** But why did you choose outside? Why not inside? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *Remember, buses are starting on the outside at NE Pacific Street. They would have to transition to the inside. It makes more sense to keep them on the outside first. (Stephanie Brown)*

**COMMENT:** 60 percent of buses are local and are heading south on Montlake Boulevard. 40 percent of buses are regional and are turning left onto SR 520. We gave the benefit to the 60 percent versus the 40 percent. (Greg Walker)

**QUESTION:** So on this slide, the existing stops are yellow? How far is it to the U-Link station? (Greg Walker)

**RESPONSE:** *Approximately 1,050 feet. The existing stops are less than 1,200 feet from the U-Link station, which was a requirement in the legislation. Please note the potential bus stops in the Montlake vicinity are also less than 1,200 feet. (Kerry Ruth)*

**COMMENT:** This sounds like a good idea. In addition to 1,200 feet, please also pay attention to where folks are going to. Don't just look at the U-Link station. Option C looks like a good option. (David Hull)

**QUESTION:** So you are looking at bus stops, but you are also looking at pedestrian connectivity, right? (Bob Powers)

**RESPONSE:** *Yes. And this is why we do not have a formal recommendation yet. It is important that we work together and integrate this topic into our work on bicycle/pedestrian connectivity. (Kerry Ruth)*

### **Public Comment**

Comments below are a summary of verbal comments and are not recorded verbatim.

#### **Comment 1: Jean Amick**

Thank you Bob Powers – you have asked very pertinent questions today. My other comment is that we have the latest graphic of the bridge to nowhere. It is quite distressing coming from Northeast Seattle. Please see what you can do about that.

#### **Comment 2: Colleen McAleer with Laurelhurst Community Club**

Thank you for your work. To reiterate Jean’s comment, we are building a bridge that doesn’t function all the way across and doesn’t meet the original workgroup’s requirement of six functioning lanes. It moves the bottleneck to the top of Lake Washington. How do we make 33 percent more vehicles go through the neighborhoods and Arboretum, with all the noise, pollution, and more? Also, there is a problem with capacity on Montlake Boulevard, University Village is doubling in size and Children’s Hospital is growing by 150 percent.

#### **Comment 3: Larry Sinnott with Friends of Seattle’s Olmsted Parks**

My group is very concerned about left turns at the bottom of 24th Avenue onto E. Lake Washington Boulevard. Under Option A in the SDEIS, capacity is already reduced to 1,200 vehicles. We still accommodated getting Madison Park and Madrona people to their neighborhoods. This is a terrible compromise. Allowing general purpose traffic to make that left turn brings back 50 percent of the traffic that shouldn’t be there in the first place.

#### **Comment 4: Paige Miller with the Arboretum Foundation**

Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I am speaking on behalf of the Arboretum Foundation. Thanks for the work you’ve done and time you have spent. Bob, thank you for asking so many wonderful questions, especially related to pedestrians. Look at where the pedestrians are going to UW, and how to connect to the Arboretum. Like Larry, I am concerned about traffic that would turn left onto Lake Washington Boulevard. Please consider tolling to reduce incentive for people to use Lake Washington Boulevard as a through route to or from SR 520. When we first learned about the 45 mile per hour speed limit as a way to reduce noise, Barbara Wright and I asked WSDOT to consider moving 45 miles per hour speed limit all the way to Foster Island. The only real way to reduce noise in the Arboretum is to reduce traffic.

**Comment 5: Edward Speer, Lake Washington Boulevard Property Owner**

I am a resident of Lake Washington Boulevard. This is a low intensity conflict. There are lots of details that there is no money for. Yellow lines are not local streets, they are off-ramps. The Arboretum off-ramps are being moved. Left turn lanes (24th Avenue and Lake Washington Boulevard) are a huge mistake. I'm not sure how it will work. All of these details must be worked out, but there is no money for it.

**Comment 6: Jonathan Dubman with the Montlake Community Council**

First, I'm against the six-lane corridor. Four-lanes do meet the purpose and need of the project. It's a 20th century solution. Second, the second drawbridge concept is absurd while the South Park Bridge is being condemned. It costs \$80 million dollars that we don't have, and impacts cultural resources. We want to redirect resources to support other needs.

**Comment 7: John Albert, Lake Washington Boulevard Property Owner**

We want to make sure that our voice is heard. This is very distressing for us. It moves a huge amount of traffic in front of our house (by 24th Avenue). Traffic is too fast. Cyclists and animals get hit. Something has to be done about the traffic.

**Comment 8: Ted Lane with Portage Bay / Roanoke Park Community Council**

I am very concerned about the 10<sup>th</sup> and Roanoke intersection that will be reconfigured. It is like a slip ramp – it accelerates traffic. We would like to see that idea considered as we move forward. We are concerned looking at noise and pollution that the I-5 lid removal will bring. We are concerned about expanding bikeways and trails in front of the Seward school (the homestead trail). We would like to see it extended, not dropped. We are concerned about the design of the Portage Bay Bridge. It could sound better with noise reduction. Roanoke historic district overlooks the Portage Bay Bridge, and this is a major issue. Too much noise, too ugly.

**Comment 9: Fran Conley with the Coalition for a Sustainable 520**

I have spent months with several dozen people involving responding to the SDEIS. Please read our response, as we have relevant concerns about what you're doing today. Please specify that mitigation must be complete at time of construction. Our neighborhoods have said to you that we're concerned about noise. And, according to a recent presentation at the Portage Bay/Roanoke Park community council WSDOT is only planning to do what's required by FHWA and nothing else. There are a great series of recommendations in place by a panel of experts, hired by WSDOT. Please implement these.

**Comment 10: Ed Newbold**

What's the efficiency of tolling? How many dollars will be raised? How much will it cost? I'm just opposed to the project. How many wetlands will be destroyed? What percentage? Is there a way to show what the marsh looks like now, and what it will look like then? I'd like to see the image of what we're losing. I am also curious about the \$2 billion shortfall.

**Comment 11: Mark Weed**

I support this process. There is a document with great information about issues – just like the question about wetlands – the 2010 January SDEIS. There are unintended consequences – neighborhoods are suggesting some of these, and these should be looked at. Delaying the 2<sup>nd</sup> bascule bridge delays transit service and benefits for corridor and Montlake Boulevard commuters – this is important to the groups I’m involved with. Improvements, such as widening, also need to be made further north along Montlake Boulevard past Husky Stadium.

**Comment 12: Jorgen Bader with the University District Community Council**

In reference to the widening of Montlake Boulevard north of the Lake Washington Ship Canal, especially north of the transit station; the University District Community Council is opposed to this, as are the other north end neighborhoods groups. In respect to the Portage Bay Bridge design, please have a design competition. It could save \$20 million, and bring the figure down to where it should be.

**Adjourn**

The group was reminded that the next meeting is on August 19, and adjourned.